Comparative Advantages of Conservation Trust Fund versus a Project Financing Approach for Protected Area Systems

- PHASE 1 -
Comparative Advantages of CTF versus a Project Financing Approach for Protected Area Systems

Key Question:

“Why should significant amounts of scarce and expensive resources be committed in the capitalization of a CTF, with small returns over the long term, while more immediate and visible results could be achieved with immediate and direct investments on biodiversity conservation in the form of short-term projects?”

Issues:

Local authorities in beneficiary countries do not see the comparative advantages of CTF financing

Majority of international donor agencies prefer project-based financing

Broader debate focused on the risks with Innovative Financing Mechanisms (IFM) for biodiversity
Objective:

to compare the advantages and disadvantages of financing through a long-term, CTF mechanism versus a project-finance approach to support Protected Areas Systems, as well as to put in evidence the conditions that determine the decision of both investment options. The focus of the study is on Africa and LAC.
Comparative Advantages of CTF versus a Project Financing Approach for Protected Area Systems

Content:
1/ Concepts and Good International Practices (broad review + OECD principles: PPP & UPP, Public finance, advocate increased use of PA system financing strategies)

2/ The Voice of PA Finance Practitioners: Web Survey.
   - Fund Managers / Project Managers / UNDP reg rep / Donors
   - 76 replies (21 Funds, 24 Projects, 10 PA, 9 UNDP, 7 Donors)

3/ Desk review of 10 cases of Parks & CTF (Benin, Bhutan, Chile, Ecuador, Madagascar, Mauritania, Mexico, Peru, Tanzania, Uganda)

4/ Conclusions and recommendations: Determining factors and elements of comparison between CTF (long-term) and donor project finance (short-term).
Underlying issue:
In most countries a PA financing gap exists, i.e. the demand for finance in a national PA system is significantly higher than the supply of finance. In many countries this gap is expected to increase over time.

**Belize**
An estimated **US$8.9 million** was spent in total on the PA system in 2010. Using the UNDP’s Financial Scorecard methodology (Bovarnick, 2010) and the Threshold of Sustainability for Tourism approach (Drumm, McCool, Rieger, 2011), financing needs for a basic scenario is **US$18.5 million**.

**Funding Gap:** **US$9.6 million** for the basic scenario increasing to **US$ 19.4 million** for an optimal scenario.
1) to elaborate an **overall PA financing strategy**: identification of needs and gaps as part of a business plan, taking into account:

- Identification
- Segmentation of needs
- Life cycle of the PA

Ref. management effectiveness tools: METT, UNDP Scorecard, etc.
2) identify which mechanisms /tools (projects, CTF), when and in what form, can help finance which priority gaps and needs of PAs, in the context of long term strategic importance of maintaining the PA system
1 – Concepts and Good International Practices
1 – Concepts and Good International Practices
...then need to aggregate this at the level of a PA system (below example not in the study)

Based on your personal experience and opinion, which type of finance is better for the financial sustainability of Protected Areas (PAs)?
Web survey results

- For 2/3 of aspects covered: preference for a CTF approach

- Preferences for CTF:
  - long term sustainability of operations,
  - local ownership in PA management,
  - leveraging additional financial sources and lowering transaction costs

- Preference for project-finance approach:
  - realizing new PAs,
  - demonstrating and mainstreaming new innovative solutions and technologies,
  - realizing technology transfer
  - implementing demonstration projects
Determining factors and elements of comparison between CTF (long-term) and donor project finance (short-term)

Analysis of when CTF and/or donor projects contribute to, among other things: building capacity, building institutions, encouraging enabling policies, delivering conservation, enhancing the effectiveness of overall PA management
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation Trust Fund</th>
<th>Project-Specific Finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A steady flow of smaller funding amounts towards <strong>financial sustainability of PAs</strong> - reduces funding gaps</td>
<td>Time limited – normally larger amounts over a shorter time – not a steady financial flow - sustainability not built in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finances smaller amounts for management activities</td>
<td>Needs to spend large sums of money quickly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential for harmonization and alignment of donor funding</strong></td>
<td>Projects raise issues of harmonization and alignment of donor funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less restrictive, <strong>more flexible</strong> allocations and rapid response</td>
<td>More restrictive use of funds – need to focus on project log frame. Harder to respond to emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Market risk is a structural element</strong></td>
<td>Risk that project design may not take into account absorptive capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicability of funding for long-term expenditure planning - can create local supplier capacity</td>
<td>Ability to <strong>procure best international expertise and execute larger contracts for goods and services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential to leverage additional funding from multiple sources over time</strong></td>
<td>Project has co-financing scheme up-front and less ability to leverage additional resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local institution with programs run by local experts – long term capacity built – benefits from local understanding</td>
<td>Project reliance on external experts with less knowledge of local conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CTF as advocacy organization and as a key actor of public policy lobbying: multi-donor and multi-stakeholder structure of a CTF makes it a very effective instrument to lobby for policy.

- **Madagascar Biodiversity Fund**: success in attracting, bundling and coordinating the allocation of endowment capital and sinking funds of a multitude of donors.
- Development of specific operational guidelines and procedures for PA’s e.g.: earmarking, eligible recurrent costs, the eligibility and priority criteria to choose protected areas that are suitable for financing, as well as requirements for contracting protected area management, fiduciary management, safeguard aspects and monitoring.
CTFs generally have a business/PA finance strategy attached that is in line with government and PA policy. That strategy provides a clear pathway to systematically address financial and capacity barriers over time.

In Uganda the **Bwindi Mgahinga Trust** has supported key PA management plan components of two important PAs with endangered mountain gorillas since 1995.

Earnings from the Eco-tourism in those parks today subsidizes the operations of the national park system with the Trust supporting community programs, research and targeted management – making more funds available for other PAs.
Some Lessons

CTFs are a very useful vehicle to provide long-term financing for PA’s and implementation of PA policy- but there are limitations

CTF funding is often limited in amount and scale – larger investments such as project financing is necessary to meet infrastructure and other investment needs

CTFs play an important regional and national institutional role – a private or public-private venture dedicated to providing public goods

We have a framework of criteria for comparing CTF and project financing but more feedback and information required
Objective: complement & illustrate with concrete examples some of the main conclusions from 1st PHASE + Synthesis

- Field work in 4 Protected Areas sites:
  - a PA site having benefitted from an ‘old’ African CTF (Uganda or Tanzania);
  - a PA in Mexico, benefit from a RedLAC member;
  - a PA with many projects but without any benefit from a CTF (Benin);
  - a PA in Madagascar, having benefitted from Project and a new CTF.
- Review of each PA sites’ financing model
- Synthesis report (1st PHASE + illustration from the field + general conclusions and recommendations)
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