

# Chapter 1

# Chapter 1

**IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ARTICLES OF THE  
CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY IN BRAZIL**



## Implementation of the Articles of the Convention on Biological Diversity in Brazil

Please provide the following details on the origin of this report

Contracting Party	Brazil	
<b>National Focal Point</b>		
Full Name of the Institution	MRE – Division of Environment	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Name and title of contact officer	Everton Vargas Diretor Geral do Departamento do Meio Ambiente e Temas Especiais	
Mailing Address	Divisão de Meio Ambiente do Ministério das Relações Exteriores Anexo I 4º andar sala 439 CEP 70.170-900 Brasília, DF	
Telephone:	55 61 411 6801	
Fax:	55 61 411 6811	
E-mail:	<a href="mailto:evargas@mre.gov.br">evargas@mre.gov.br</a>	
<b>Contact officer for national report</b>		
Full name of institution	Ministry of the Environment Secretariat for Biodiversity and Forests	
Name and title of contact officer	Paulo Yoshio Kageyama Director for the National Biodiversity Conservation Programme	
Mailing Address	SCEN Trecho 2, Setor de Clubes Desportivos Norte Ed. Sede do IBAMA, Bloco H 70818-900 Brasília, DF Brazil	
Telephone	55 61 325 3987 / 55 61 325 5590	
Fax	55 61 3257967	
E-mail	<a href="mailto:paulo.kageyama@mma.gov.br">paulo.kageyama@mma.gov.br</a> <a href="http://www.mma.gov.br">http://www.mma.gov.br</a>	
<b>Submission</b>		
Signature of officer responsible for submitting the national report		
Date of submission	Final version approved by the National Commission for Biodiversity – CONABIO on the 24 <sup>th</sup> October 2003	

# Chapter 1

*Please provide summary information on the process by which this report has been prepared, including information on the stakeholders actively involved in its preparation and on the material used as a basis for the report.*

Three sectors were consulted in the preparation of the *Second National Report for the Convention on Biological Diversity*: 1) Federal Government, 2) State Governments, and 3) Non-governmental organizations. First the MMA team drew up a memorandum summarizing the results of a questionnaire based on a survey (mainly via the internet) of the initiatives of the different sectors of society addressing the articles of the Convention. The memorandum was presented at two consultative meetings: one with representatives of the 50 federal government programmes of the Pluri-annual Plan (7<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> November, 2002, Brasília) and the other with representatives of 19 non-governmental organizations (26<sup>th</sup>-27<sup>th</sup> November, 2002, Brasília). The memorandum included the principal experiences of the state governments (26 states and the Federal District) with regard to their compliance with the CBD articles.

Fifty of 396 federal programmes of the *Plano Plurianual do Governo* – PPA [Government Pluri-annual Plan – PPA] were selected. For each, the main initiatives were summarized and mapped, and directives were formally established by the Brazilian government in areas which in principal were not directly related to biodiversity issues but had implications for the country's commitment regarding the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity – CBD. A survey of these 50 programmes was carried out, based on information from the Internet and the document: *Políticas Públicas e Biodiversidade no Brasil* [Public Policies and Biodiversity in Brazil] by P. Leitão, S. Albagli and F. Leite.

Information available on-line and in the publications of non-governmental organizations concerning the fulfillment of the Convention on Biological Diversity was compiled and organized and included as comments to the guidelines relevant to each article.

The present version of this report was based on the considerations resulting from the two workshops (50 federal government programmes of the Pluri-annual Plan and of the 19 non-governmental organizations).

State Environmental Secretariats or equivalent agencies of each member of the federation (27 in total) were asked to include comments regarding their achievements in relation to the articles of the Convention. Information was also extracted from the document *Diagnóstico da Gestão Ambiental no Brasil* ["Diagnosis of Environmental Administration and Management in Brazil"] (a product of the *Programa Nacional do Meio Ambiente II – PNMA II* [National Environment Program II – PNMA], which in 2000 consolidated all aspects of environmental management by the Brazilian States in five volumes, available at [www.mma.gov.br/port/se/pnma2/index.cfm](http://www.mma.gov.br/port/se/pnma2/index.cfm)). Information was also obtained from the web sites of the state governments.

Further information was collected individually from the staff of pertinent federal and state institutions and non-governmental organizations.

A preliminary version was sent to the Secretariat of CBD in December 2002.

On the 24<sup>th</sup> October 2003, this report was approved by the CONABIO – National Commission on Biodiversity, according to the attributes established by the Decree No. 4,703, dated on the 21<sup>st</sup> May 2003.

*Please provide information on any particular circumstances in your country that are relevant to understanding the answers to the questions in this report.*

A country of continental dimensions, Brazil has numerous and significant regional differences, not only in physical and ecological aspects but also in terms of socio-economy and politics. Regional differences are generally considerable and, although necessary, it is as such difficult to generalize on the country as a whole, obscuring as it does the reality of extensive areas, and obscuring important information through considerations expressed as averages. This is especially serious, for example, when it fails to bring to light the chronic problems in the poorest regions – the North and Northeast.

To adjust for this aspect of the methodology, a memorandum was prepared prior to the consultation, which summarized the replies and comments of the questionnaire with a view to helping in the identification of common denominators among the representatives of the various institutions involved in managing biodiversity. Divergences and differing interpretations regarding the application of particular articles among the various sectors consulted were duly noted.

For general information on Brazil: [www.ibge.gov.br](http://www.ibge.gov.br).

## PRELIMINARY DISPOSITIONS

*The Conference of the Parties (COP) has established work programs that respond to a number of Articles. Please identify the relative priority accorded to each theme and the adequacy of resources. This will allow for the contextualization of the resulting information on the implementation of each Article. There are other questions on the implementation of the work programmes at the end of these guidelines.*

### *Inland water ecosystems*

<b>1. What is the relative priority for implementation of this work programme in your country?</b>	
a) High	
b) Medium	
c) Low	X
d) Not relevant	
<b>2. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?</b>	
a) Good	
b) Adequate	
c) Limiting	X
d) Severely limiting	

### *Marine and coastal biodiversity*

<b>3. What is the relative priority for implementation of this work programme in your country?</b>	
a) High	
b) Medium	X
c) Low	
d) Not relevant	
<b>4. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?</b>	
a) Good	
b) Adequate	
c) Limiting	
d) Severely limiting	X

# Chapter 1

5. What is the relative priority for implementation of this work programme in your country?	
a) High	
b) Medium	X
c) Low	
d) Not relevant	
6. 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	

## *Forest biodiversity*

7. What is the relative priority for implementation of this work programme in your country?	
a) High	X
b) Medium	
c) Low	
d) Not relevant	
8. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?	
a) Good	
b) Adequate	
c) Limiting	
d) Severely limiting	X

## *Biodiversity of dry and sub-humid areas*

9. What is the relative priority for implementation of this work programme in your country?	
a) High	
b) Medium	
c) Low	X
d) Not relevant	
10. To what extent are the resources available adequate for meeting the obligations and recommendations made?	
a) Good	
b) Adequate	
c) Limiting	
d) Severely limiting	X

## Further comments on work programmes and priorities

### Questions 1 and 2.

Important progress in the Administration and Management of Water Resources in Brazil. A significant step was the publication of Law No.9433, 8<sup>th</sup> January, 1997, which established the *Política Nacional de Recursos Hídricos* [National Policy for Water Resources], to be implemented by the *Agência Nacional de Águas - ANA* [National Water Agency - ANA] (see [www.ana.gov.br](http://www.ana.gov.br)).

### Questions 1-10.

Policies for the conservation of biodiversity in Brazil have tended to privilege forest ecosystems such as those of Amazon and the Atlantic Forest. To address this bias, from 1998 to 2001 the Ministry of Environment, through the *Projeto de Conservação e Utilização Sustentável da Diversidade Biológica Brasileira – PROBIO* [Project for Conservation and Sustainable Use of Brazilian Biological Diversity], financed by the GEF, held five workshops to determine priority areas for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use as well as for the sharing of the benefits resulting from the access to the genetic resources and the associated traditional knowledge in five principal biome groups of the country: 1) Cerrado (bush savannah of central Brazil) and Pantanal (floodplains and swamps of the upper Rio Paraguay); 2) Mata Atlântica (Atlantic Forest) and Campos Sulinos (southern grasslands); 3) Caatinga (xerophytic forest and semi-desert thorn scrub) of the Northeast; 4) Amazon (tropical rain forest and savannahs); and 5) the Coastal and Marine Zones. Each workshop counted on the participation of an average of 200 specialists and resulted in full reports and an executive summary for each biome, with maps of the priority areas and recommendations for their use and conservation. These five evaluations were published together (in Portuguese) in *Biodiversidade Brasileira: Avaliação e Identificação de Áreas e Ações Prioritárias para Conservação, Utilização Sustentável e Repartição de Benefícios da Biodiversidade Brasileira* [Brazilian Biodiversity: Evaluation and Identification of Priority Areas and Actions for the Conservation, Sustainable Use and Sharing of Benefits of Brazilian Biodiversity], No.5 of the “Biodiversity” Series of the MMA (available at [www.mma.gov.br/port/sbf/chm/relpub.html#biodivbr](http://www.mma.gov.br/port/sbf/chm/relpub.html#biodivbr)). (See Chapter 3 of this report.) Nine hundred areas were identified as of priority for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, and for benefit sharing resulting from the access to the genetic resources and the associated traditional knowledge, and summary recommendations were made for actions within each, including, for example, management and recuperation and the creation of protected areas when appropriate. Priority for the protection of these areas was ranked as: “Extremely high”, “High”, or “Medium”, and many were classified as “Insufficiently known”. The recommendations arising from the assessments of each biome are being adopted in programmes and initiatives for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use by government and non-governmental organizations. As an example, the *Fundo Nacional do Meio Ambiente – FNMA* [National Environment Fund – FNMA], which finances projects to support the *Política Nacional do Meio Ambiente* [National Environment Policy], has established funding opportunities for projects in the priority areas selected by the workshops.

Two Brazilian states, Pernambuco and Minas Gerais, have carried out the following independent priority-setting initiatives:

- The Atlas of Biodiversity of Pernambuco. A publication which identifies priority actions for the conservation of the state’s biodiversity, including an insert with numerous maps of the ecosystems and priority areas for the different taxonomic groups. One hundred and seventeen researchers were involved in the project. The Atlas, with more than 100 articles providing a comprehensive evaluation of the biodiversity of the state of Pernambuco, was published in 2001 in two volumes by the Massangana Publishing Company.
- The Atlas of Biodiversity for the State of Minas Gerais. A pioneering initiative in regional planning of the state of Minas Gerais in 1998 included a workshop involving the scientific community and environmentalists, which defined and mapped priorities for the conservation of its biodiversity. The results of the discussions and deliberations were summarized in a publication, *Biodiversidade em Minas Gerais: Um Atlas para sua Conservação* [Biodiversity in Minas Gerais: An Atlas for Its Conservation]. The information provides the wherewithal for the strategic planning of conservation actions in the state, especially those involving the creation of protected areas, and defines the priorities for inventories and research.