



## Supporting Country Action on the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas



### APPLICATION FOR FUNDING

#### “SUSTAINABLE FINANCE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BELIZE NATIONAL PROTECTED AREAS SYSTEM PLAN, COST OF THE SYSTEM AND ECONOMIC VALUATION.”

<b>1. Country</b>	Belize
<b>2. Agency and/or ministry responsible for protected areas</b>	Forest Department - Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Fisheries Department, Ministry of Fisheries and Agriculture, National Institute of Culture and History (NICH)
<b>3. CBD ratification date</b>	12-30 – 1993
<b>4. GEF OFP endorsement</b>	Name: Mr. Ismael Fabro Position: Chief Environmental Officer, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment Date of Endorsement:
<b>5. CBD PoWPA Activities (out of those eligible) to be supported</b>	3.4.1 , 3.1.2
<b>6. LDC country (Yes/No)</b>	No
<b>7. SIDS country (Yes/No)</b>	Yes
<b>8. Application submission date</b>	February 28, 2008
<b>9. Duration: (24 months maximum)</b>	24 months
<b>10. Contacts</b>	<p><b>Contact for project substantial issues</b> Name: Wilber Sabido Title: Chief Forest Officer Ministry: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment Phone: (501) 822-2079 Fax: (501) 822-1523 E-mail: <a href="mailto:cfo@mnrei.gov.bz">cfo@mnrei.gov.bz</a></p> <p><b>Contact for budget issues</b> Name: Valdemar Andrade Title: Executive Director Ministry: Protected Areas Conservation Trust Phone: (501) 822-3637 or 822-0642 Fax: (501) 822-3759 E-mail: <a href="mailto:valdemar@pactbelize.org">valdemar@pactbelize.org</a></p>

---

### 11. Financing plan, in US\$\*

Funding requested from GEF:	\$150,000
Co-financing <sup>1</sup> total, <b>including:</b>	<b>\$172,000, including:</b>
Government	\$47,000
Bilateral	
NGOs	\$25,000
International multilateral organizations	
Private Sector	
Other	\$100,000
<b>TOTAL FOR PROJECT BUDGET</b>	<b>\$322,000</b>

\* Details to be provided in the Financing Section of the proposal document below

---

<sup>1</sup> Please see the definition of co-financing in the Guidance Note

## ACRONYMS

APAMO	Association of Protected Areas Management Organizations
BAPPA	Belize Association of Private Protected Areas
BAS	Belize Audubon Society
BDF	Belize Defense Force
BERDS	Biodiversity and Environmental Resource Data System of Belize
BTB	Belize Tourism Board
CFO	Chief Forest Officer
CHM	Clearing House Mechanism
CPA	Community protected area
FCD	Friends for Conservation and Development
FID	Fisheries Department
FOD	Forest Department
FON	Friends of Nature
GOB	Government of Belize
HOD	Head(s) of Department
MNRE	Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment
MNS	Ministry of National Security
NFCBC	National Federation of Community Based Co-Managers
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NMPF	National Management Plan Framework
NPA	National protected areas
NPAC	National Protected Areas Commission
NPASA	National Protected Areas System Act
NPCA	National Parks Conservation Association
NPSA	National Parks System Act
PA	Protected area(s)
PACT	Protected Areas Conservation Trust
PAP	Public awareness programme
PD	Police Department
PfB	Programme for Belize
PPA	Private protected area
REA	Rapid Ecological Assessment
SATIIM	Sarstoon Temash Institute of Indigenous Management
TEV	Total economic valuation
TIDE	Toledo Institute of Development and Environment
TOR	Terms of reference
UB	University of Belize
UDP	United Democratic Party
YCT	Ya' axche Conservation Trust

## SECTION I.1 SUMMARY

## I.1.A Rationale and objective of the country project

Belize has a very high level of terrestrial and aquatic biodiversity. Belize hosts more than 150 spp. of mammals, 540 spp. of birds, 151 spp. of amphibians and reptiles, nearly 600 spp. of freshwater and marine fishes and 3,408 spp. of vascular plants. The country is unique, not only in the total number of species present, but also in the vast array of ecotypes and their species richness. The Mesoamerican Barrier Reef System (MBRS), stretching the full length of Belize's coastline, is the second largest in the world. The diversity of corals and related reef dwellers as well as its sheer size, has qualified this reef to be declared a World Heritage Site, in recognition of its rich biodiversity and consequent global importance. Belize also plays an integral part in the maintenance of the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor (MBC), comprised of a network of protected areas linked by biological habitat corridors, stretching from México to Panamá. This wealth of biological diversity, coupled with a rich cultural heritage has made Belize a very popular tourist destination, providing significant economic benefits for the nation.

Aware of the need to conserve and manage this vast biological and cultural richness, Belize has declared a series of Protected Areas which total 94 protected areas accounting for a total coverage of 1.22 million hectares, representing 44% of the national territory. The protected areas system comprises national parks, nature reserves, wildlife sanctuaries, natural monuments, forest reserves, marine reserves, archaeological sites and archaeological reserves, as well as private reserves, strategic biological corridors and scenic landscapes of geomorphic significance.

Belize has made significant advancement towards meeting the obligations required under the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity Programme of Work on Protected Areas, established at the 7<sup>th</sup> Conference of parts. Among these achievements is the design and approval in late 2005 of the National Protected Areas Policy and System Plan. However, to continue advancement with the required obligations and implementation of the Programme of Work on Protected Areas' objective which is to establish a system of representative protected areas that are effectively managed, it is necessary to develop a plan for long term financial sustainability of the National Protected Areas System and to conduct economic valuation studies of the priority terrestrial systems. This then forms the basis for mobilizing support for a robust protected areas system and providing information for sustainable business plans contributing to the system's effective management.

## I.1.B Expected outcomes, indicators, risks and mitigation measures

Expected outcomes	Indicators	Risk associated with attaining the indicator (high, medium, or low)	Risk mitigation measures
The contribution of the priority Terrestrial Protected Areas of the Maya Mountain Massif (MMM) and the Maya Mountain Marine Corridor (MMMC) to the country's economy is determined and that major stakeholders and decision makers are	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report on current and potential strategic benefits being delivered to local populations and social sectors by the protected areas of the MMM and the MMMC.</li> </ul>	<u>Medium</u> The available information for the determination of the total economic value of the MMM and the MMMC system is limited.	Extrapolate data of economic valuation studies from other areas similar to these sites.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total Economic Valuation (TEV) report of strategic</li> </ul>	<u>Medium</u> Limited in-country	Hire international

Expected outcomes	Indicators	Risk associated with attaining the indicator (high, medium, or low)	Risk mitigation measures
aware of these economic benefits.	<p>benefits of the Maya Mountains Massif and Maya Mountains Marine Corridor terrestrial portion of the Protected Areas system completed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plan and strategies to communicate results of studies developed and implemented.</li> </ul>	<p>capacity to develop a comprehensive economic valuation of resources and opportunities.</p> <p><u>Low</u> Stakeholders unwilling to participate in the process</p>	<p>consultants (regional specialists) to conduct the evaluation in collaboration with local consultants to build in-country capacity.</p> <p>Train national co-management partners in TEV procedures and protocols.</p> <p>Involve stakeholders in every phase of project implementation through their representation on the National Protected Areas Commission</p>
The Protected Areas System Finance plan is completed and tools and mechanisms designed and implemented towards an effective management of financial resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial Sustainability Plan for NPASP including a Budget estimate<sup>2</sup> for its effective implementation.</li> <li>• Results of PA legislative review relevant to financial mechanisms for the sustainability of NPA System.</li> <li>• Costs Accounting Standardization Package for management of Protected Areas in Belize by co-managing NGO's, Forest Department and Fisheries Department</li> </ul>	<p><u>Low</u> Limited in-country capacity to develop a comprehensive plan showing a full outlay of opportunities in financial sustainability.</p> <p><u>Medium</u> Limited political support to overcome the existing legal barriers.</p> <p><u>Medium</u> Resistance on behalf of the NGOs in implementing a standardized system of costs.</p>	<p>Hire international consultants (specialists) to conduct the evaluation.</p> <p>Participation of key decision makers and stakeholders from project inception in order to ensure buy-in and ownership.</p> <p>Develop a participatory process with NGOs to ensure buy-in and ownership of the project and</p>

<sup>2</sup> The Estimated Budget will be determined based on the estimated costs associated with the effective implementation of the National Protected Areas System Plan identified during project implementation.

Expected outcomes	Indicators	Risk associated with attaining the indicator (high, medium, or low)	Risk mitigation measures
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completed Financial PA scorecard</li> </ul>	<p><u>Low</u> Co-management organizations and relevant government ministries reluctance to implement Financial PA scorecard due to lack of knowledge.</p>	<p>understand the importance of making efficient use of available financial resources.</p> <p>Train accounting personnel in each co-management organization and relevant government ministries in use of Cost Accounting Standardization package. At a country support level conduct training of trainers in TNC, PACT and APAMO.</p> <p>Training accounting personnel in co-management organization and relevant government ministries in use of Financial PA scorecard</p>

## SECTION I.2 LINK TO INITIAL POWPA ANALYSIS AND PRIORITY

In an effort to fulfill the commitments established at the 7<sup>th</sup> Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, and to implement the Programme of Work on Protected Areas, the government of Belize in September 2004, jointly with allied organizations, conducted an assessment and priority setting exercise that resulted in the consigning of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

Partners to the MOU are the Government of Belize represented by the Ministry of Natural Resources; the Ministry of Tourism; and the Ministry of Fisheries; and Conservation International, The Nature Conservancy, World Wildlife Fund and Wildlife Conservation Society, who agree to contribute with technical and financial resources.

The objective is to collaborate on the implementation of the Programme of Work (POW) on Protected Areas under the CBD.

The MOU includes the following set of priority activities.

1. Protected Area Policy formulation that ensures or recognizes increased social and economic benefit while guaranteeing core protected area objectives.
2. Protected Area System Assessment & Analysis including the assessment of the attributes of the existing Protected Areas system and analysis of the existing Protected Areas system to emerge with a comprehensive system of protected areas linked to their surrounding land and seascapes developed based on the ecosystem approach.
3. Management procedures and sustainable use
4. Identification and delivery of economic benefits
5. Strengthening management & monitoring
6. Elaboration of the National Protected Areas System Plan.

Further to the MOU of 2004, an initial financial gap analysis<sup>3</sup> was conducted under the National Protected Areas Plan Project in 2005 which determined that the funding base for protected area management remains fragile. Across the network as a whole, some 20% still derives from orthodox subvention under GoB budgets and 45% comes from international donors. The first is under downward pressure and the second is inherently unstable, while the overall sum remains insufficient and the proposals for policy implementation made in the System Plan only widen the gap between needed and available financial resources. Thus, there is an urgent need to define a sustainable financing plan for the national system and its sites that would include viable financial mechanisms to fill the actual financial gap.

### **SECTION I.3 ACTION PLAN TO IMPLEMENT THE POWPA**

Belize has completed the initial analysis and priority setting exercise and has made advancements in establishing a National Protected Areas Policy and System Plan. The design of the National Protected Areas Policy and System Plan resulted from a series of consultative processes, implemented as part of the two-year national planning initiative that included the participation of relevant government entities (namely, the Forest Department and Fisheries Department), local and international conservation NGO's, community-based organizations, local communities, indigenous communities, academia, and industry<sup>4</sup>.

The National Protected Areas Commission (NPAC), a standing commission appointed by the Minister of Natural Resources charged with the implementation of the National Protected Areas System Plan, is the national framework for collaboration on the implementation of the POWPA while the priority setting exercise and the National Protected Areas Policy and System Plan of 2005 forms the basis for the development of the National Protected Areas System Plan Belize - Operational Framework: Principal Themes and Areas of Action of the System Plan. The Operational Framework is the guiding document for NPAC in the implementation of the System Plan and as such is viewed as the guiding document for achieving the country's obligations under the CBD Program of Work on Protected Areas.

The Thematic areas identified in the Operational Framework are as follows:

- 1) The establishment of an enabling administrative structure for policy implementation
- 2) The Protected Areas System is functional
- 3) The National Protected Areas System is Comprehensive
- 4) A Consolidated and Simplified National Protected Areas System

In addition to those activities being covered by this project, the Government of Belize, local conservation NGOs and donor NGOs are working on achieving several other PoWPA activities. They include the following:

---

<sup>3</sup> Launchpad Consulting, Sustainable Financing Mechanism, Belize Protected Areas System (Result 5), 2005.

<sup>4</sup> National Protected Areas System Plan Belize – Operational Framework, 2008.

Activity 1.1.4: Conduct, with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities and relevant stakeholders, national-level reviews of existing and potential forms of conservation, and their suitability for achieving biodiversity conservation goals, including innovative types of governance for protected areas that need to be recognized and promoted through legal, policy, financial institutional and community mechanisms, such as protected areas run by government agencies at various levels, co-managed protected areas, private protected areas, indigenous and local community conserved areas.

Activity 2.1.2: Recognize and promote a broad set of protected area governance types related to their potential for achieving biodiversity conservation goals in accordance with the Convention, which may include areas conserved by indigenous and local communities and private nature reserves. The promotion of these areas should be by legal and/or policy, financial and community mechanisms.

Activity 3.1.1: Identify legislative and institutional gaps and barriers that impede the effective establishment and management of protected areas, and by 2009, effectively address these gaps and barriers

## **SECTION I.4 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

### **I.4.A. Overview of the national protected area system**

The Protected Areas of Belize have evolved over the last few decades from being considered primarily as a resource bank, typically for forestry, to become a complex network of large and small 'enclaves' having a diversity of purposes and under a variety of management regimes, some more effective than others, reflecting changing conservation attitudes, as has the scope and direction of the various agencies responsible for their administration.

Today the country has 44% (1.22 Million hectares) of its land and sea resources protected under a variety of management structures: 769,093 ha of terrestrial reserves, 159,030 ha of marine reserves, and a further 128,535 ha protected through 'officially recognised' private conservation initiatives.

Based on the recently completed National Protected Areas System Plan (Meerman & Wilson), Belize has 94 protected areas that are governed by several protected areas related legislation. The protected areas system comprises national parks, nature reserves, wildlife sanctuaries, natural monuments, forest reserves, marine reserves, archaeological sites and archaeological reserves, as well as private reserves, strategic biological corridors and scenic landscapes of geomorphic significance.

Protected Areas in Belize include archaeological reserves and "accepted" private reserves. As part of Belize's protected areas system, there are Birds Sanctuaries that are some of the oldest protected areas. Archaeological Reserves include a number of Maya Sites managed by the National Institute of Culture and History (NICH).

Extractive Reserves form a grouping of Forest Reserves and Marine Reserves. These management categories were created for the management of extractive resources. This is the largest section of Protected Areas Categories (50% of total protected area extension):

- Forest Reserves = 9.3% of Total National Territory;
- Marine Reserves = 3.7% of Total National Territory; and,
- Combined coverage = 13.0% of Total National Territory.

The other conservation management categories are a grouping that represents management categories with conservation objectives. These include Nature Reserves, Wildlife Sanctuaries, no



take areas (marine reserves), National Parks, and Natural Monuments. This grouping includes a total of 53 areas falling in 6 different classes including conservation/wilderness/no-take zones of marine reserves. The total national coverage of this category of protected areas is 9.3% of the total national territory.

With respect to Private Protected Areas, there are 8 private protected areas that meet the classification of either having a standing agreement with the Government, and those that have a defacto recognition and have management structure in place (Shipstern Nature Reserve, Community Baboon Sanctuary, Runaway Creek, Aguacate Lagoon, Monkey Bay Wildlife Sanctuary and Golden Stream Corridor Preserve) (Meerman, 2006). The total area that these 8 protected areas represent is 31, 663 hectares or 3.2% of Belize’s National Territory.

The System is managed by 3 different Government Agencies : National Institute of Culture and History (NICH), the Forest Department and the Fisheries Department. There are also National NGO’s and Community Based Organisations participating as co-managers of an important number of Protected Areas.

PA category/type	Quantity	Surface area, hectares	Corresponding IUCN category	Management authority
Archeological Reserve	12	11,573.1	II	National Institute of Culture and History
Bird Sanctuary	7	5.9	IV	Forest Dept
Forest Reserve	17	380,328	VI	Forest Dept
Marine Reserve	29	169,958.2	II/IV	Fisheries Dept
National Park	17	166,138.5	II	Forest Dept
Natural Monument	6	7,034.4	Ia/III	Forest Dept
Natural Reserve	3	45,012.7	Ia/II	Forest Dept
Wildlife Sanctuary	7	149,243.0	IV	Forest Dept
Private Reserve	8	131,663.4	VI	Private

#### I.4.B Threats to the protected areas

**Threat 1. Unsustainable and illegal harvesting of natural resources:** Like so many Protected Areas throughout the world, Belize’s PAs face ongoing anthropogenic threats. One such threat is the unsustainable and illegal harvesting of the natural resources. The Forest Department and the Fisheries Department have been monitoring the harvesting of timber, non- timber, game species and fish stocks for many years; however, their limited resources have affected their enforcement capabilities. This has resulted in large scale illegal harvesting of timber, non-timber products, game species and fisheries throughout the protected area system. If the unsustainable harvesting of these resources continues the ecological function of the system will be compromised.

The impacts include but not limited to:

- Changes in species composition with selective removal of species such as cedar, mahogany, etc
- Fragmentation of forest structure through construction of logging roads and tracks
- Increased access for hunting and other illegal activities
- Hunting by logging crews
- Over-harvesting of seed and fruit trees
- Increased risk of erosion<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Wildtracks, Draft Interim CAP Output Report – Technical Assessment of the Maya Mountains Massif, 2007

**Threat 2. Unmanaged Development:** Tourism is one of the country's largest income earners and as such much attention has been placed on the creation of tourist destinations. Belize has experienced a marked increase in foreign investments in large scale developments targeted mainly at coastal regions of the country but the demand and pressure for land ranges the entire length and breadth of the country. Due to the lack of a National Development Policy, areas are continuously being cleared for small and large scale developments causing fragmentation and increasing the human footprint in critical areas. There is the need for a comprehensive economic valuation of critical areas and a concerted effort among government agencies in promoting development.

**Threat 3. Agricultural clearing:** There is ongoing agricultural clearing within and buffering protected areas. This is of particular concern in the southern region of the country where poverty levels are the highest and the indigenous communities depend on the natural resources for their basic needs. The traditional milpa system is still a widespread practice in Belize causing impacts which include among others

- Associated impacts on wildlife – indiscriminate hunting, harvesting of parrots for pet trade, harvesting of pacaya and other plant food sources
- Fire impacts associated with forest clearance for agriculture
- Leaching of soils with removal of forest canopy
- Increased erosion on steeper slopes<sup>6</sup>

While agricultural clearing is practiced by local communities, several large tracts of land have been cleared in recent years associated with large cattle ranching and citrus plantation (primarily in the south of Belize).

#### **I.4.C. Barriers and limitations preventing the existing PA system from achieving the targets of the CBD PoWPA**

**Barrier 1.** *Finance:* the funding base for protected area management remains fragile. Across the network as a whole, some 20% still derives from orthodox subvention under GoB budgets and 45% comes from international donors. The first is under downward pressure and the second is inherently unstable, while the overall sum remains insufficient and the proposals for policy implementation made here only widen the gap between needed and available financial resources.

**Barrier 2.** *Legal Framework:* there are major weaknesses in the key legislations that govern protected areas in Belize. The major weaknesses relate to the nature of the designation of, and rules for, the various categories of protected areas. These have been largely inconsistent with the needs of the key stakeholders, and do not have appropriate management regimes that promote and make a balance between conservation and sustainable use. Private protected areas and community-based protected areas are not formally and legally integrated into the protected areas system of Belize. Furthermore, there are no written departmental guidelines for the declaration, de-reservation, reclassification or alteration of protected areas in Belize.

**Barrier 3.** *Institutional Capacity:* Co-management arrangements with NGO's/CBO's and the Forest Department for the management of selected protected areas, and with NGO's/CBO's and the Fisheries Department for selected MPA's, exist with varying degrees of effectiveness. Privately-owned and managed lands have also been designated protected areas and some are recognized by the government. Such co-management agreements have been made when it was felt that there was a strong desire and capacity of the NGO/CBO to manage the site. Weaknesses in these arrangements include: a) lack of or insufficient stakeholder participation in

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

the preparation of management plans; b) lack of clarity on the implementation of regulations; c) insufficient details on dispute/conflict resolution; and d) lack of a mechanism for recovery of investment cost upon termination of the co-management agreement.

#### I.4.D Project outcomes and activities, and PoWPA Activities related to outcomes

PoWPA activities to be addressed	Project outcomes that correspond to PoWPA activities	Activities per each outcome
3.1.2 Conduct national level assessments of the contributions of the protected areas to the country's economy and culture.	The contribution of the priority Terrestrial Protected Areas of the Maya Mountain Massif (MMM) and the Maya Mountain Marine Corridor (MMMC) to the country's economy is determined and that major stakeholders and decision makers are aware of these economic benefits.	Identify and quantify actual and potential protected area goods and services, and potential sources of demand for such goods and services.
		Complete Economic valuation of the Maya Mountain Massif and Maya Mountain Marine Corridor terrestrial portion.
		Identify laws, policies and other measures that need to be put in place to ensure the payment for environmental services and integration of economic valuation in key government decision making process.
		Train national co-management partners and relevant government agencies in the use of economic tools and integration into financial planning process.
3.4.1 Conduct national level study of financial resources use effectiveness. Identification of possible funding instruments and elimination of perverse incentives.	The Protected Areas System Finance plan is completed and tools and mechanisms designed and implemented towards an effective management of financial resources.	Identify and analyze funding levels and shortfalls for the NPA system management and for the NPASP implementation.
		Train co-managers and relevant government agencies in the use of and completion of the financial sustainability scorecard.
		Conduct screening and feasibility analysis, including review PA legislation, for potential financial mechanisms for the NPA System.
		Conduct Standardization of Cost reporting accounting of PA.
		Prepare a comprehensive financial sustainability plan for ensuring long-term financial support for the system of protected areas.

#### I.4.E. Related projects and initiatives (not to be included in co-financing)

Project name	Funding: source and amount, US\$	Implementing agency(ies)	Which PoWPA activities are supported and how
Economic Valuation of Belize Barrier Reef	OAK Foundation \$ 250,000	WRI – World Resources Institute	3.1.2 – EV of Marine systems of Belize. The WRI project is focused only on the Marine areas within Belize while this project will only be focusing on the terrestrial areas. While they are both economic valuations they are of two different areas and the methodology used to complete the economic valuations in this project will be based on WRI's model with adjustments (if

			<p>necessary) making them complimentary.</p> <p>The NPAC is in close communication with all the NISP partners such as TNC, CI, WCS and OAK Foundation ensuring that projects do not overlap. The NPAC will ensure that this does not occur through continued dialogue and close working relationships through its Coordinator and by inviting these partners to present their agendas and ongoing work in the country.</p>
Economic Valuation of Belize Barrier Reef	Match Funds by WRI - \$250,000	WRI – World Resources Institute	<p>3.1.2 - – EV of Marine systems of Belize.</p> <p>The WRI project is focused only on the Marine areas within Belize while this project will only be focusing on the terrestrial areas. While they are both economic valuations they are of two different areas and the methodology used to complete the economic valuations in this project will be based on WRI’s model with adjustments (if necessary) making them complimentary.</p> <p>The NPAC is in close communication with all the NISP partners such as TNC, CI, WCS and OAK Foundation ensuring that projects do not overlap. The NPAC will ensure that this does not occur through continued dialogue and close working relationships through its Coordinator and by inviting these partners to present their agendas and ongoing work in the country</p>

## SECTION I.5 STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT

Stakeholder	Mechanism for involvement in the project
Forestry Department	Direct Consultation. Project management.
Fisheries Department	Direct Consultation. Project management through participation in NPAC
PACT	Direct Consultation. Project management through participation in NPAC. Manager of project funds.
National Protected Areas Commission (NPAC)	Commission will manage the implementation of the project.
NGO's, CBO's that currently manage significant portions of the national protected areas system, to include BAS, FON, FCD, PFB, TIDE, YCT, SATEEM, and umbrella organizations such as APAMO, and NFCBO.	Direct Consultation. Project management through participation in NPAC.
National Institute of Culture and History (NICH)	Direct Consultation. Project management through participation in NPAC.

## SECTION I.6 MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF EXPECTED OUTCOMES

The Forest Department will be the Government Agency responsible for the overall management and supervision of the project with all key stakeholders playing a role in the monitoring and evaluation of the expected outcomes through the recently established National Protected Areas Commission (NPAC). NPAC was established as a result of the NPAPSP and is the commission charged with its implementation. The Commission is comprised of the Forest Department, the Fisheries Department, the Association of Protected Areas Co- Management Organizations, National Institute of Culture and History – Institute of Archaeology, Belize Association of Private Protected Areas, Belize Tourism Board, Belize Tourism Industry Association, Indigenous Peoples for Conservation Alliance, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of National Development, National Federation of Community Based Co-managers, Protected Areas Conservation Trust, University of Belize and the Lands and Survey Department – Ministry of Natural Resources.

Type of M&E activity	Responsible party (ies)	Timeframe
1. Inception report	Forest Department	One month following receipt of first project disbursement
2. Quarterly technical and financial reports	Forest Department	The 30 <sup>th</sup> day of each calendar quarter, i.e. March 30, June 30, September 30 and December 30.
3. One-page travel reports	Consultants, stakeholders and PACT staff that travel for project purposes	Within 10 days of trip conclusion
4. Project completion report	Forest Department	Within 30 days of the end of the month in which last project disbursement has been received

## SECTION I.7 BUDGET

### I.7.A Estimated project costs

Outcome	GEF(US\$)	Co-financing (US\$)	Total (US\$)
1. Economic Valuation – Terrestrial PAs	80,000	30,000	110,000
2. Financial Sustainability Plan	50,000	15,000	65,000
Project management budget/costs*, (including audit <sup>7</sup> cost specified separately in the brackets)	20,000 (including 5,000 audit costs)	127,000	147,000

\* A maximum of 10% of the funding request may be spent on project management, *not taking into account audit costs.*

### I.7.B Budget lines

#### Outcome 1: Economic Valuation

Budget category	GEF(US\$)	Co-financing (US\$)	Total (US\$)
1. Local consultants	20,000	10,000	30,000
2. International consultants	60,000	-	60,000
3. Training		10,000	10,000
4. Travel		10,000	10,000
TOTAL for Outcome 1	\$80,000	30,000	110,000

#### Outcome 2: Sustainable Finance

Budget category	GEF(US\$)	Co-financing (US\$)	Total (US\$)
1. Local consultants	10,000		10,000
2. International consultants	40,000	5,000	45,000
3. Training		5,000	5,000
4. Travel		5,000	5,000
TOTAL for Outcome 2	50,000	15,000	65,000

<sup>7</sup> Please note that a financial audit is necessary for every project annually.

**Project management:** (maximum 10% of the total amount requested from the GEF under this application):

Budget category	GEF(US\$)	Co-financing (US\$)	Total (US\$)
1. Local consultants engaged in managing the project	10,000	50,000	65,000
2. Stationery and disposable items		10,000	10,000
3. Travel		20,000	20,000
4. Inception and Closing Workshop	5,000		
5. Overhead Costs		47,000	47,000
<i>TOTAL, before audit costs</i>	<i>15,000</i>	<i>127,000</i>	<i>142,000</i>
6. Audit cost	5,000		5,000
<b><i>TOTAL project management, including audit</i></b>	<b>20,000</b>	<b>127,000</b>	<b>147,000</b>

**I.7.C Co-financing (provide information on all co-finance sources directly relevant to the PoWPA activities which are the focus of this application)**

Institution	Classification	Type	Amount (US\$)	
			Confirmed*	Unconfirmed
Forest Department	Government Agency	In-Kind	47,000	
PACT	National Trust Fund	In-kind	50,000	
PACT	National Trust Fund	Cash	50,000	
TNC	NGO	Cash	25,000	
<b>Total co-financing</b>			172,000	

**PART II RESPONSE TO ITRC REVIEW AND COMMENTS – IF APPLICABLE**

Comment	Response from project developer	Please modify the application to incorporate your response, mark changes in yellow color, and say here at which page/paragraph the application was modified
I think it is just possible to evaluate PAs in the time frame, but this does not translate either into a full understanding of the benefits of PAs, let alone any full experience of these benefits by people. In this respect Outcome 1 seem not achievable within the control of the project alone. What are the measures the project will	The outcome has been revised to state specifically the two priority terrestrial areas that will be evaluated – the Maya Mountain Massif and the Maya Mountain Marine Corridor. These two blocks include 18 protected areas which represent a total of 25% of the entire terrestrial system. It is believed that the understanding of the benefits	Section I.1.b Expected Outcome 1 Page 4 & 5  <b>on I.4.D Project outcomes and activities, and</b>

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response from project developer</b>	<b>Please modify the application to incorporate your response, mark changes in yellow color, and say here at which page/paragraph the application was modified</b>
be taken to make this happen?	currently being derived from protected areas has to be linked to its financial and social contributions to the country's economy. For this reason, the total economic valuations will identify the monetary value of these two priority areas to the country's economy but it will also include a distributional analysis which will aid in identifying and communicating the social benefits to major stakeholders and decision makers in monetary terms.	<b>PoWPA Activities related to outcomes</b>  <b>11</b>
Putting together a realistic TEV report can take considerable resources and time. The budget allocation for such an activity is not representative of the effort needed, especially if the report is to be used to support the development of PoWPA goals. However, building on the earlier efforts of WRI will be helpful in this regard. What is the plan of the project in this regard? Please uncover.	NPAC through its membership is participating and aware of the works being completed under the WRI initiative. This information and model will serve as the basis for the work to be implemented under this project making modifications as needed to apply to the terrestrial evaluations. This project will not seek to reinvent the wheel but rather complement the work being implemented by WRI resulting in significant cost savings.  The project will also seek expertise from the top business school in the Latin American region (INCAE) in gathering the baseline information needed to conduct the economic evaluations. Again this is expected to reduce the cost of the economic valuations significantly.	
Please make a stronger case that this project does not overlap with (1) WRI project, (2) any current activity funded or expected to be funded by TNC, CI or WCS under the NISP or otherwise.	The WRI project is focused only on the Marine areas within Belize while this project will only be focusing on the terrestrial areas. While they are both economic valuations they are of two different areas and the methodology used to complete the economic	Section I.4.E: Related projects and initiatives (not to be included in co-financing)



<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response from project developer</b>	<b>Please modify the application to incorporate your response, mark changes in yellow color, and say here at which page/paragraph the application was modified</b>
	<p>valuations in this project will be based on WRI's model with adjustments (if necessary) making them complimentary.</p> <p>The NPAC is in close communication with all the NISP partners such as TNC, CI, WCS and OAK Foundation ensuring that projects do not overlap. The NPAC will ensure that overlap does not occur through continued dialogue and close working relationships through its Coordinator and by inviting these partners to present their agendas and ongoing work in the country to the Commission.</p>	Pages 11 & 12
<p>Costs for international consultants seem high. Please justify or modify accordingly.</p>	<p>The daily rate used is \$500 USD in line with those of UNDP and other international agencies. The project is aware of the limited expertise in country to carry out both the Financial Sustainability Plan and the Economic valuations therefore it envisions contracting the services of international consultants to carry out a significant portion of the work. Due to the nature of both outcomes, a considerable amount of time will be needed to achieve both outcomes resulting in high costs.</p> <p>The dollar amount for the economic valuation has been reduced by \$5,000 and added to training as building local capacities is crucial to the long term success of the protected areas system.</p>	<p>Section I.7.B: Budget Lines Outcome 2: Economic Valuations Page 14</p>

**ANNEX III.1 OUTCOMES OF THE INITIAL POWPA ANALYSIS AND PRIORITY SETTING**

**III.1.A and III.1.B The initial POWPA analysis and priority setting process and outcomes**

The Government of Belize realizing that the country’s protected areas represent a wealth of valuable resources and being faced with the task of developing the Protected Areas System decided to endorse the National Protected Areas Policy and System Plan Project and appointed a Task Force to oversee its implementation. The NPAPSP and the Operational Framework represent the framework for implementation of the COP-7 Programme of Work on Protected Areas.

In collaboration with key stakeholders the GoB identified its priorities and signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the international NGOs outlining the priority areas ensuring that the technical and financial resources would be available to achieve the objectives under the PoWPA. Further details can be found in Annex.III.1.E under the NPAPSP, the Operational Framework and the MOU between the Gob and the International NGOs.

An overlay of the protected areas on the ecosystems and comparison with target coverage provides a measure of the degree the present network meets system requirements (NPAPSP, Meerman & Wilson 2005). This shows that a full forty ecosystems are under-represented in the present protected area network. Some twenty-seven are poorly represented (i.e. 20% or more below target) and at least nine fail to meet the 10% IUCN target or are not captured in the network at all. Conversely, another twenty-seven are well covered (i.e coverage is within 10% of the target) and twenty-one exceed target coverage by over 10%.

The initial financial gap analysis determined that the funding base for protected area management remains fragile. Across the network as a whole, some 20% still derives from orthodox subvention under GoB budgets and 45% comes from international donors. The first is under downward pressure and the second is inherently unstable, while the overall sum remains insufficient and the proposals for policy implementation made here only widen the gap between needed and available financial resources.

**III.1.C Linkage between initial POWPA analysis and priority setting outcomes and activities proposed under this application**

<b>Initial POWPA analysis and priority setting result</b>	<b>Which activity is it linked to in the application</b>
Result 5 - of the initial POWPA Analysis for the development of the NPASP is titled: “Sustainable Financing Mechanisms, Belize’s Protected Areas System.”	
This result recommends: 1. At the system level it recommends: “Funding a Total Economic Valuation study for Belize’s PA at the earliest opportunity and share the results with the stakeholders.”	1. Activity 1 – Total Economic Valuation of priority national Protected Areas – at the terrestrial level (marine is being covered by a parallel project with WRI with OAK Foundation Funding).
2. “Identification of costs needs and ways of streamlining or reducing costs where possible.”	2. Activity 2 – Sustainable Finance addresses the development of a cost for the NPASP system in Belize.
3. “Developing institutional capacity to recover costs through revenue generation and collection at site level.”	3. Activity 2 – Sustainable Finance addresses standardization of cost accounting as a first step in developing institutional capacity across all

	partners in management and co-management.
--	---

**ANNEX III.2 GEF OFP ENDORSEMENT LETTER**

Attached separately

**ANNEX III.3 CO-FINANCING LETTERS**

Attached separately