

Protected Area Management

Options open to Development Co-operation for Supporting Environmental Funds

Protected Area Management

Options open to Development Co-operation for Supporting Environmental Funds

Uwe Klug

Eschborn, 2001

Series number: ABS-7e

Publisher:	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH Postfach 5180 D-65726 Eschborn
Responsible:	„Schutzgebietsmanagement und Randzonen entwicklung ABS-LISTRA“ Dr. Rolf Mack/Kirsten Hegener
Author:	Uwe Klug
Translation:	Oliver Pye, Melissa Moye
Editing:	Michaela Hammer
Production:	TZ-Verlagsgesellschaft mbH, D-64380 Roßdorf
ISBN:	3-933984-97-1
Nominal fee:	5,- €

© 2001 All rights reserved

Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	OBJECTIVES, ORGANISATION AND MANAGEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL FUNDS	3
2.1	Background and Objectives of Environmental Funds	3
2.2	Legal Structures of Environmental Funds.....	4
2.3	Supervisory Structures of Environmental Funds.....	7
2.4	Management of Environmental Funds	8
2.5	Financing Environmental Funds.....	10
2.6	Asset management.....	13
3	POLICY AND EXPERIENCE OF SELECTED ORGANISATIONS IN DEVELOPMENT CO-OPERATION WITH ENVIRONMENTAL FUNDS	15
3.1	Experience of Specific Institutions within German Development Co-operation with Environmental Funds	15
3.1.1	Framework.....	15
3.1.2	Examples	19
3.2	Policy and experience of selected other donors with environmental funds.....	19
3.2.1	GEF	20
3.2.2	USAID.....	21
3.2.3	International NGOs.....	23
3.2.4	Co-operation between environmental funds.....	23
3.3	Framework for the Support of Environmental Funds.....	24
3.4	Typical Steps for the Establishment of an Environmental Fund (according to the IPG, 2000, slightly modified).....	28
3.5	Options open to German Development Co-operation for supporting the establishment of Environmental Funds	29
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	33
	INTERLOCUTORS	37
	ENVIRONMENTAL FUNDS IN AFRICA, ASIA AND LATIN AMERICA.....	39

1 Introduction

This study was commissioned by the sectoral project 'Protected Area and Bufferzone Management' of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ). The study's objective is to describe the current international practice and discussion of environmental funds as a tool to support conservation measures as well as to discuss the experience made by and possibilities open to German development co-operation organisations in utilising this innovative finance instrument.

The increasing interest of German development co-operation in environmental funds can be explained by the fact that the sustainability of many conservation projects is uncertain after support has ended. This is because the financial basis of running costs and the follow-on costs of managing protected areas are not sufficiently guaranteed.

Even though most projects made efforts to increase revenue by decreasing the costs involved in managing the protected area and by improving the quality of the protected area, this was usually only successful in exceptional cases where the protected area had a high touristic potential. This topic is especially relevant today as, due to the new priorities of the Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development (BMZ) in focal areas and partner countries, many of the protected area projects will soon come to an end.

The possibilities open to partner governments to fill the funding gaps through grants from government budgets are limited, especially because of the low level of public support for conservation. Those government institutions which are charged with the task of implementing conservation measures have to compete with other budget lines and sectors over the increasingly scarce fiscal resources in order to fulfil their long-term responsibilities. The debt crisis of many developing countries in the eighties and the implementation of structural adjustment programmes have further aggravated budgetary problems for conservation.

With the ratification of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the preservation of biodiversity is now seen as a global responsibility and the costs generated by measures to protect biodiversity need to be covered by national and international sources. In particular, the industrialised countries are called on to support developing countries in the implementation of the convention by supplying additional funding and measures for strengthening national management capacities. In effect, this means that the global effects of protecting biodiversity (biodiversity, protection of water cycles and CO₂-sink) are internalised. The main financing mechanism introduced for the CBD is the *Global Environment Facility* (GEF), which, to date, has been the most important funding source for environmental funds.

As a response to the debt crisis, from the beginning of the nineties onwards, environmental funds have been established as an innovative instrument to fund conservation, through which, relatively large amounts have been mobilised for conservation at low transaction costs. A pioneering role in this respect was played by the US Agency for International Development (USAID) and US conservation non-governmental organisations (NGOs), including Conservation International (CI), The Nature Conservancy (TNC) and the WWF-US.

The information for this study was generated by analysing relevant literature on environmental funds as well as through interviews with representatives of organisations which have had comprehensive experience with this instrument (CI, GEF, TNC, World Bank, WWF-US) and with representatives of German development co-operation organisations (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit – GTZ, Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau - KfW, WWF-Germany).

2 Objectives, Organisation and Management of Environmental Funds

2.1 Background and Objectives of Environmental Funds

Over the past several years, environmental funds for the long-term financing of environmental and conservation measures have been established in many countries. World-wide, over US\$ 500 million, usually in the form of permanent capital endowments, have been invested in over 40 environmental funds which have the objective of creating a long-term financial security for protected areas.¹

Initially, the environmental funds were seen as an innovative instrument which, within the framework of debt-for-nature swaps, could help to channel relatively high sums of capital with low transaction costs into nature and environmental conservation measures. Within the framework of protected area management, environmental funds serve in particular to guarantee a long-term source of funding for running costs of protected areas.

This explains the increased interest in this financing instrument, as in contrast to project financing, a long-term predictable financing stream is supplied which can guarantee a significant portion of the funding required for operating, running and reinvestment costs.

The evaluation conducted by the GEF in 1999² underlines the fact that environmental funds also make an important contribution to:

- the development of national conservation strategies;
- the strengthening of structures in civil society and thereby of the social and political embodiment of conservation aspirations; and
- the availability of expert knowledge.

¹ I. Inamdar a. de Merode, E. (1999): Towards Financial Sustainability for Protected Areas. WWF-UK, Godalming.

² GEF (1999): Experience with Conservation Trust Funds, Evaluation Report #1-99. Washington.

The term “environmental funds” describes financing mechanisms for which four fundamental components are essential:

- **Capital assets**, which are invested in order to generate income.
- **Legal structures**, which define the objectives and procedures involved in investing this capital. In most cases, this is a non-governmental form of organisation.
- A **supervisory structure**, which decides how to use the funds. The members of this body should represent different interest groups, including local populations, NGOs, government institutions and donor organisations.
- A **management structure**, which is responsible for the implementation of measures. In the case of environmental funds supporting protected areas, these are usually national conservation institutions or the protected areas administrations that are formally independent of the environmental fund. Operative environmental funds (grant funds), which fund different target groups, need to establish their own structures.

De facto, there are no typical environmental funds. Their concrete form is dependent on the pursued objectives, the legal framework, their role within national conservation planning, etc.

2.1 Legal Structures of Environmental Funds

Environmental funds are normally established with non-governmental structures. Their legal characteristics are dependent on the legal system of the country in which the environmental fund is to be set up.

In countries where the legal system is based on English **common law**³, the legal form of a ‘Trust Fund’ is used⁴. In this case, money or other capital is transferred to a trustee as owner and administrator. The transfer of ownership rights takes

³ For example the UK, US, Canada, India, and most English-speaking countries in Africa, the Caribbean and the South Pacific

⁴ Barry Spergel (2000): Trust Funds in common law countries, in: IPG ed. (2000): The IPG Handbook on Environmental Funds, New York.

place under the condition that revenue will be used for particular persons or predefined objectives.

The 'trustee' is bound to administer the capital wisely and to make sure that it is used for the predefined goals. The trust fund can be established on a permanent basis, so that only the annual revenue of the fund is disbursed (endowment fund). Alternatively, the fund can be established for a predefined period, during which the capital itself is gradually allocated to the specified person or use (sinking fund).

In many countries, tax exemption is guaranteed for revenues generated by trust funds, if these fulfil certain prerequisites (e.g., if they serve the public welfare). Donors to trust funds can expect tax benefits.

In common law countries, trust funds are legally established with the registration of the legal statutes, the deed of trust (or charter, articles of incorporation). This document must specify the goal and site of the trust fund, the composition of the board of trustees, the mode of their appointment and their powers, the powers of the managing director, internal regulations, potential sources of funding, financial management and planned activities.

Depending on legislative practice in the particular country, the trust fund must also receive governmental approval of its statutes and recognition as a non-profit organisation, as well as the permission to earn foreign currency.

Examples:

South Africa	Table Mountain Trust Fund
Belize	Protected Area Conservation Trust
Uganda	Mgahinga-Bwindi Impenetrable Forest Conservation Trust
Sri Lanka	Sri Lanka Wildlife Trust
Bhutan	Bhutan Trust Fund for Environmental Conservation
Ghana	Ghana Heritage Conservation Trust
Papua New Guinea	Papua New Guinea Conservation Trust Fund

In countries with a **civil legal system (code civil)**, the idea of a trust fund in the public interest can take different institutional forms⁵. The most common legal institution is the **foundation** (fondation, fundación, Stiftung, Stichting). To establish a foundation, the founder must, in writing, irrevocably donate capital towards the establishment of a fund under the condition that this fulfils public welfare. Foundations are under special observation by government authorities which make sure the goals of the foundation are followed.

Another form of organisation is the **association**. An association can be founded when two or more parties agree to pursue a particular objective. The minimum number of association members varies from country to country. Whereas in Germany, seven members are required for the foundation of an association, in Argentina, only 2 and in the Dominican Republic, only 5 are necessary.

Some countries (e.g. Japan, Liechtenstein, Peru, Nicaragua) have the option of creating a fund by **national decree**. In some Spanish speaking countries, funds can be created by a **fideicomiso**, in Germany, the foundation of a **Limited Company in the public interest** (gemeinnützige GmbH) is also possible.

The most important criteria for the choice of the legal form as the basis of an environmental fund are, as with the establishment of a trust fund, the recognition of the public welfare status, tax exemption for revenues, the possibility for donors to receive tax benefits and the right to earn foreign currency. The expertise of a lawyer is to be recommended for the sometimes complicated details involved in choosing the right legal form and establishing the organisation.

Examples:

Switzerland	WWF, foundation according to article 80 of the civil code
Seychelles	Seychelles Island Foundation
Honduras	Fundación VIDA, Presidential Decree
The Philippines	Foundation for the Philippine Environment
Dom. Republic	Pronatura, established as an association
Indonesia	Indonesian Biodiversity Foundation

⁵ Marianne Guerin-Mc Manus (2000): Structures typical of civil code legal systems, in: IPG ed. (2000): The IPG Handbook on Environmental Funds, New York.

Panama	Fundación Natura, private non profit organisation
PNG	Papua New Guinea Conservation Trust Fund

2.2 Supervisory Structures of Environmental Funds

With a few exceptions⁶, environmental funds are established as private law organisations. The supervisory body of an environmental fund, the ‘Board of trustees’ (whose designation is stipulated in the relevant legal form of the environmental fund) make all the important decisions concerning the environmental fund. Government and civil society members are represented on the board. This ensures a close collaboration with governmental authorities, without the negative aspects associated with government dominance such as government budget regulations or the environmental fund’s use as a ‘check book’ for the state administration, which can have an effect on the operation of the fund. In order to qualify for funding by the GEF or USAID, the non-governmental members of the board should be in the majority.

Some environmental funds also integrate other bodies into the decision-making process such as plenary assemblies, technical or scientific advisory bodies or representatives of local population groups.

The supervisory bodies have the following fundamental responsibilities:

- **Supervision** of executive management and management structures, the approval of financing and activities reports;
- Strategic and programmatic **orientation** of the fund and the use of the fund assets;
- Approval of the **investment strategy for the funds’ assets; and,**
- **Advocacy** for conservation and the **mobilisation of funds.**

Results of the GEF cross-section evaluation of 13 environmental funds show that environmental funds are more successful to the degree that:

⁶ E.g Bhutan Trust Fund for Environmental Conservation

- A wide spectrum of **relevant governmental and non-governmental protagonists and interest groups** are represented on the supervisory bodies. Apart from national governmental and non-governmental organisations, representatives from donor organisations and international nature conservation NGOs are usually represented. In addition, it can be appropriate to make sure that local village communities and user groups as well as the private sector are represented. Decisions by the supervisory board are usually made according to the principle of majority rule, although donor organisations can be awarded the right to veto decisions.
- the supervisory board is diversified enough to guarantee that expertise required to perform the responsibilities of the supervisory board is available. This can also be achieved by setting up technical advisory committees that can advise the supervisory board on specific questions (e.g. for the asset management, scientific questions).
- The members of the supervisory board consider themselves to be representatives of an independent environmental fund and not of the individual interests of their governmental or non-governmental organisations. In the latter case, the danger is that the fund degenerates into an additional financing instrument of the represented organisations. This can be avoided by appointing persons ad persona and not as representatives of a particular organisation.
- A periodic **rotation of members** allows for new ideas and expertise to be integrated and for the integration of further social groups in the conservation work. The rotation process should be well planned so as to avoid discontinuities in the work.

2.3 Management of Environmental Funds

The organisation of the management structure depends on the objectives pursued within the environmental fund and on its strategic orientation. The resources available to environmental funds are usually limited compared with the needs. It is therefore expedient to focus the fund either thematically or geographically in order to attain significant results.

Additional advantages of focusing activities are the lower administrative costs involved and the fact that expertise only needs to be built up for a certain number of areas. Within protected area management, the main areas of activities for environmental funds are the financing of running costs and possibly the support of local village communities and user groups as well as the encouragement of small enterprises.

The conceptualisation of the programme and the implementation of measures can be executed by the protected area administration.⁷ Experience shows that it is advisable to build up the environmental fund step-by-step, e.g., by initially financing only the running costs of the protected area, and then, in a second phase, to support development measures for the population. This makes sense as the support of local NGOs, self-help organisations and the private sector necessitates a high level of consultative advice by the applicant.

The policy of the GEF and the World Bank is currently to support environmental funds for the financing of national protected area systems. However, it is still possible within this framework to start by supporting one protected area and then to fund more protected areas on a step-by-step basis.

Assistance cycle

Support for protected areas

- The protected area administration sets up an annual budget and operational plan in co-operation with relevant stakeholders.
- The environmental fund (Board) defines the activities worthy of assistance according to the priorities of the protected area (s)
- Agreement on the funding plan, payment according to the plan, verification of technical and financial reports before payment of the next instalment.

⁷ If, for example, the environmental fund aims to develop a broad support programme within the framework of implementing national environmental action plans, then this usually requires a more sophisticated administrative structure (managing director, administrative and technical staff) which cannot be discussed here.

*Support of NGOs, self-help organisations and the private sector
(grant funds)*

- The environmental fund defines the priorities and criteria for assistance and the planned financial volume
- Call for proposals
- The conceptual report is evaluated by a technical committee and its recommendations are given to the board
- Applicants hand in completed project applications. The technical committee completes its evaluation and submits its recommendations to the Board. Applicants often need advice with project planning and with the application
- Board selection of the projects to be supported by the fund and conclusion of a contract with the grantee.

Source: GEF (1999), slight modifications

One important factor for success for an environmental fund is the creation and application of a monitoring and evaluation system. However, the GEF study quoted above came to the surprising conclusion that most funds, both on the programme level and on the single project level, do not operate with adapted monitoring systems and that there was only one case of a plan being set up with the aid of a logical framework.

2.4 Financing Environmental Funds

The following factors are important for the financing of environmental funds:

- The **annual financial needs** need to be estimated in accordance with the objectives of the environmental fund
- The establishment of capital for the environmental fund should follow the three following principles:
 - (1) In the case of '**endowment funds**' (permanent capital assets), the entire capital of the fund is invested and only the income generated by the capital, minus the investment costs (about 0.5 - 1% of the capital invested

- per annum) and with an adjustment for inflation (about 2% per annum) is used. The permanent nature of the capital stock guarantees a long-term planable financial contribution towards the management of the protected area.
- (2) In the case of **'sinking funds'** (capital which is used up), the invested capital is used up over a pre-defined period of time. This mechanism is suitable for those cases in which the objectives of the project can be met within a given period or in which the capital required can be supplied by other sources in the future. Sinking funds are particularly interesting for those bilateral donors whose financing guidelines prohibit contributions to endowment funds . Some environmental funds⁸ invest revenue from sinking funds in endowments in order to build up a long-term perspective.
- (3) In addition to the mechanisms mentioned so far, the capital of an environmental fund can be supplemented by a **'revolving fund'**. This is often made up of assets which are brought into the fund as a partner contribution. Sources can be special taxes, like the tourism tax in Jamaica or levies, like the entrance fees for protected areas in Uganda. These assets are then used to the extent to which they can be replaced by levies or tax collections.

There is in fact no typical environmental fund with respect to the mechanisms discussed. Depending on the objectives, legal framework and potential financial sources, an adapted fund structure needs to be developed. Most environmental funds therefore combine the mechanisms mentioned above in order to achieve a differentiated group of donors with different preferences in their financing policy that enables the solicitation of the highest possible capital assets.

- Apart from the costs of asset management, which should be performed by professional financial service companies, and the adjustment for the rate of inflation, which jointly make up about 3% of the annual revenue generated, the calculation of the financial resources which are actually available needs

⁸ one example is PROFONANPE in Peru

to subtract the **administrative costs** (costs for the ‘board’, administration, fund-raising etc.). In the case of environmental funds with the aim of supporting national park systems, these costs can be kept relatively low, as the main tasks involved with the management of the environmental fund can be taken over by the protected area administration.

➤ The development and implementation of a fundraising strategy is the highest priority of existing funds and should be an important aspect of any environmental fund from the outset⁹. Experience has shown that it is easier to mobilise ‘sinking funds’ than ‘endowments’. However, it is especially ‘endowments’ which guarantee a long-term perspective for a fund and they are therefore of special importance. Because of the unique nature of every fund, each environmental fund needs to tailor its own course of action. The following fundamentals are important for successful resource mobilisation strategies:

- (1) Documentation of active support by relevant stakeholders (government bodies, NGOs, etc.);
- (2) A clear vision with regard to the goals of the environmental fund, its contribution to the protection of biodiversity within the framework of national strategies, and co-operation with existing institutions;
- (3) The definition of measurable objectives and operational programmes and activities according to a prioritisation of needs;
- (4) The implementation of a financial requirements analysis which should consist of the costs of activity plans for at least the next 5 years and the requirements for endowment, sinking and revolving funds;
- (5) The implementation of a market analysis regarding potential national and international donors, such as:
 - Bilateral donors
 - Debt swaps
 - Multilateral donors

⁹ a survey of 20 funds undertaken in 1997 quoted by Rosenzweig, in IPG (2000)

- Private foundations
 - Individuals and private industry
 - National sources (contributions from the government budget, earmarked taxes, entrance fees, hunting concessions, ecotourism, etc.);
- (6) Definition of the most appropriate acquisition strategy for approaching each donor; and,
- (7) The implementation of the fundraising strategy is a time-consuming and cost-intensive activity that requires allocation of necessary resources.

2.5 Asset management

The management of the capital assets¹⁰ constitutes an important factor for the success of an environmental fund, because it is the basis for the future availability of financial resources and for the acceptance by donor organisations. A prerequisite for professional asset management is the selection of an experienced investment professional and the definition and regular updating of investment criteria and strategy. In addition, internal know-how should be built up within the environmental fund (e.g. by having appropriate members in the supervisory body) so that asset management can be supervised.

Asset management should be done by a private investment firm or bank which has experience with portfolios with similar objectives. When making the choice, care should be taken that the investment advisory service is not influenced by interests of the commissioned company.

In general, the choice of an asset manager should follow criteria concerning (i) the capacity to actually implement the chosen investment strategy (performance in recent years, etc.); (ii) experience and reputation (long experience with different national and international customers and capital assets with similar objectives, evaluation by rating agencies, experienced employees etc.), (iii) security, stability and reliability (low-risk investment strategies, no involvement in legal disputes, no

¹⁰ Mary Mc Clellan in: IPG (2000) and World Bank (1995)

connection to dubious business partners, no disputes with other funds or foundations)¹¹. Finally, the costs connected with asset management are important for the selection. They usually constitute about 0.5 - 1% of the assets invested and should not be paid on a pro bono basis.

The objectives of the environmental fund, its “spending rule” and the potential to secure further capital all determine the investment strategy. The spending rule, in order to attain a long-term and balanced provision of finance, should reinvest part of the revenues generated into the capital. This can then be used for funding when the yield from investments is low.

Most environmental funds follow conservative investment strategies in which a part of the capital assets is invested in stocks, but where at least 50% is invested in safe bonds. The experience of the economic crisis in Asia and Latin America at the end of the 1990s shows that environmental funds should not invest their capital (or only a small portion of it) in the markets of newly industrialising countries or in insecure currencies. USAID, for example, stipulates that the capital assets need to be invested in dollars on the US market¹²

The yields gained by environmental funds from capital assets with a conservative investment strategy averaged between 6% and 8% years.

¹¹ Worldbank (1995), S. 57

¹² USAID (1994)

3 Policy and Experience of Selected Organisations in Development Co-operation with Environmental Funds

3.1 Experience of Specific Institutions within German Development Co-operation with Environmental Funds

3.1.1 Framework

Following the ratification of the CBD, conservation has had an important role to play within German development co-operation. One example among others is the BMZ ‘Sector concept for the conservation of biodiversity through nature conservation’.

The options open to environmental funds as a suitable instrument for financing operating and resultant costs of protected areas are determined by the following factors:

➤ **BMZ ‘Sector concept for the conservation of biodiversity through nature conservation’**

The goal of development co-operation in the conservation sector is to support partner countries in reconciling the goals of conserving biodiversity with their own interests.

The guiding principle is globally sustainable development. A fundamental principle in attaining this goal is the utilisation of the economic potential of biological resources through adapted use systems and a fair compensation for losses incurred by this.

The sector concept stipulates that during project implementation, the economic mobilisation of biological resources needs to be encouraged and that ‘alternative financial sources for the long-term payment of the running costs of conservation be found’. In particular, the establishment of

environmental funds is one measure that is recommended.¹³ However, it is also revealed that participation by German Financial co-operation (FC) in such funds is not yet possible.

Conservation is a key area of government intervention. The implementation of measures of area protection usually have grave consequences for economic activity and user rights of the affected population groups and businesses in the area declared under protection.

The political priority afforded to conservation (ownership) by the responsible political authorities is therefore largely dependent on its acceptance by the public at a regional and national level.

With the participation of different social groups and personalities on the board of trustees, environmental funds can play an important role as an organisation of civil society: representation of the interests of affected interest groups, public relations for conservation, political lobbying, participation in developing national strategies for conservation.

To attain these goals, technical assistance (TA) is given the following tasks: institutional support, advisory services, training and re-training, implementation of model measures, management consultation.

Financial co-operation has the following areas of activity: investment in the areas' physical infrastructure and the equipment of park administrations, gazetting of the protected areas and zones for economic activity and credit for the support of productive measures as a contribution to improving the living conditions of adjoining communities and users.

➤ **Development Co-operation Projects**

A great many of the conservation projects of German development co-operation were established at the end of the eighties and beginning of the nineties and are nearing the end of their project support. The new policy of concentrating on focal and programme countries will increase this tendency.

¹³ BMZ Sektorkonzept p. 17

This situation is problematic in that, with certain exceptions (for example the Selous Game Reserve in Tanzania), most projects have not managed to guarantee a long-term financial security for the protected areas by income generation or by the assumption of costs by the partner country or other donors.

Although many projects are planning to establish environmental funds, it is in reality exceedingly difficult to persuade other bilateral donors to co-finance the fund. Even German bilateral development co-operation has no effective instruments to contribute to follow-on costs after the end of a project.

➤ **The German contribution to the Global Environmental Facility (GEF)**

Based on the CBD, the Global Environment Facility was set up in 1991. The financial resources are earmarked for financing costs in countries where global nature and environmental conservation go beyond national priorities (so called “incremental costs”).

These can thereby supplement a country’s own resources or financial support from other donors. The support of environmental funds for the financing of the operating costs of protected areas is one possible utilisation open to GEF resources. With US\$900 million, Germany is the third biggest contributor to GEF, being represented by BMZ on the board.

Since the responsibility for project implementation lies with the implementing organisations of the GEF (in particular the World Bank, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)), there is the possibility of mobilising resources other than bilateral ones for establishing environmental funds.

The general political framework described above, which can contribute to sustainable conservation of biodiversity, are contradicted by budgetary and administrative legal restrictions and considerations concerning the possibility of using funds from the BMZ budget for the capital stock of an environmental fund.

➤ **Financial Co-operation/Technical Assistance Guidelines of the BMZ**

The BMZ guidelines stipulate that financial support is dependent on the progress of the project. This includes the progressive financing of operating and running costs of conservation projects with financial co-operation

resources (12-15 years). The financing of a permanent endowment in the form of an environmental fund which is then invested on the capital markets is not possible according to these guidelines.

However, as the example of Peru shows, the contribution of resources towards a sinking fund is permissible if the financial resources are spent within a given time period. The precondition is that the costs which the partner country will assume when the activities are continued are taken into consideration during the planning phase of the project. In addition, the search for other donors etc. can be supported.

➤ **Subsidising international and national NGOs**

The regulations on supporting NGOs stipulates that only concrete projects, with a sufficiently detailed description of how funding will be used, can be supported. Again, this regulation makes the financing of an environmental fund problematic, as the concrete utilisation of funds is periodically defined anew and is not fixed from the start.

➤ **Debt reduction and conversion**

In this case, government negotiations between Germany and the debtor country need to establish an agreement which defines the modalities. In general, bilateral debts can be cancelled if the partner government agrees to set aside a specified amount of the foreign debt in local currency for conservation measures, e.g., to finance an environmental fund. As this funding is supplied by the partner country, the Financial Co-operation/Technical Assistance guidelines stipulating financial support according to project progress do not apply.

In principle, this procedure could also be applied in the current debt cancellation initiative of the G8 for the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative.

➤ **Equivalent interest proceeds**

The payment of equivalent interest proceeds into an environmental fund is generally possible. A precondition, however, is that a corresponding financial co-operation project exists and that there is an agreement with the partner government on the utilisation of the financial resources; i.e. that the partner

government or partner organisations pay the amount into an environmental fund.

3.1.2 Examples

Support for environmental funds with German bilateral development co-operation funding is mainly limited to advisory services during the establishment and start-up phase of the funds. Within technical assistance projects, for example, studies on setting up environmental funds were conducted in Benin (financing the operating costs of the nature conservation agency CENAGREF), the Ivory Coast (Tai National Park), Cameroon (Mount Cameroon) and in the Central African Republic (Réserve Spéciale de Dzanga Sangha). Many other technical assistance projects also plan to set up an environmental fund as an instrument for the sustainable financing of operating and follow-on costs.

Apart from conducting studies on the operational optimisation of protected area management, German financial co-operation has been engaged in Peru, where the environmental fund PROFONAMPE was allocated a sinking fund to be used up within 15 years. Apart from this, neither contributions towards permanent endowment funds, due to the reasons mentioned above, nor other forms of financing follow-on costs have been made so far.

3.2 Policy and experience of selected other donors with environmental funds

Environmental funds play an increasing role in the conceptions of bilateral and multilateral development organisations. The following chapter looks at the policies and experiences of the GEF, USAID and international NGOs as the most important actors. Because this is a dynamic field of policy, other donors should not be ignored. UNESCO is currently examining how the World Natural Heritage Sites can be supported financially in the long-term.

The EU itself has so far not supported environmental funds, but it is represented in the Interagency Planning Group on Environmental Funds (IPG) and is developing a strategy for the long-term funding of protected areas in Central Africa. Among bilateral donors, Belgium should be mentioned since it has just

finished the process of reorganising its development co-operation and is now considering supporting environmental funds.

3.2.1 GEF

The cross-section analysis of environmental funds supported by the GEF, which was commissioned by GEF in 1998 and undertaken by the World Bank, is to date the most comprehensive evaluation of experience gained with this innovative financing instrument.

The World Bank was asked to undertake the evaluation after questions arose in the GEF and the World Bank as to whether the supported environmental funds were achieving their objectives, whether adaptations in the concept of environmental funds were necessary and whether or in what form the GEF should carry on supporting environmental funds.

After the positive results of the study, support for environmental funds is now a permanent feature of the GEF's programme. The GEF does not implement the projects itself, but rather relies on the World Bank (capital), UNDP (technical advice) and UNEP (scientific advice) for the implementation. It is planned to expand the number of implementing agencies by including the regional development banks.

Formal requirements for support of environmental funds by the GEF are that:

- The partner country has ratified the CBD.
- The environmental fund contributes to the protection of globally significant biodiversity.
- The environmental fund mobilises local resources, including bilateral finance. The GEF then finances the so-called 'incremental costs', i.e., those costs which arise because the country contributes to the conservation of globally significant biodiversity resources and which cannot be met locally. However, it seems as if there are yet no operational definitions of these terms. The local contribution is usually seen as the financing of the start-up phase, including fundraising. Generally, the GEF aims for a relation of 80% local financing to 20% support. Some environmental funds, however, show that a 50% contribution is also possible.

- Structure, objectives, etc. of the environmental fund correspond to the guidelines in the GEF programme. In the case of environmental funds which support protected areas, these state that (i) environmental funds should not be set up as an ‘exit strategy’ for bilateral donors, (ii) that support for environmental funds for a whole protected area system should be given priority over those which are limited to single protected areas¹⁴ and (iii) that the points described in chapter 1 are systematically incorporated into a coherent programme proposal.

GEF support is usually given in various phases. Project preparation grants (PDF) can be requested for the start-up phase of an environmental fund. Contributions to the capital of an environmental fund usually take place in two or more tranches. Before the payment of the second tranche, certain conditions need to be fulfilled by the environmental fund or the partner government (for example the mobilisation of additional funds from its own revenue sources or local donors, political conditions in the partner country with regard to tax exemption etc.).

Contact points for the GEF are either the so-called ‘focal points’ of the GEF in the partner countries or representatives of the implementing organisations - World Bank, UNDP or UNEP.

3.2.2 USAID

Until 1990, legislation on grants and donations prohibited keeping interest gained from financial contributions given by USAID. This meant that USAID, like German development co-operation, had practically no instrument with which it could contribute its own funds towards an independently run endowment fund. The only exception possible required approval of the US Congress for individual cases.

Since 1990, NGOs have been allowed to use contributions from USAID through debt conversion programmes in order to generate interest revenue in the local currency and to keep this revenue. This has allowed the establishment of

¹⁴ although the fund can be built up step by step, by initially supporting one protected area and later on, when more financial resources are available, by extending activities to other areas.

endowment funds. Beginning in fiscal year 1993, the US Congress allowed interest revenue to be generated from USAID sources given in US dollars.¹⁵

Within the context of the ‘Enterprise for the Americas Initiative’ (EAI)¹⁶, beginning in 1990, the US government cancelled US\$900 million in exchange for the financing of environmental and social funds with a total volume of US\$175 million.

Since 1998/1999, the programme has been extended to countries with tropical moist forests with the ‘Tropical Forest Conservation Act’ (TFCA). Both programmes require the following criteria: participating countries need to have debts incurred through USAID or PL-480 (‘Food for Peace’), they have to fulfil political criteria concerning democratisation, drug policy, terrorism and human rights and must comply with the following economic conditions: access for foreign investment, regulations on copy rights, implementation of structural adjustment programmes and satisfactory debt service record.¹⁷

In summary, USAID has the following instruments for the support of environmental funds: (a) buy-backs of US government debt, (b) debt swaps, i.e. the purchase of US government debt by NGOs, (c) debt reduction and (d) direct support of environmental funds by USAID through contributions to the capital of a fund, technical advice on setting up an environmental fund or parallel project financing.

With regard to the direct contribution to the capital of an environmental fund, it should be noted that the capital must be invested in US dollars, by a qualified US investment manager and in the US capital markets.

For implementing the programmes, different procedures are required: with EAI, a bilateral agreement must be reached between the US government and the partner country. For participation in TFCA, the Finance Minister of the partner country needs to file a request with the US Department of Treasury.

¹⁵ USAID (1994)

¹⁶ Participant countries Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, El Salvador, Jamaica, Peru, Uruguay

¹⁷ Victor Bullen (2000), in: IPG

Finally, national boards must be established in which non-governmental representatives have the majority. Proposals for the strategic concept must be developed and objectives and implementation concepts must be defined. Contacts for these programmes and for direct support by USAID can be found in the USAID offices in partner countries.

3.2.3 International NGOs

International NGOs are among the most important promoters of environmental funds. In particular, WWF, TNC and CI must be named. The MacArthur Foundation supports the financing of environmental funds. Essential tasks which can be undertaken by international NGOs for the establishment and administration of environmental funds are:

- Co-ordinate debt swaps. As examples from Latin America in particular show, NGOs did not just come up with the idea, but were also crucial intermediaries within the debt conversion programmes.
- Advisory services for the national structures in building an environmental fund (capacity building), including the (partial) financing of the start-up phases.
- Contributions to the capital of environmental funds. Usually, NGOs only have limited funds of their own however, it can still make sense for them to show their responsibility for the environmental fund by contributing some of their own resources. This diversifies the donor base of the environmental fund and can help to mobilise other sources.
- Position on the supervisory board. Many bilateral and multilateral donors prefer to not have their own representatives on the supervisory board of environmental funds for long periods of time and insist that the majority of representatives come from the private sector. International NGOs can play an important role in this respect.

3.2.4 Co-operation between environmental funds

Co-operation between environmental funds has become increasingly important in recent years. The *Interagency Planning Group on Environmental Funds (IPG)*,

founded in 1993, brings together representatives of donor organisations, NGOs, philanthropic foundations and environmental funds on an informal basis.

The Africa Resources Trust, Conservation International, European Union (EU), Ford Foundation, GEF, Inter American Development Bank, IUCN-the World Conservation Society, MacArthur Foundation, TNC, UNDP, United Nations Office to Combat Desertification (UNSO), USAID, Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), World Bank, World Resources Institute (WRI), WWF and many other organisations participate in this group. The IPG receives administrative support from TNC. The objectives of the IPG are

- to act as a forum for the exchange of information;
- to co-ordinate advisory and other services for environmental funds; and,
- to advocate for environmental funds as an innovative financing instrument.

The *Latin American and Caribbean Network of Environmental Funds (REDLac)* aims to improve communication and co-operation between existing environmental funds in the region and to act as a representative of the interests of environmental funds. Their first workshop was held in 1999 and the report will appear shortly.

Whereas in Latin America and Asia, first forms of co-operation between environmental funds are developing, in Africa, the IPG has just done a survey on African environmental funds in preparation for a joint workshop to be held in Tanzania in April 2002.

3.3 Framework for the Support of Environmental Funds

Initially, environmental funds were only seen as a financing instrument through which nature and environmental conservation, in the context of debt reduction programmes, could be supplied with large amounts of funding with relatively low transaction costs and without overstraining the absorption capacity of the partner country.

On the basis of experience gained with environmental funds so far, other mainly structural advantages for conservation policy in the partner countries can also be named:

Advantages of environmental funds

- The revenue from environmental funds can be used to finance *operating and follow-on costs* of protected areas and which are usually not covered by the donor organisations
- As a *long-term* source of finance, environmental funds facilitate the *planning process* of protected area management
- The broad participation of governmental and non-governmental stakeholders in the supervisory bodies of environmental funds contributes to a transparent decision-making process and improves acceptance of conservation measures in society (*ownership*). Through the support of NGOs, village groups and the commercial sector, they also make an important *contribution towards the development of civil society*.
- As they are independent of government regulations, environmental funds can react *flexibly* to new challenges.
- Environmental funds can plan in the long-term, because they are *independent of changes of government* and the connected shifts in political priorities
- They are more capable than donor organisations of working flexibly and with attention to *small scale details*
- They create better *co-ordination* between various actors possible (donors, government, civil society).

The advantages of environmental funds as an instrument of financing conservation need to be compared with the disadvantages and risks which are connected with their establishment:

Disadvantages and risks of environmental funds

- Environmental funds tie up *large finance volumes* which only generate relatively modest income, a part of which is spent on administrative costs. However, most funds invest their capital wisely and receive income which corresponds to the opportunity costs. In particular, environmental funds which aim to support protected areas can keep their administrative costs down.

- Depending on the overall framework and the authority of the supervisory board, there is a danger that the *funds are instrumentalised* by governments and/or NGOs and that there is pressure to spend resources instead of increasing the capital of the fund.
- Given the scarcity of resources, the existence of an environmental fund can entice governments and donors to reduce their financial support of the conservation sector.
- The allocation of fund resources underlines a project orientation with the danger of neglecting the legal and economic framework.

The GEF study quoted above summarises the criteria for the success of environmental funds as follows:

Success criteria for environmental funds

- Existence of a globally significant biodiversity, whose protection is politically, technically, economically and socially feasible.
- Active political support within the partner country on various levels
- Legal structures which allow the establishment of a fund, including tax exemption and incentives for donations
- A common vision shared by relevant stakeholders
- A functioning financial system (this can be partly compensated by off-shore funds)
- A participatory process which integrates important stakeholders within the decision-making process
- The existence of mentors (donor organisations, international NGOs...)
- The prospect of diversified revenue sources

Whether the advantages of an environmental fund listed above can be realised depends to a certain extent on the overall framework. These criteria can be used as a checklist for an evaluation of this framework, but this does not mean that in

an individual case, all criteria need to be fulfilled before setting up an environmental fund.

In this context, it should be taken into consideration that **the costs** of environmental funds are initially much greater than financing projects, but that the investment generates long-term revenue which guarantees the long-term financial security of a protected area, whereas project finance is restricted to a limited period of time.

Environmental funds or project funding?		
	Environmental funds	Project funding
<u>Threat to biodiversity</u>	Long-term threat Long-term financing	Immediate and severe threat
<u>Budget requirements</u>	Limited but long-term financing necessary	Initially high financing required, long term effects of project likely
<u>Absorption capacity</u>	Limited capacity which can be expanded over a period of time	High absorption capacity
<u>Common vision</u>	Government and important representatives of civil society share a common vision and are ready to work together in the supervisory bodies	Common vision and first steps towards a collaborative management need to be developed
<u>Programme efficiency</u>	Little and efficient bureaucracy	Administration functions satisfactorily and does not block nature conservation measures
<u>Co-operation</u>	Co-operation between the state and private sector is institutionalised (community based organisations, NGOs, Private industry)	Co-operation exists or it is not an objective
<u>Demand</u>	Protected areas exist, protected area administration, NGOs and user groups have the capacity to utilise fund resources effectively	Protected area system is emerging, low capacities

Source: GEF (1999): p. 53, slightly modified

3.4 **Typical Steps for the Establishment of an Environmental Fund** (according to IPG, 2000, slightly modified)

- 1 **Vision:** Discussion of the general vision of the environmental fund: objective, who and what should be supported, consultation with the most important stakeholders, concept draft
- 2 **Partner:** Establishment of a steering committee with the participation of technical experts on environmental funds and members who have access to ministerial decision-making levels.
- 3 **Donor:** Discussion of the concept with different potential donors.
- 4 **Finance:** Securing of the financial resources necessary for the planning and development phase (workshops, consultants, fund raising).
- 5 **Strategy:** A more precise definition of the vision and development of a strategy. Typical questions are: the role of environmental funds within the national context (national protected areas, national environment or development plans, legal structures of the environmental fund such as foundation, trust fund, non-profit company, association civile etc.; structure and composition of the supervisory board; finance mechanisms of the environmental fund: who should be supported according to what criteria?; objectives, action programmes, finance projection: how much capital does the environmental fund need as a permanent, sinking or revolving fund?
- 6 **Project proposal:** After sufficient discussion with stakeholders and relevant donors, a project proposal should be developed for the establishment of an environmental fund. Presentation of the proposal to the donors.
- 7 Is it realistic to expect contributions by the donors, drawing up of statutes by a lawyer, including the election procedure for the supervisory board.
- 8 The legal **establishment of the environmental fund** and election of the supervisory structures

- 9 Solicitation of contributions, build-up of administrative structure, development of an operations manual, engagement of professional asset management

3.5 Options open to German Development Co-operation to support the establishment of Environmental Funds

Internationally, there is wide experience by various donor organisations, non-governmental organisations and individual consultants concerning the establishment and administration of environmental funds.

However, apart from certain exceptions such as Canada, the Netherlands, Scandinavia, Switzerland and the USA, bilateral co-operation has generally been isolated from the international debate.

The German contribution so far has been restricted to providing advisory support for the establishment of environmental funds. Financial contributions for capital of funds have not been donated. The only exception is support to Peru for the establishment of a sinking fund.

For German development co-operation, the following fundamental options regarding the support of environmental funds for the long-term financing of follow-on and operating costs, are proposed:

- **Advisory services:** Technical assistance can support the establishment of environmental funds in collecting the necessary information, implementing measures aimed at raising revenue, preparing decisions on the long-term financing of follow-on costs and, perhaps, in following the ‘typical steps’ listed above for the establishment of an environmental fund.
- **Debt conversion:** The German government can offer debtor countries debt reduction or cancellation under the condition that, in return, the partner government declares its readiness to use national financial resources, e.g. in the form of an environmental fund, to finance conservation measures. The debt cancellation initiative for HIPC countries would be a good starting point.

- ***'Rehabilitation investments'***: Instead of supporting the management of more protected areas with new projects, German development co-operation should limit itself to intervention in fewer and particularly important protected areas and take on a long-term responsibility in the form of rehabilitation investments or project extensions. Following an eco-regional approach, e.g. the following selection criteria can be used: global significance of the biodiversity to be protected, level of threat, commitment of the partner government.
- ***Increased utilisation of complementary bilateral and multilateral development co-operation:*** As a significant donor with a seat on the executive board, Germany can influence decisions concerning the allocation of GEF resources. A strengthening of the complementarities between bilateral and multilateral development co-operation should be aimed for at two levels: new projects should make sure that the long-term financial security of protected areas is ensured by co-operation. One example for this is the multi-donor-programme for the management of the National Park system in Benin, within which the GEF has taken on the job of financing the operating costs and personnel costs of the to a large extent independent conservation agency and has contributed a significant amount towards the establishment of an environmental fund. Development co-operation projects which are already running should check whether the BMZ has the possibility of mobilising GEF resources for the establishment of an environmental fund in order to cover follow-on and operating costs of the protected areas after the end of the project support.
- ***Direct contributions of German Development Co-operation for the establishment of environmental funds:*** A number of currently operating projects of German co-operation plan to establish environmental funds in order to finance operating and follow-on costs of protected area management. As of now, it is unlikely that other bilateral donors can be found who would contribute to such funds with their own resources. Only the GEF, via the World Bank and UNDP can be seen as potential donors. Apart from the assumption that it is not very likely that the GEF would be ready to finance an exit strategy for a bilateral donor, it should be taken into account that the GEF

only supports such projects where at least 50% of the capital of the fund (endowment, sinking and revolving components) are funded by other sources. **At least with regard to these current projects, a German contribution to the capital seems to be essential if the establishment of environmental funds is to be continued successfully.** The direct contribution into such funds requires, as with USAID in the 1990s, changes to the current guidelines and an agreement with the Ministry of Finance.

Bibliography

- BMZ (1997): Sektorkonzept Naturschutz, BMZ aktuell, Nr. 087/Dezember 1997. Bonn.
- BMZ Hrsg. (2000): Biodiversity Conservation in German Development Cooperation. Implementing the Biodiversity Convention. Published by GTZ. Eschborn
- F. J. Convery (1995): Applying Environmental Economics in Africa. World Bank Technical Paper No. 227. Washington.
- Conservation International (1989): The Debt for Nature Exchange. Washington.
- M. Dillenbeck (1994): National Environmental Funds: A new Mechanism for Conservation Finance, in: PARKS, Vol. 4, No. 2.
- E. Dinu: Financial Mechanisms Proposed for Protecting Biological Diversity in Romania
- Ecofondo & IUCN (1996): Regional Consultation on National Environmental Funds (NEFs) in Latin America and the Carribean. Part 1 Final Report. Santafé de Bogota.
- Ecofondo & IUCN (1996): Regional Consultation on National Environmental Funds (NEFs) in Latin America and the Carribean. Part 2 Profiles of the National Environmental Funds. Santafé de Bogota.
- J. Esser (1998): Mission zur Vorbereitung eines Finanzierungstrumentes für die Nationalparke in Benin. Ergebnisbericht im Auftrag der GTZ. Bremen.
- E. Gärtner (1996): Schritte zur Einrichtung einer internationalen Stiftung für den Tai-Nationalpark in Côte d'Ivoire. Gutachten im Auftrag der GTZ. Eschborn.
- GEF (1998): GEF Evaluation of Experience with Conservation Umweltfonds. GEF Secretariat, Monitoring and Evaluation Team. Washington.
- GTZ (1997): Orientierungsrahmen für die finanzgerechte Gestaltung und Handhabung von Kreditfonds. OE 405, Finanzsysteme & Kleingewerbeförderung. Eschborn.

- GTZ/TwrP (1997): Innovative Finanzierungsinstrumente im Forst- und Naturschutzsektor Costa Ricas. Studie von Th. Heindrichs. Eschborn
- The Global Biodiversity Forum, 10th Session (1998): Background Documentation. Abstracts and Papers. Bratislava.
- Interagency Planning Group on Environmental Funds (IPG) (2000): The IPG Handbook on Environmental Funds. A Resource Book for the Design and Operation of Env. Funds. Ruth Norris (ed.).New York
- INDUFOR & Ecosecurities (1999): Financial Mechanisms for Sustainable Forestry. Report prepared for UNDP/SEED Program on Forests. Helsinki-Oxford.
- IUCN (1997): Biodiversity, International Waters and the GEF. An IUCN Guide to Developing Project Proposals for the GEF. Gland and Cambridge.
- IUCN (o.J.): Economic Assessment of Protected Areas: Guidelines for their Assessment. Draft Report by Prepared by the Economic Benefitsof Protected Area Takforce on behalf of IUCN CNPPA. Melbourne
- IUCN, WWF & Nature Conservancy (1994): Report of the First Global Forum on Environmental Funds. Santa Cruz.
- IUCN (1996): Review of Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund (CEPF). Commission of National Parks and Protected Areas CNBPPA. o.O.
- A.N. James et al. (1998): Sustainable Financing für Protected Areas: A Comparison of Parastatal and State-Funded Conservation Agencies in Africa and the Caribbean. o.O.
- J. Kaiser & A. Lambert (1996): Debt Swaps for Sustainable Development. A Practical Guide for NGOs. Produced for IUCN, SCDO, EURODAD. Gland.
- Klug, U. (2000): Finanzierung von Naturschutz durch Umweltfonds. In: Naturschutz in Entwicklungsländern. Neue Ansätze für den Erhalt der biologischen Vielfalt. Hrsg. GTZ und BfN. Heidelberg.
- H. Mountford & J. H. Keppler (1998): Financing Incentives for the Protection of Biodiversity Presentation at the EFRI Conference on Managing for Biodiversity. Savannah, Georgia.

-
- M. Moye (1998): Feasibility Research and Consultations for the Creation of a Conservation Fond in Cameroon. Prepared for the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MINEF) and WWF-Cameroon. Washington.
- Ministère de l'Environnement et de la Forêt, RCI (1998): Avant Projet de Loi relatif à la Définition, la Gestion et le Financement des Aires Protégées. Abidjan
- OECD-IPG (1995): Environmental Funds: A New Approach to Sustainable Development. A Report by the Interagency Planning Group of a Briefing April 1995. Paris.
- M. Richards (1999): Internalising the Externalities' of Tropical Forestry: A Review of Innovative Financing and Incentive Mechanisms. European Union Tropical Forestry Paper No. 1. ODI, London, Brussels.
- J. Salazar (1996): History and Experience of Debt-For-Nature Swaps and its Potential Role in Eco-Development in Peru. M:A: Thesis University of Kent, Durrell Institute of Conservation and Ecology. Canterbury.
- B. Spergel (1998): Les Options de Création d'un Statut Autonome pour le Projet Dzanga-Sangha avec un Fonds Fiduciaire comme une des Sources de Financement. Projektstudie für GTZ/Luso-Consult. Washington D.C..
- UNDP/GEF (1995): Environmental Funds: The first five years. A Preliminary analysis for the OECD/DAC Working Party on Development Assistance and Environment. Commissioned for the Interagency Planning Group on Environmental Funds. O.O.
- UNDP/GEF (1998): Workshop Report Strengthening the Capacities of National Environmental Funds in Latin America and the Caribbean. Mérida.
- USAID (1994): Handbook 01: Policy Determination: Guidelines: Endowments Financed with Appropriated Funds. Washington D.C.
- Weltbank (1995): Issues and Options in the Design of GEF Supported Umweltfonds for Biodiversity Conservation, Environment Department Papers, No. 011, Kathleen Mikitin. Washington D.C.

Weltbank & IUCN (1994): Protected Area Economics and Policy. Linking Conservation and Sustainable Development. Hrsg. M. Munasinghe und J. McNeely. Washington D.C.

World Resources Institute (1989): Natural Endowments. Financing Resource Conservation for Development. International Conservation Financing Project Report. Washington.

WWF-UK (1999): Towards Financial Sustainability for Protected Areas. Learning from Business Approches. A. Inmamdar u. E. de Merode. Godalming.

WWF (2000): Conversion of External Debts for Nature Conservation Purposes. WWF Russia Programme. Moscow.

Interlocutors

Global Environmental Facility:	<i>Frank Ritter, Program Manager</i>
World Bank:	<i>Christophe Crepin, Global Environment Regional Coordinator Africa Region</i> <i>Christine Kimes, Regional Coordinator Latin America, Environmentally & Socially Sustainable Development</i> <i>Kathleen McKinnon, Biodiversity Specialist</i> <i>Kathleen Mikitin, Operations Specialist</i> <i>Christian Peter, Forestry Specialist</i> <i>Dr. Günther Riethmacher, Environmental Specialist</i>
Inter American Develop. Bank:	<i>Kari Keipi, Senior Forest Officer (per telephone)</i>
USAID:	<i>James S. Hester, Agency Environmental Coordinator</i>
Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau:	<i>Ulrich F. Dorf, Abteilungsleiter Lateinamerika Süd und Ost, Karibik</i> <i>Dr. Thomas Duve, Stellv. Leiter Westafrika</i> <i>Burkhard Hinz, Sektorökonom Auslandssekretariat</i>
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit:	<i>Dr. Jasper Abramovski, Rechtsabteilung</i> <i>Kirsten Hegener, Projekt Absicherung von Schutzgebieten</i> <i>Renate Klöppinger-Todd, Fachplanerin Finanzsystementwicklung und Kreditwesen</i> <i>Dr. Rolf Mack, Projektleiter ABS-LISTRA</i>
WWF Deutschland:	<i>Dr. Uwe Kievelitz, Abteilungsleiter Naturschutz</i>
WWF US:	<i>Barry Spergel, Director Conservation Finance</i> <i>Richard W. Carroll, Director West and Central Africa & Madagascar</i>
The Nature Conservancy:	<i>Scott Smith, Advisor Conservation Finance & Policy</i>
Conservation International:	<i>Marianne Guerin-McManus, Director Conservation Finance</i>

Environmental Funds in Africa, Asia and Latin America

From: Interagency Planning Group on Environmental Funds (IPG) (2000): The IPG Handbook on Environmental Funds. A Resource Book for the Design and Operation of Env. Funds. Ruth Norris (ed.).New York

AFRICA

COUNTRY

CONTACT

BURKINA FASO

POSSIBLE NEW FUND

National Environmental Fund

Donor: IUCN (TA)

Status: (3/99) National Environmental Code legally creates the NEF, but so far the NEF only exists on paper.

Ibrahim Thiaw
Regional Coordinator for West Africa
IUCN Regional Office for West Africa
B.P. 1618, Ouagadougou 01, Burkina Faso
Tel: (226) 30 85 80
Fax:(226)307561
E- mail: ithiaw.uicn@fasonet.bf

CAMEROON

FUND IN THE PROCESS OF ESTABLISHMENT

National Environment Foundation

Donor: WWF-Netherlands
(start-up and capital pledge of US\$500,000)

Status: (10/99) Legal registration submitted to the Government of Cameroon

Dr. Steve Gartlan
Country Representative
WWF-Cameroon
B.P. 6776, Yaounde, Cameroon
Tel: (237) 21 42 41
Fax: (237) 21 42 40
E- mail: sgartlan@wwfnet.org

REPUBLIC OF CONGO

POSSIBLE NEW FUND

Fund for Odzala National Park

Donors: Conservation International (TA)

Status: (2/2000) Proposal under development

Conrad Aveling, Coordonnateur
Cellule de Coordination ECOFAC
AGRECO-GEIE
B.P. 15155, Libreville, Gabon
Tel: (241) 73 23 43/44, Fax:(241)732345
E- mail: ecofaccoord@internetgabon.com

COTE D'IVOIRE

FUND IN THE PROCESS OF ESTABLISHMENT

Foundation for the Financing of Protected Areas (*Fondation pour le Financement des Aires Protégées*)

Donors: GEF PDF-B (US\$322,000)

Status: (2/2000) Legal statutes prepared. Fundraising and asset management work to be commissioned. Task force members (CI, WWF) will guide further preparation.

Ngoran Djé Francois, Coordonnateur du PCGAP
Programme Cadre de gestion des aires protégées
B.P. VI 78, Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire
Tel: (225) 21 91 41, Fax:(225)210990
E- mail: ipcgap@africaonline.co.ci

Jean-Michel Pavy, World Bank
01 BP 1850, Abidjan 01, Côte d'Ivoire
Tel: (225) 44 22 27, Fax:(225)441687
E- mail: jpavy@worldbank.org

COUNTRY

CONTACT

ETHIOPIA

POSSIBLE NEW FUND

Trust Fund for the Conservation of Ethiopia's Protected Areas

Status (9/99): Workshops and feasibility work conducted in 1995-96 by WWF-UK with funding provided by UNDP. No recent actor.

Ato Leykun Albulie
Manager
Ethiopian Wildlife Conservation Organization
P.O. Box 386, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Tel: (251) 1 152001
Fax:(251)1550298

GABON

POSSIBLE NEW FUND

Fund for Protected Areas

Donors: WWF International (TA)

Stams (2/2000): Feasibility work scheduled for Spring 2000

Olivier Langrand
Regional Representative - WWF
B.P. 9144, Libreville, Gabon
Tel: (241) 73 00 28
Fax:(241)738056
E-mail: o.langrand@inet.ga

GHANA

EXISTING FUND

The Ghana Heritage Conservation Trust (GHCT)

Donors: USAID (start-up and initial capitalization of \$2 million), CI (TA)

Status: (11 /99) Registered in August 1997.

Executive Secretary, GHCT
P.O. Box KAPT 30426
Accra, Ghana
Tel: (233) 21 773893
Fax: (233) 27 571773
E-mail: cioaa@ghana.com

GUINEA BISSAU

DORMANT FUND

National Environment Fund

Donors: Government of Switzerland (US\$300,000 debt conversion)

Status: (3/99): Fund suspended operations because of conflict in Guinea-Bissau

Ibrahim Thiaw
IUCN Regional Office for West Africa
B.P. 1618
Ougadougou 01, Burkina Faso
Tel: (226) 20 70 47 / 30 85 80
Fax:(226)307561
E-mail: ithiaw.uicn@fasonet.bf

KENYA

POSSIBLE NEW FUND

Biodiversity Conservation Trust Fund (BIOTF)

Donors: European Union (start-up)

Status: (11/99) Under review by EC

Dr. John Waithaka, African Conservation Centre
P.O. Box 62844
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: (254) 2 335044 / 223569
Fax:(254)2251969
E-mail: acc@africaonline.co.ke

COUNTRY

CONTACT

MADAGASCAR

ESTABLISHED FUND

Tany Meva - The Malagasy Environment Foundation

Donors: USAID (US\$12 million),
Government of Madagascar (debt conv.)

Status: (2/2000) Established in 1996.

Laurent Rasolofonirina Executive Secretary
Tany Meva
B.P. 4300
Antananarivo 101, Madagascar
Tel: (261) 20 22 403 99
Fax: (261) 20 22 403 99
E-mail: tanymeva@dts.mg

MALAWI

FUNDS IN THE PROCESS OF ESTABLISHMENT

Malawi Environmental Endowment Trust (MEET)

Donors: DANIDA (US\$1 million start-up),
USAID (US\$600,000 start-up). UNDP-
Malawi (TA), UNSO (TA)

Status: (11/99) Registered as Trust in 1999.
Endowment fund to be created in 2000

Carl Bruessow
MEET. Coordinator
Malawi Environment Endowment Trust
Private Bag 344, Chichiri, Malawi
Tel: (265) 636 496
Tel: (265) 829 655 (cellular)
Tel: (265) 634 117 (home)
E-mail: meet@malawi.net

Mulanje Mountain Conservation Trust (MMCT)

Donors: GEF (US\$300,000 PDF-B,
US\$700,000 1st two years, US\$4 million
endowment requested), DFID (technical
studies)

Status: (11/99) Registered as Trust in 1994.
Preparation work for Conservation Trust
Fund (CTF) almost completed

Jones Njala
Programme Coordinator
Mulanje Mountain Conservation Trust
P.O. Box 139, Mulanje, Malawi
Tel: (265) 465282,465241
Fax:(265)465241
E-mail: MMCT@malawi.net

MALI

POSSIBLE FUND

National Environmental (Desertification) Fund

Donors: IUCN (TA), UNSO (TA)

Status: (3/99) NDF/NEF created by
legislation in September 1998, but only
exists on paper due to lack of funding.

Moctar Traore
Chef de Mission
IUCN Country Office Mali
B.P.1567
Bamako, Mali
Tel: (223) 227 572
Fax: (223) 230 092
E-mail: uicn@spider.toolnet.org

COUNTRY

CONTACT

MAURITIUS

EXISTING FUND

National Environmental Fund

Donors: Ministry of Environment, Human Resource Development and Employment; hotel sector.

Satyadev Seebaluck
Ministry of Environment
Human Resource Development and Employment
Ken Lee Tower, Port Louis, Mauritius
Tel: (230) 212 71 81

NAMIBIA

EXISTING FUND

Namibia Nature Foundation

Donors: Danish Government, Finnish Government, German Embassy, GTZ, Netherlands, Norwegian Embassy, SIDA, corporate donors.

Status: Founded in 1982.

Dr. Chris J. Brown, Executive Director
Namibia Nature Foundation
P.O. Box 245
68a Robert Mugabe Ave., Kenya House
4th floor (physical), Windhoek, Namibia
Tel: (264) 61 248 345, Fax:(264)248344
e-mail: nnf@iwwn.com.na

FUND IN THE PROCESS OF ESTABLISHMENT

Environmental Investment Fund

Donors: USAID (design work)

Status: (11/99) Minister of Environment expected to submit statutes to Cabinet

Joseph McGann, EIF Coordinator
Ministry of Environment and Tourism
Private Bag 13306
Windhoek 9000, Namibia
Tel: (264) 61 249 015, Fax: (264) 61 240 339
E-mail: joemcg@dea.met.gov.na

NIGER

POSSIBLE NEW FUND

Protected Areas Trust Fund

Donors: IUCN (technical assistance), UNDP (technical assistance), GEF (World Bank) - under consideration

Status: Technical studies completed in 1997/98.

Mamadou Mamane
Chef de Mission, UICN-Niger
B.P. 10933 Niamey, Niger
Tel: (227) 724 028
Fax: (227) 724 005
E-mail: iucn@intnet.ne

SENEGAL

POSSIBLE NEW FUND

National Environmental Fund

Donors: IUCN (start-up)

Status: Much of preparation work completed, but Government needs to approve registration

Alioye Faye, UICN-Sénégal
B.P. 3215, Avenue Bourgiba x Rue 3, Castors
Dakar, Sénégal
Tel: (221) 82405 45, Fax: (221) 824 92 46
E-mail: iucnsn@sonatcl.senet.net

COUNTRY

CONTACT

SEYCHELLES

EXISTING FUND

Seychelles Island Foundation

Government of the Seychelles

Donors: tourism receipts

Status: Established in 1979.

Lindsay Chong-Seng, Executive Director

Independence House, P.O. Box 853

Victoria Mähe, Republic of Seychelles

Tel: (248) 324883,241104, Fax: (248) 324884

E-mail: sif@seychelles.net

SOUTHERN AFRICA

EXISTING FUND

Peace Parks Foundation

(Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Swaziland, Zambia, Zimbabwe)

Donors: Corporate and institutional

Status: (2/2000) Established in 1997

Note: contact information beginning May 15, 2000.

Dr. John Hanks , Executive Director

Peace Parks Foundation

P.O. Box 12743

Die Boord, Stellenbosch, 7613, South Africa

Tel: (27) 21 887 6188, Fax: (27) 21 887 6189

E-mail: parks@ppf.org.za

Web-site: www.peaceparks.org.za

SOUTH AFRICA

EXISTING FUNDS

The Green Trust

Donors: Nedbank, Nedbank clients using Nedbank's Green Affinity products

Status: Founded in 1990

Thérèse Brinkcate, Coordinator, The Green Trust

P.O. Box 456

Stellenbosch 7599, South Africa

Tel: (27) 21 887 2801, Fax: (27) 21 883 8175

Cell: (27) 83 212 7980

E-mail: tbrinkca@wwfsa.org.za

Table Mountain Fund

Donors: GEF (US\$5 million), private donors (US\$2 million)

Status: (11/99) Established in 1993 by WWF and registered as a trust in 1998.

Brent Myrdal, Coordinator, Table Mountain Fund

C/O WWF-South Africa

P.O. Box 456

Stellenbosch 7599, South Africa

Tel: (27) 21 762 8525, Fax: (27) 21 762 1905

E-mail: bmyrdal@wwfsa.org.za

SWAZILAND

POSSIBLE NEW FUND

Swaziland Environment Fund

Donors: UNSO (start-up)

Status: (12/99) Legal documentation prepared and will be presented to Parliament in March 2000.

Bongani S. Masuku

Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives

P.O. Box 162, Mbabane, Swaziland

Tel: (268) 43858/463361, Fax: (268)

43858/44700

E-mail: lups@realnet.co.sz

COUNTRY

CONTACT

TANZANIA

POSSIBLE NEW FUNDS

Eastern Arc or Usambaras Mountain Trust Fund

Donors: GEF (PDF - start-up), World Bank (feasibility work)

Status: (2/2000) Initial feasibility work in 1998.

Dr. W.A. Rodgers, GEF Regional Coordinator
John Salehe
P.O. Box 1041
57 Old Moshi Rd., Cr. Haile Selassie Rd.
Arusha, Tanzania
Tel: (255) 578 398, Fax: (255) 578 791

Peter DeWees, Senior Environmental Economist
The World Bank
1818 Street, NW
Tel: (1) 202 473 3959, Fax: (1) 202 473 8185
E-mail: pdeweess@worldbank.org

Tanzania Land Conservation Trust

Status: (10/99) The Trust Constitution has been drafted and is being circulated to members.

Dr. James Kahurananga, Senior Project Officer
African Wildlife Foundation
P.O. Box 2658, Arusha, Tanzania
Tel/Fax: (255) 57 4453
Mobile: (255) 0811 510933
E-mail: jkahurananga@awf-tz.org

UGANDA

EXISTING FUND

Mgahinga and Bwindi Impenetrable Forest Conservation Trust (MBIFCT)

Donors: GEF (US\$4.35 million endowment), Netherlands (US\$3 million - operational), USAID (US\$890,000 - operational)

Status: (11/99) Established in 1995.

Christine Oryema-Lalobo
Trust Administrator, MBIFCT Mutebile Road
P.O. Box 1064, Kabale, Uganda
Tel: (256) 0486 24120
Fax: (256) 0486 24122
E-mail: mbifct@imul.com

FUND IN THE PROCESS OF ESTABLISHMENT

Environmental Conservation Trust (ECOTRUST)

Donors: USAID (start-up)

Status: (10/99) Trust is registered. Funding proposal submitted to USAID.

Isaac Kapalaga, Acting Executive Director
ECOTRUST
P.O. Box 8986, Kampala, Uganda
Tel: (256) 041 543 562/3/4
Fax: (256) 041 543 565
E-mail: isaac.gmu@imul.com

POSSIBLE NEW FUNDS

Uganda National Desertification Fund

Stephen Muwaya
Ministry of Agriculture, Animal, Industry and Fisheries
Tel: (267) 350523

COUNTRY

CONTACT

Uganda National Environment Fund

Dr. John Okedi, Executive Director
National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA)
6th floor, Telecom House
1st Portal, Collville Street
P.O. Box 22255, Kampala Uganda
Tel: (256) 41 251064/5/8
Fax: (256) 41 257521/232680
E-mail: NEMA@imul.com
NEIC@stracom.co.ug

WEST AFRICA

EXISTING FUND

West Africa Rural Foundation (WARF) (Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mali and Senegal)

Donors: The Ford Foundation, International
Development Research Centre (Canada)

Status: 11/99

Fadel Diamé, Executive Director
WARF/FRAO
Sicap Amitié III - Villa 4318
Allees Seydou Norou Tall
C.P.13 Dakar Fann
Dakar Sénégal
Tel: (221) 824 1400, Fax: (221) 824 5755
E-mail: WARF@CYG.SN

POSSIBLE NEW FUNDS

Mount Cameroon Fund

Donor: DFID (start-up)

Status: (10/99): Terms of Reference drafted
for preparation work in context of Mount
Cameroon project.

Joseph Besong, Project Director
Alex Forbes, Project Manager
Mount Cameroon Project
Tel/Fax: (237) 43 18 83/85/72/76, ext. 381

Foundation for Environment and Development in Cameroon (FEDEC)

Donors: US\$3.5 million to be provided by
COTCO, a joint venture pipeline Company
consisting of Exxon, Shell, Elf and the
Government of Cameroon

Status: (10/99) Establishment of FEDEC
pending approval of project loan.

Dr. Amar Inamdar, Director
The Environment and Development Group
11 King Edward St., Oxford OX14HT, UK
Tel: (44) 1865 263400, Fax: (44) 1845 263401
E-mail: amar@edg.org.uk

(EDG provided consulting Services regarding
design of the foundation)

CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

POSSIBLE NEW FUND

Trust Fund for Dzanga-Sangha Reserve

Donor: GTZ (start-up)

Status: (2/2000)

Initial feasibility work.

Jean Yamindou
WWF-CAR Office
B.P.1053
Bangui, Central African Republic
Tel: (236) 61 42 99, Fax: (236) 61 10 85
E-mail: wwfcAR@intnet.cf

COUNTRY

CONTACT

COMORES

POSSIBLE NEW FUND

National Environmental Fund

Donor: IUCN (TA)

Status: (2/2000)

Feasibility work 11/99.

Suzie LeBlanc
Conseillere Technique Principale
MDE, Ex-CEFADER
B.P. 2445
Moroni, Comores (via Paris)
Tel/Fax: (269) 73 62 22
E-mail: sleblanc@snpt.km

ASIA-PACIFIC

COUNTRY

CONTACT

BHUTAN

ESTABLISHED FUND

Bhutan Trust Fund for Environmental Conservation (BT FEC)

Donors: Royal Government of Bhutan, Denmark, Finland, Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland, WB/GEF, WWF-US, UNDP (TA)

Status: established May 1991

Tobgay S. Namgyal, Director
Bhutan Trust Fund for Environmental Conservation (BT FEC)
P.O.Box 520, Thimphu, Bhutan
Tel (975.2)323.846/326419
Fax (975.2)324.214
Email: namgyal@druknet.net.bt
www.bhutantrustfund.org

CHINA

ESTABLISHED FUNDS

Local Environmental Funds in China

Donors: World Bank, Municipal taxes

Status: several municipal funds have been established since 1988

Jinnan Wang, Associate Professor
Environmental Management Institute
Chinese Research Academy for Environmental Sciences (CRAES)
Beijing 100012, Peoples Republic of China
Fax (86.10)649.015.32
Email: emicraes@public.east.cn.net

LU Xinyuan, Deputy Director General
Department of Supervision and Management
National Environmental Protection Agency (NEPA)
115 Xizhimemei Nanxizojie
Beijing 100035, Peoples Republic of China
Tel (86.10)661.51925, Fax (86.10)661-51768

FIJI

ESTABLISHED FUND

Fiji Heritage Foundation (FHF)

Donor: Donations from business in Fiji

Status: established July 1992

Birandra Singh, Secretary
Fiji Heritage Foundation (FHF)
P.O Box 2089, Government Buildings
Suva, Fiji
Tel (679) 301-807, Fax (679) 305-092
Email: nationaltrust@is.com.fj

FUND IN THE PROCESS OF ESTABLISHMENT

Sovi Basin Trust Fund

Donors: CI (TA), New Zealand Overseas Development Aid

Annette Lees, Director, CI New Zealand
P.O Box 2089, Government Buildings
Suva, Fiji
Tel (679)301-807, Fax (679)305-092
Email: ci-newzealand@conservation.org

COUNTRY

CONTACT

INDONESIA

ESTABLISHED FUND

KEHATI

Indonesian Biodiversity Foundation (IBF)

Donors: USAID, John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, UNEP, World Bank, IPGRI, Indonesia

Status: established January 1994

Ismid Hadad, Executive Director
KEHATI/Indonesian Biodiversity Foundation (IBF)
Patra Jasa Bldg. RoomIC2
Jl. Gatot Subroto Kav. 32-24
Jakarta 129501, Indonesia
Tel (62.21)522.8031/522.8032
Fax (62.21)522.8033
Email: ihadad@kehati.or.id

FUND IN THE PROCESS OF ESTABLISHMENT

West Papua Conservation Fund

Donors: Conservation International (CI) (TA), WWF (TA)

Yance de Fretes, Secretary
Steering Committee
West Papua Conservation Fund
P.O.Box 334
Jl.Sentani, No. 11
Abepura, Jayapura, IRJA 99351, Indonesia
Tel (62)967.834.36, Fax (62)967.834.36
Email: ci-irian@jayapura.wasantara.net.id

Augustinas Rumansara, Vice-Chair
Steering Committee
West Papua Conservation Fund
WWF-Jayapura, IRJA, Indonesia
Tel (62.967)542.765, Mobile (62.811)803.794
Email: arumansara@wwfhet.org

FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA

PROPOSED FUND

Conservation Trust Fund

Donor: TNC (TA)

The Nature Conservancy
P. O. Box 216, Kolonia, Pohnpei 96941
Federated States of Micronesia
Tel: (691) 320-4267, Fax:(691)320-7422
Email: braynor@mail.fm

Scott E. Smith
The Nature Conservancy (TNC)
4245 N. Fairfax Drive, Suite 100
Arlington, Va. 22203-1606
Tel: (703) 841-8175, Fax: (703) 525-0208
Email: scott_smith@tnc.org

COUNTRY

CONTACT

MONGOLIA

ESTABLISHED FUND

Mongolia Environmental Trust Fund (METF)

Donors: UNDP/GEF, Environment and Development Group (EDG) of UK (TA), Mongolia

Status: established November 1998

N. Battogtokh, Executive Director
Mongolia Environmental Trust Fund (METF)
P.O.Box 960
Ulaanbaatar-46, Mongolia
Tel/Fax (976.1)312.771
Email: metf@magicnet.mn
www. un-mongolia/metf

NEPAL

FUND IN THE PROCESS OF ESTABLISHMENT

Nepal Trust Fund for Biodiversity (NTFB)

Donors: WB/GEF, TMI (TA)

Nabina Shrestha, Special Projects Officer
The Mountain Institute
P.O.Box 2785, Kathmandu, Nepal
Tel (977.1)419.356/414.237
Fax (977.1)414.902
Email: nshrestha@mountain.org
njain@mountain.org

PACIFIC

FUND IN THE PROCESS OF ESTABLISHMENT

Pacific Conservation Trust Fund (PCTF)

Donors: New Zealand, UNDP/GEF

Joe Reti, Programme Manager
South Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Programme (SPBCP)
PO Box 240 Apia, Samoa
Tel (685)21.929, Fax (685)20.231
Email: joer@sprep.org.ws
sprepinfo@sprep.org.ws

PAKISTAN

FUND IN THE PROCESS OF ESTABLISHMENT

Mountain Areas Conservancy Trust Fund

Donors: UNDP/GEF, IUCN- Pakistan (TA)

Christopher Shank, Project Manager
Mountain Areas Conservancy Trust Fund
IUCN, 26, St.87, G-6/3
Islamabad, Pakistan
Tel (92.51)270-686, Fax (92.51)270-688
Email: chris@iucn-isb.sdnpk.undp.org

PAPUA NEW GUINEA

ESTABLISHED FUND

PNG Conservation Trust Fund (PNGCTF)

Donors: Australia, WB/GEF, TNC (TA)

Anthony Patrick Power, Chair, Board of Trustees
PNG Conservation Trust Fund (PNGCTF)
PO Box 772 Wewak East
Sepik Province, Papua New Guinea
Tel (675)856.2425 and

COUNTRY

CONTACT

PO Box 1907
Port Moresby NCD, Papua New Guinea
Tel/Fax: (675)323.5662
Email: powerap@daltron.com.pg

PHILIPPINES

ESTABLISHED FUNDS

Foundation for the Philippine Environment (FPE)

Donors: USAID, Bank of Tokyo, John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Ford Foundation, Netherlands, UNDP/GEF, IPG, WWF/US (TA), TNC (TA)

Status: established January 1992

Julio Galvez Tan, Executive Director
Foundation for the Philippine Environment (FPE)
77 Matahimik St., Teachers Village
Quezon City 1101 Philippines
Tel (63.2)927-9403/927-2186/433-0565
Fax (63.2)922-3022
Email: jujutan@pworld.net.ph
Email: fpe@info.com.ph

Foundation for Sustainable Societies, Inc. (FSSI)

Donors: Sweden, Foundation for the Philippine Environment (FPE) -TA

Status: established January 1996

Eugene Gonzales, Executive Director
Foundation for Sustainable Societies, Inc. (FSSI)
Samar Avenue cor. Scout Albano St.
South Triangle, Quezon City, Philippines
Tel (63.2)928-8671/928-8422
Fax (63.2)928-8671
Email: fssi@fssi.com.ph

SRI LANKA

DORMANT FUND

Forest Conservation Trust Fund (FCT)

Donors: NORAD

Status: established October 1996

Deputy Conservator of Forests
Forest Department
Rajamalwatta Road
Battaramulla, Sri Lanka
Tel (94.1)866-631/866-632/866-634
Fax (94.1)866.633
Email: forest@slt.lk
wrmswick@slt-net.lk

ESTABLISHED FUND

Wildlife Trust of Sri Lanka (WLTSL)

Donor: USAID

Status: established August 1991

Jinasiri Dadallage, Executive Director
Wildlife Trust of Sri Lanka (WLTSL)
229 Kirula Road, Colombo 05, Sri Lanka
Tel (94.1)502-271/508-345, Fax (94.74)516-324
Email: wltrust@itmin.com

COUNTRY

CONTACT

THAILAND

ESTABLISHED FUND

Thailand Environment Fund

Donors: Thailand Fuel Oil Fund, OECF

Status: established 1992

Krisana Choeypun
Chief, Standard and Criteria Subdivision
Thailand Environment Fund
Office of Environment Fund, OEPP
60/1 Phibulwattana 7, RamaVI Road
Bangkok 10400, Thailand
Tel (66.2)279.8087, Fax (66.2)271.4239
Email: envifund@asiaaccess.net.th

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

COUNTRY

CONTACT

ARGENTINA

EXISTING FUNDS

Fondo Iniciativa de las Américas

Argentina

Jörge Bilbao/Silvia Tissoni
Presidente de la Comisión Adminisiradora
Fondo para las Américas
San Martin 459, Entrepriso Of. 69
(1004) Buenos Aires, Argentina
Tel: (54-011) 4348-8253
Fax: (54-011) 4348-8521
Email: stissoni@sernah.gov.ar

POSSIBLE NEW FUND

National Environmental Fund

Secretariat for Natural Resources and
Human Environment, IDB, IUCN National
Committee

(To be appointed)
Coordinador; Fondo Nacional Ambiental
Secretaría de Recursos Naturales y Ambiente
Humano
San Martín 459, Piso 2 Oficina 215
Capital Federal (1004) Buenos Aires, Argentina
Tel: (541) 348-8452/3; Fax: (54-1) 348-8495
Email. Intercon@interlink.com.ar

BAHAMAS

EXISTING FUND

The Bahamas National Trust

Gary E. Larson, Director
The Bahamas National Trust
P.O. Box N-4105
Nassau, Bahamas
Tel: (242) 393-1317/393-2848
Fax: (242) 393-4978
Email: bnt@bahamas.net.bs

BELIZE

EXISTING FUND

Protected Areas Conservation Trust (PACT)

Tourism taxes

Valerie Woods, Executive Director
Protected Areas Conservation Trust (PACT)
2 Mango Street, P.O. Box 443
Belmopan, Belize CA
Tel: (501-8) 23657/20642, Fax: (501-8) 23759
Email: val.pact@btl.net

COUNTRY

CONTACT

BOLIVIA

EXISTING FUNDS

Enterprise of the Americas Fund

Consuelo Wolfhard, Coordinator
c/o FONAMA
Edificio Mariscal Ballivián, Mezzanine
Casilla 862, Calle Mercado No. 1328
La Paz, Bolivia
Tel: (591-2) 392-370/392-367
Fax: (591-2) 391-774
Email: fonama@mail.megalink.com

Fundación para el Desarrollo del Sistema Nacional de Areas Protegidas de Bolivia (FUNDESNAP)

Roberto Jordán Mealla
Executive Director
FUNDESNAP
Email: heidyrjm@ceibo.entelnet.bo

GEF, Canada, Switzerland, Germany

BRAZIL

EXISTING FUNDS

Fundo Brasileiro para a Biodiversidade (FUNBIO)

GEF (World Bank), private sector

Pedro Wilson Leitao Filho/Arminda Campos
Executive Director, FUNBIO
Largo do IBAM, 1-6o.
Andar Humaitá 22271-070
Rio de Janeiro-RJ, Brazil
Tel/fax: (55-21) 579-0809
Email: funbio@openlink.com.br
pleitao@openlink.com.br

Fundo Nacional de Meio Ambiente (FNMA)

Government, IDB

Luiz Carlos Ros/Manuel Serrao/Karen Oliveira
Fundo Nacional de Meio Ambiente (FNMA)
Ministerio do Meio Ambiente (MMA)
Esplanada dos Ministerios
Bloco B – 7to- andar, CEP: 70.068-900
70068-900 Brasilia-DF, Brazil
Tel: (55-61) 317-1203, Fax: (55-61) 224-0879
Email: luiz.ros@mma.gov.br
manoel.sampaio@mma.gov.br
karen.oliveira@mma.gov.br

FUND IN PROCESS OF ESTABLISHMENT

Mamiraua Sustainable Development Reserve Endowment Fund

Sociedade Civil Mamirauá
Universidade Federale do Para
Campus do guama
Depanamento de Antropologia - CFCH
66073-250 Caixa Postal 531
Belem, Para, Brazil
Tel: (55-91) 249-6369, Fax: (55-91) 249-6369
Email: ayerswes@libnet.com.br

COUNTRY

CONTACT

CENTRAL AMERICA

FUND IN PROCESS OF ESTABLISHMENT

Central American Fund for Environment and Development (FOCADES)

Central American Governments, GEF, IDB/MIF

Erick Cabrera, Director, a.i., FOCADES;
Director for International Cooperation and International Affairs
Ministry of Environment and Energy 1338-1002
Paseo Los Estudiantes
San Jose, Costa Rica
Tel: (503)2896131, Fax: (506)2896124

CHILE

EXISTING FUND

Fondo de las Américas

Chile Government, EAI

Jorge Osorio Vargas/ Rodrigo Calcagni
Director Ejecutivo
Fondo de las Américas - Chile
Consejo de las Americas
Huerfanos 786, of. 708
Santiago de Chile, Chile
Tel: (562) 633-5950, Fax: (562) 632-7017
Email: Josorio@fdla.cl; Rodrigoc@fdla.cl

COLOMBIA

EXISTING FUNDS

Corporación ECOFONDO

EAI, CIDA

Rafael Colmenares/ Julio César Uribe
Secretary General
Corporación ECOFONDO
Calle 82, No. 19-26, Apartado Aereo 350.224
Santa Fe de Bogota, Colombia
Tel: (57-1) 691-3452/63/74, Fax: (57-1) 691-3485
Email: ecodir@colnodo.apc.org
ecotodos@colnodo.apc.org

National Environmental Fund

Government of Colombia, IDB

Maria Victoria Cifuentes, Coordinadora General,
Unidad Coordinadora, Ministerio del Ambiente
Carrera 10 No. 27-27 of. 705
Bogota, Colombia
Tel: (57-1) 284-9262/9102, Fax: (57-1) 342-7242

FUND IN PROCESS OF ESTABLISHMENT

Environmental Fund for the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta

GEF (World Bank)

Rafael Gómez/Armando Calvano
Fundación Pro-Sierra Nevada
Calle 17 No. 3-83, Santa Maria, Colombia
Tel: (57-5) 4310551, Fax: (57-5) 4310552
Email: snevada@uniandes.edu.co
prosierra@compunet.net.co

COUNTRY

CONTACT

COSTA RICA

EXISTING FUNDS

Fondo Nacional de Financiamiento Forestal (FONAFIFO)

Jorge Mario Rodriguez Zuniga, Executive Director
FONAFIFO
Ave. 7 & 9, Calle 5
San Jose, Costa Rica
Tel: (506)257-8475, Fax: (506) 257-9695
Email: fonanfifo@ns.minae.go.cr

Fundacion de Parques Nacionales

Karia Ceciliano, Executive Director
Apartado 1108-1002 Paseo de los Estudiantes
San Jose, Costa Rica
Tel: (506)257-2239, Fax: (506) 222-4732
Email: kcecilian@ns.minae.gov.cr

Foundation "Funde-cooperación" for Sustainable Development

Government, Netherlands

Milton Rojas, Fundación Fundecooperación para el Desarrollo Sostenible
Apartado 1108-1002
100 M al oeste, 100 m. sur de la Iglesia de Fatima
Los Yoces, San Pedro, San José de Costa Rica
Tel: (506)2838327/2800221, Fax: (506) 225-5900
Email: fundecop@sol.racsa.co.cr

Centro Agricola Siquirres

Félix Méndez Morales
Hatillo5, San José, Costa Rica
Tel (506) 768 6825, Fax (506) 7686171

FUNDECOR (Fundacion para el Desarrollo de la Cordilera Volcanica Central)

USAID

Carlos Herrera Arguedas, Sub-Director Ejecutivo
FUNDECOR
200 m. al Este y 50 m. al norte del Banco Nacional de C.R.
Moravia, San José, Costa Rica
Tel: (506) 240-2624, Fax: (506) 297-1044
Email: herrera@fundecor.or.cr

CUBA

POSSIBLE NEW FUND

National Environmental Fund

Gricel Acosta Acosta/Cristobal Diaz, CITMA
Capirolio Nacional
C. de la Habana, 10200, Cuba
Tel: (537) 570598/570615, Fax: (537) 33-8054
Email: cdmdpa@yahoo.com; dpa@ceniai.inf.cu

COUNTRY

CONTACT

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

EXISTING FUND

Fondo Pro Naturaleza (PRONATURA)

Puerto Rico Conservation Trust, MacArthur Foundation, TNC/USAID

René Ledesma, Director Ejecutivo,
PRONATURA
c/o Paseo de los Periodistas #4 Ens. Miraflores
Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic
Tel: (809) 687-5799, Fax: (809)687-5766
Email: pronatura@codetel.net.do

ECUADOR

EXISTING FUND

Fondo Ambiental Nacional

Ministry of Finance

Reyna Oleas, Directora Ejecutivo
Fondo Ambiental Nacional
Ministerio de Medio Ambiente
La Pradera N30 258 y Mariano Aguilera
Edificio Santorini, 60. Piso, Quito, Ecuador
Tel: (593-2) 557-691, Fax: (593-2) 557-691
Email: roleas@fan.or.ec; FANI@fan.org.ec

EL SALVADOR

EXISTING FUNDS

Fondo Iniciativa para las Américas (FIAES)

EAI

Ana Maria Majano FIAES
Ave. Maracaibo No. 645
Colonia Miramome, San Salvador, El Salvador
Tel: (503) 260-1269/1442, Fax: (503) 260-1286
Email: fiaes@sal.gbm.net

Fondo Ambiental de El Salvador (FONAES)

Antonio Villacorta, Presidente, FONAES
29 Avenida Norte y Calle
Gabriela Mistral. No. 1013
San Salvador, El Salvador
Tel: (503) 226-3058/PHX 226-3000
Fax: (503) 226-4339

GUATEMALA

EXISTING FUNDS

Fideicomiso para la Conservación en Guatemala (FCG)

Maria José González, Directora Ejecutiva
Fideicomiso para la Conservación en Guatemala (FCG)
Ruta 7 6-42, Zona 4 OF. 201
01004, Guatemala C.A., Guatemala
Tel: (502) 334-3547, Fax: (502) 334-3548
Email: fcgua@intelnet.net.gt

FOGUAMA (Fondo Guatemalteco del Medio Ambiente)

Comisión Nacional del Medio Ambiente (CONAMA), Government of Guatemala

Erick Cabrera, Executive Director, FOGUAMA
7av.7-09 Zona 13 Guatemala, Guatemala
Tel: (502) 475-3551, Fax: (502) 475-3568
Email: foguama@infovia.com.gt

COUNTRY

CONTACT

Fondo Nacional para la Conservacion de la Naturaleza (FONACON)

Juan José Narcisco Executive Manager
Via 54-50, Zona 4
Edificio Maya Nivel 4
Tel: (502)332-0463, Fax: (502)331-5528
Email: seconap@guate.net

HAITI

FUNDS IN PROCESS OF ESTABLISHMENT

Haiti Environmental Foundation (FHE)

Jean-André Victor/Juliette Nicolas/Hans Tipperhauer/Guisse Samba
Chair, Steering Committee
Haiti Environmental Foundation
c/o Asset Project, Att.: Samba Guisse
60, rue Villatte
B.P.15771, Pétion-Ville, Haiti
Tel.: (509) 510-7728, Fax: (509)257-6492
Email: htipn@hotmail.com
jnicolas@hotmail.com
sambaguisse@hotmail.com
kathyowen@hotmail.com
fhc.Jiari@yahoo.com

Fonds pour la Protection et la Conservation de la Biodiversité (FOPECOB)

ATPPF, Ministry of Environment; World Bank

Micha Gaillard
Haiti Solidarité Internationale
P.O.Box 320, Port-au-Prince, Haiti
Tel: (509)45-8681/45-5217, Fax: (509) 45-1022.
Email: atppf@compa.net

HONDURAS

EXISTING FUND

Fundación Hondurena de Ambiente y Desarrollo "Vida"(Fundación Vida)

Government, USAID, UNDP

Oscar Lanza/Jorge A. Quinonez /Carlos Pineda
Executive Director, Fundación Vida
Boulevard Suyapa, Edificio Florencia
2do. Piso, 203
Apartado Postal 4252
Tegucigalpa, MDC, Honduras
Tel: (504) 239-1642, Fax: (504) 239-1645
Email: fundvida@sdnhon.org.hn
quinonenz@sdnhon.org.hn

JAMAICA

EXISTING FUNDS

The Environmental Foundation of Jamaica (EFJ)

EAI

Selena Tapper/Patrick Daily, Executive Director
Environmental Foundation of Jamaica (EFJ)
Unit27 Seymour Park 2, Seymour Ave
Kingston 10, Jamaica
Tel: (876) 978-6925, Fax: (876) 978-6557
Email: deacond@cwjamaica.com

COUNTRY

CONTACT

Jamaica National Park Trust Fund

USAID, Conservation Trust of Puerto Rico,
TNC

David Smith, Executive Director
Jamaica Conservation and Development Trust
(JCDDT)
95 Dumbarton Ave., Kingston 10, Jamaica
Tel: (876) 960-2848/9, Fax: (876) 978-6557
Email: jcddt@kasnet.com

MEXICO

EXISTING FUND

Fondo Mexicano para la Conservacion de la Naturaleza (FMCN)

GEF (World Bank), Government, USAID,
MacArthur Foundation

Lorenzo Rosenzweig Pasquel, Director General
Fondo Mexicano para la Conservacion de la
Naturaleza (FMCN)
Calle Damas No. 49, Col. San José Insurgentes
CP./03900, México, D.F.
Tel: (525) 611-9779, Fax: (525) 611-9779
Email: laros@infosel.nct.mx

NICARAGUA

EXISTING FUNDS

Fondo Canada - Nicaragua para el Manéjo del Medio Ambiente

Canada

Mercedes Salgado, Secretario Tecnico
Fondo Canadá-Nicaragua para el Manejo del
Medio Ambiente
Bolonia de los Pipitos 2 C. Abajo
Managua, Nicaragua
Tel: (505) 268-1983/4, Fax: (505) 268-1985
Email: bosque@ibw.com.ni

FONANIC

Ninnette Montes •
Marena Km. 12 1/2 carretera Sur
Tel (505) 263 2615
Email: ninnettc@tmx.com.ni

PANAMA

EXISTING FUND

Fundación para la Conservación de los Recursos Naturales (NATURA)

Government, USAID, TNC

Zuleika Pinzón, Director Ejecutivo
Fundación Natura
Apartado Postal 2190, Panamá, zona 1
República de Panamá.
Tel 507 232-7615/17/16/7435, Fax 507 232-7613
Email: natura@sinfo.net

PERU

FUNDS IN PROCESS OF ESTABLISHMENT

The Americas Fund for Peru

EAI

Tim Miller, USAID/Peru
Larra Bure y Unanus 110
Lima, Peru
Tel: (51-1)433-200, Fax: (51-1)433-7034

COUNTRY

CONTACT

EXISTING FUND

Fondo Nacional para las Areas Naturales Protegidas por el Estado (FONANPE)/PROFONANPE

GEF (World Bank), KFW/GTZ (Germany),
CIDA-FINIDA

Alberto Paniagua Villagra
Coordinador General, PROFONANPE
Prolongación Arenales 722 – 724
Miraflores, Lima 18, Peru
Tel: (51-1) 441-5870, Fax:(51-1) 441-8385
Email: gquijandria@profonanpe.org.pe
apaniagua@profonanpe.org.pe

SURINAME

Suriname Conservation Fund

Government of Suriname, Conservation
International, UNDP/GEF, United Nations
Foundation (UNF), World Wildlife Fund
(WWF)

Amb. Wim Udenhout, Executive Director
Conservation International Suriname
Lim A Po Straat
Paramaribo, Suriname
Tel: (597) 421305/426715
Fax:(597)421172
Email: cisgraun@sr.net

TURKS AND CAICOS

EXISTING FUND

Turks and Caicos Conservation Fund

Department for International Development

URUGUAY

EXISTING FUND

Fondo de las Américas – Uruguay

EAI

Jonathan D. Farrar/ Alvaro Mendy/Alba
Peralta/Mabel Gómez, US Representative
Fondo de las Américas – Uruguay
Av. 12 de Julio 907-Piso 4
Montevideo, Uruguay
Tel: (598) 2-900-0461, Fax: (598) 2-902-5662
Email: fondoame@adinet.com.uy