Sustainable Finance Workshop Discussion: Successes and Challenges

1. Successes	2. Challenges	3. Opportunities
• In Samoa, project funded by GEF/IUCN. How to provide info re: where funding came from? Solution: Make bank information widely available. • Philippines – User fee of $1/tourist – funded conservation/ visitors facilities. • In Malaysia, entrance fees for MPAs will be a dual system – different for locals/visitors • $10/night for tourists for entire Maldives • W. Indian Ocean – good examples of cost-sharing. o Seychelles – gov't has extended reach for conservation by delegating responsibility to NGOs who manage rangers, manage funds. Gov't role is to set policy governing mngmnt. o Semi-autonomous Seychelles Island Fdn. Manages World Heritage sites (2). Tourist destination fees at one subsidize management of both. • Indian government established trust fund for each MPA that is managed by local authorities that collect and spend revenue.	• When Scaling up to networks – how to ensure communication/coordination across jurisdictional boundaries. • How to create a sustainable funding source when you are trying to protect an area from excessive visitor use. • If multiple agencies are involved, how to avoid fighting over who manages those funds. • Many islands (Caribbean) are sensitive to perception of a "tourist tax" that might be seen as discouraging visitors. • Great Barrier Reef – consumer surplus is about $40/visitor. It took some time to institute a fee because of disagreement with industry (resentment) of how to use surplus. Eventually a fee of $1/visitor. Stipulation that it must be spent on research. 5-6 years later…fee too low, raised to $4 and limit to research removed. Then $6 billion industry, limited government resources, government looks at this as funding source for broader government needs because revenues are from public resource. Challenge is that industry (tourism) was reluctant to have fees on their activity when fishing industry has none. Fisheries levies a fee – but only to cover research (hence limit on early tourism fee).	• Linking mitigation fees for land based sources of pollution to marine protection (e.g. road construction, ship groundings) • Linking fisheries and environment • Possible links to license/access fees from high seas fisheries • Focus on willingness to pay (e.g. recreational fisheries, tourism) • Celebrity champion for coral reef protection. • NOAA proposals for community-based proposals to protect coral reefs – NFWF RFP. • Define financial and non-monetary value as a means of leveraging support for marine conservation (e.g. work with pride, inspiration and commitment of local and political leaders • Maintaining what works – build on existing community or government conservation/finance schemes, ensure they succeed and replicate/share successes

• Philippines – community-based management. Community organized to charge visitors tourist fees to support conservation and community needs. Success was movement from a local strategy to part of a national program. Able to charge more, dual system. Difficult transition to national level because community felt loss of control, moving money back to the community became more difficult – but prognosis is good. • Belize – national and network level sustainable financing mechanism. Did a study of costs of running a nation network (14 sites). Looked at a number of mechanisms to fund needs. Benefit of a network approach was that higher revenues were collected from places with more tourists. MPAs can be designated for environmental conservation and fisheries protection. Targeting users that benefit from resources as well as those that have an adverse impact. • Florida – capturing revenues from vehicle license plates. Many choices of plates are available, if you select a particular plate, you pay a higher fee, Mote Marine Lab created "protect our reefs" plate, proceeds fund coral	• Guam – economy is based on tourism, largely from Japan. Typhoons, war, SARS all impact tourism, user fees are susceptible. • Micronesia – remoteness, it's difficult for tourists to get here. • Pacific countries collect fees from foreign fishing vessels – opportunity/challenge (both!?) to devoting some of those resources to conservation. • Mitigation fees as a sustainable finance mechanism, as in for road development. • Lack of political will! • Create sense of entitlement for one sector • Mitigation for damage to reef – company is doing a feasibility study for establishing anchorages for vessels in area with high number of vessel groundings. • Using mitigation dollars to establish navigation aids to prevent groundings • S. Africa, living marine resources management governed by Act that has fee structure including commercial fishing, diving fees, etc. Disbursement becomes controversial. • Overlapping issues in fisheries management – environment and fisheries management are not necessarily working together.	

conservation efforts. • NSW, Australia – rec. fishery user fees have been used to buy back commercial licenses from net fishermen. • RMI fisheries Management plan provides for sharing of license fees (sharing is a success), funds used for community needs as well as resource management needs.	• HI – EPA reviewing Clean Water Act mitigation for coral reefs – what would be effective? For harbor/port construction where corals are dredged out of existence, mitigation would include reducing land-based sources of pollution or in-lieu fee paid in perpetuity for activities to support MPAs, pollution control, etc. Missing factor is lack of trustworthy and interested 3rd party to manage the fund. • Value the impact/loss of no action	