



# Financial Sustainability Scorecard: for National Systems of Protected Areas

Weblink: <http://www.undp.org/gef/05/kmanagement/newpublication.html>

**Version 1.5, August 2008**

UNDP Copyright © 2007.

United Nations Development Programme,  
304 East 45th Street, New York, New York 10017

**Acknowledgments:**

Many thanks to the following who contributed to the development of this document: Maria Fernanda Acosta, Steve Cobb, Christopher Cosslett, Scott Edwards, Marlon Flores, Julie Gale, Maria Jose Gonzalez, John Hough, Helen Negret, Midori Paxton, Juan Jose Rodriguez, Nik Sekhran, Jonathan Smith, Lee Thomas, Maria Elena Zuniga

Graphic Design: Sandra Rojas

Cover photo: Amazonia © urbanhearts. Fotolia.com



# Financial Sustainability Scorecard: for National Systems of Protected Areas

Electronic downloadable versions:  
<http://www.undp.org/gef/05/kmanagement/newpublication.html>





# Financial Sustainability Scorecard: For National Systems of Protected Areas

ANDREW BOVARNICK

AUGUST 2008

**NOTE:** THIS DOCUMENT REFLECTS THE VIEWS OF THE AUTHOR AND NOT NECESSARILY THOSE OF UNDP. IT IS WORK IN PROGRESS AND ALL COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS SHOULD BE SENT TO THE AUTHOR AT [ANDREW.BOVARNICK@UNDP.ORG](mailto:ANDREW.BOVARNICK@UNDP.ORG).

# Contents

INTRODUCTION 3

FINANCIAL SCORECARD – PART I – OVERALL FINANCIAL STATUS 6

FINANCIAL SCORECARD – PART II – ASSESSING ELEMENTS OF THE FINANCING SYSTEM 11

FINANCIAL SCORECARD – PART III – SCORING AND MEASURING PROGRESS 18

# INTRODUCTION

## Context

Protected area financing is critical for sound PA management. However, globally, protected area financing needs to be improved at both site and system level. Hence developing long-term financing systems is a key element for protected areas sustainability.

Protected area “financial sustainability” refers to the ability of a country to meet all costs associated with the management of a protected area system. The system level is defined here simply as the aggregation of PA sites and central level operations. This implies a funding “supply” issue of generating more revenue across the system, but just as importantly, a “demand” side challenge of managing PA financing needs (at sites and at the central level). PA financial sustainability needs to be addressed from both sides of the financial equation.

It is this systematic process of defining costs and identifying ways to meet those costs that constitutes financial planning. Good financial planning enables PA managers to make strategic financial decisions such as re-allocating spending to match management priorities, and identifying appropriate cost reductions and potential cash flow problems.

In addition to cost and revenue concerns, a third area that requires special consideration in order to achieve PA financial sustainability is institutional arrangements. Responsibility for PA management and financing are often shared across various institutions and roles need to be clarified and harmonized for effective financial planning and budgeting. Furthermore, within these managing institutions efficient and transparent mechanisms for collecting and managing PA-related fees are often not in place.

Therefore, UNDP has developed this scorecard to assist project teams and governments track their progress to make PA systems more financially sustainable. The scorecard has been designed at the PA system level and not site level because:

- There are activities required at a national level and not just at site level such as policy reform, fund management and setting PA fees, which can affect all PAs;
- There are activities that require a coordinated effort and support from several government institutions, particularly the Ministry of Finance, which are best achieved through a centralized management and financing system;
- Sites will often require similar activities so it is cost-effective to provide these centrally, such as training or monitoring;
- Fundraising can be more effective if coordinated centrally;
- System level planning allows cross-subsidization between sites; and
- Harmonized fee systems can reduce competition issues between sites.

PA financing must be viewed at two levels. One is the basic status of a PA system’s finances – how much is being spent and how much is needed to be spent for effective management. This will look at annual expenditures, operational costs, investment needs, revenue generation etc. From this it is possible to assess financing gaps and financial targets for increasing budgets and expenditures and/or reducing management costs in order to balance accounts.

However, there are limitations to what a snapshot of a PA system’s financial accounts shows about the underlying structure, health and future direction of its finance. One year there could be a high level of expenditure due to donor support, a capital injection from a debt-for-nature swap, or a jump in tourism. However, one year’s financial status does not necessarily ensure the future financial health of a PA system. To fully assess if a PA system is moving towards financial sustainability it is also important to investigate and analyse the structural foundations of what enables and promotes long-term financial improvements for PAs. A PA system’s financing is based on many elements, which are becoming increasingly known, and are quite common across countries.



## Purpose

The purpose of this scorecard is to assist governments, donors and NGOs to investigate and record significant aspects of a PA financing system – its accounts and its underlying structural foundations – to show both its current health and status and to indicate if the system is holistically moving over the long-term towards an improved financial situation. The scorecard is designed for national systems of PAs but could be used by sub-national eg state, regional or municipal or even sets such as MPA networks.

There is a section to record overall financial status and changes to the inflows and outflows of capital of the PA system. However, the scorecard is designed to check the progress of the entire PA financing system and its foundations which will lead to the future financial viability of a PA system. Therefore the scorecard is structured to look at elements of a financing system, described below.

These elements in themselves provide guidance on what a framework for a PA financing system should comprise. Assessing each element can help a country identify which areas of its governance structure needs to be improved to enhance its PA financing system.

The questions regarding financial data also provide an opportunity for a country to assess its capacity to generate and collect cost and revenue data fundamental for PA financial planning. Where data is unavailable, provision of such data should be a priority for the country.

Whilst the scorecard recognizes the importance of cost-effective management in PA financing it does not provide specific guidance on the use of funds. UNDP plans to develop guidance on this at a later date.

## Structure

The scorecard has three sections:

- Part I** – Overall financial status of the protected areas system. This includes basic protected area information and a financial analysis of the national protected area system.
- Part II** – Assessing elements of the financing system.

### Part III – Scoring.

**Part I** requires financial data to determine the costs, revenues and financing gaps of the PA system both in the current year and as forecast for the future. It provides a quantitative analysis of the PA system and shows the financial data needed by PA planners needed to determine financial targets and hence the quantity of additional funds required to finance effective management of their PA system. As different countries have different accounting systems certain data requirements may vary in their relevance for each country. However, where financial data is absent, the first activity the PA authority should be to generate and collect the data.

**Part II** of the scorecard is compartmentalized into three fundamental components for a fully functioning financial system at the site and system level – (i) legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks, (ii) business planning and tools for cost-effective management (eg accounting practices) and (iii) tools for revenue generation.

### COMPONENT 1: LEGAL, REGULATORY AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORKS THAT ENABLE SUSTAINABLE PA FINANCING

Legal, policy, regulatory and institutional frameworks affecting PA financing systems need to be clearly defined and supportive of effective financial planning, revenue generation, revenue retention and management. Institutional responsibilities must be clearly delineated and agreed, and an enabling policy and legal environment in place. Institutional governance structures must enable and require the use of effective, transparent mechanisms for allocation, management and accounting of revenues and expenditures.

### COMPONENT 2: BUSINESS PLANNING AND TOOLS FOR COST-EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT

Financial planning, accounting and business planning are important tools for cost-effective management when undertaken on a regular and systematic basis. Effective financial planning requires accurate knowledge not only of revenues, but also of expenditure levels, patterns and investment requirements. Options for balancing the costs/revenues equation should include equal consideration of revenue increases and cost control. Good financial planning enables PA managers to make strategic financial decisions such as allocating spending to match management priorities, and identifying appropriate cost reductions and potential cash flow problems. Improved planning can also help raise more funds as donors and governments feel more assured that their funds will be more effectively invested in the protected area system.

## COMPONENT 3: TOOLS FOR REVENUE GENERATION AND MOBILIZATION

PA systems must be able to attract and take advantage of all existing and potential revenue mechanisms within the context of their overall management priorities. Diversification of revenue sources is a powerful strategy to reduce vulnerability to external shocks and dependency on limited government budgets. Sources of revenue for protected area systems can include traditional funding sources – tourism entrance fees – along with innovative ones such as debt swaps, tourism concession arrangements, payments for water and carbon services and in some cases, carefully controlled levels of resource extraction.

**Part III** summarizes the total scores and percentages scored by the country in any given year when the exercise is completed. It shows the total possible score and the total actual score for the PA system and presents the results as a percentage. Over time changes to the scores can show progress in strengthening the PA financing system.

## Scoring

The Scorecard should be completed every year to show the yearly situation in the protected area system and changes over time. The first year the Scorecard is completed becomes the baseline year and this stays fixed. Then if the Scorecard is completed every subsequent year the results can be compared to the baseline data and data from previous years to show the annual progress of the national PA financing system.

Each year the scores within Part II should be totaled for each Component and these sub-totals added together to reach an overall score for the national PA system.

In each country certain elements may be more important and difficult to achieve than others. In this case country teams have the flexibility to modify the current weighting system and change the number of points allocated to a certain element so the scoring better suits their national conditions. Any modifications to scoring should be transparent and footnoted.

Additionally if a specific element or sub-element is not appropriate for a country then it and its associated maximum scores can be taken out of the total possible scoring. In this way the total score can be adjusted to fit the country conditions. Because this

means the total possible score may vary countries should present annual scores as a percentage (actual score compared to total possible score).

The percentage of achievement of each Component should be presented. This allows a comparison of advance between each Component and can aid countries identify where are their weaknesses and strengths within their financing systems. Where lower scores are identified the corresponding areas should be a focus for future intervention and capacity building. The percentages will also permit comparisons across countries

## FINANCIAL SCORECARD – PART I – OVERALL FINANCIAL STATUS OF THE PROTECTED AREAS SYSTEM

### Basic Protected Area System Information

**Describe the PA system and what includes:**

This could be defined by IUCN Categories I-VI. However, if a country defines its PA system differently or has multiple PA systems then insert a definition that best describes the system about which the Scorecard is presenting data. For example some PA systems have a mixture of public, private and mixed ownership protected areas. What is important is for each country to explain and state which types of protected areas are included in the defined system and financial analysis. Some countries have private reserves separate from the national PA system. In these cases it is optional to report these here in an additional category in the tables (under other) as they do not fall under the responsibility of the government.

Also include any additional specific characteristics of the national PA system that might affect its financing.

Protected Areas System or sub-system	Number of sites	Total hectares	Comments
National protected areas			
Sub-national (state/regional/municipal) protected areas			
Co-managed protected areas			
Others (define)			

FINANCIAL SCORECARD – PART I – OVERALL FINANCIAL STATUS OF THE PROTECTED AREAS SYSTEM

Financial Analysis of the National Protected Area System	Baseline year <sup>1</sup> (US\$) <sup>2</sup>	Year X <sup>3</sup> (US\$) <sup>4</sup>	Comments <sup>5</sup>
<b>AVAILABLE FINANCES<sup>6</sup></b>			
<b>1. Total annual central government budget allocated to PA management (excluding donor funds and revenues generated for the PA system)</b>			
- national protected areas			
- sub-national (state/regional/municipal) protected areas			
- co-managed protected areas			
- others			
<b>2. Total annual government budget provided for PA management (including PA dedicated taxes<sup>7</sup>, Trust Funds, donor funds, loans, donations, debt-for nature swaps and other financial mechanisms)</b>			Specify sources of funds and US\$ amounts for each
- national protected areas			
- sub-national (state/regional/municipal) protected areas			
- co-managed protected areas			
- others			
<b>3. Total annual site based revenue generation across all PAs broken down by source<sup>8</sup></b>			Indicate total economic value of PAs (if studies available) <sup>9</sup>
A. Tourism entrance fees			Specify the number of visitors to the protected areas in year X - internacional: - national:  Specify fee levels:
- national protected areas			
- sub-national (state/regional/municipal) protected areas			
- co-managed protected areas			
- others			
B. Concessions			
- national protected areas			
- sub-national (state/regional/municipal) protected areas			
- co-managed protected areas			
- others			

## FINANCIAL SCORECARD – PART I – OVERALL FINANCIAL STATUS OF THE PROTECTED AREAS SYSTEM

C. Payments for ecosystem services (PES)			Provide examples:
- national protected areas			
- sub-national (state/regional/municipal) protected areas			
- co-managed protected areas			
- others			
D. Other (specify each type of revenue generation mechanism <sup>10</sup> )			
- national protected areas			
- sub-national (state/regional/municipal) protected areas			
- co-managed protected areas			
- others			
<b>4. Total annual revenues generated by PAs (total of (3))</b>			
- national protected areas			
- sub-national (state/regional/municipal) protected areas			
- co-managed protected areas			
- others			
<b>5. Percentage of PA generated revenues retained in the PA system for re-investment<sup>11</sup></b>			
	%		Specify whether PA generated revenues are retained directly in the PA system or are sent to government and then returned back to the PA system
- national protected areas			
- sub-national (state/regional/municipal) protected areas			
- co-managed protected areas			
- others			
<b>6. Total finances available to the PA system [line item 2] + [line item 4 * line item 5]</b>			
- national protected areas			
- sub-national (state/regional/municipal) protected areas			
- co-managed protected areas			

FINANCIAL SCORECARD – PART I – OVERALL FINANCIAL STATUS OF THE PROTECTED AREAS SYSTEM

- others			
<b>COSTS AND FINANCING NEEDS</b>			
<b>7. Total annual expenditure for PAs (all PA operating and investment costs and system level expenses)<sup>12</sup></b>			<p>State any extraordinary levels of capital investment in a given year.</p> <p>State rate of disbursement - total annual expenditures as % of available finances (line item 6.)</p> <p>If this % is low, state reasons <sup>13</sup>.</p>
- national protected areas			
- sub-national (state/regional/municipal) protected areas			
- co-managed protected areas			
- others			
<b>8. Estimation of financing needs<sup>14</sup></b>			
A. Estimated financing needs for <i>basic</i> management costs (operational and investments) to be covered			
- national protected areas			
- sub-national (state/regional/municipal) protected areas			
- co-managed protected areas			
- others			
B. Estimated financing needs for optimal management costs (operational and investments) to be covered. <sup>15</sup>			
- national protected areas			
- sub-national (state/regional/municipal) protected areas			
- co-managed protected areas			
- others			
<b>9. Annual financing gap (financial needs - available finances)<sup>16</sup></b>			
A. Net actual annual surplus/deficit <sup>17</sup>			
- national protected areas			

## FINANCIAL SCORECARD – PART I – OVERALL FINANCIAL STATUS OF THE PROTECTED AREAS SYSTEM

10

- sub-national (state/regional/municipal) protected areas			
- co-managed protected areas			
- others			
<b>B. Annual financing gap for basic expenditure scenarios</b>			
- national protected areas			
- sub-national (state/regional/municipal) protected areas			
- co-managed protected areas			
- others			
<b>C. Annual financing gap for optimal expenditure scenarios</b>			
- national protected areas			
- sub-national (state/regional/municipal) protected areas			
- co-managed protected areas			
- others			
<b>D. Projected annual financing gap for basic expenditure scenario in year X+5<sup>18, 19</sup></b>			
- national protected areas			
- sub-national (state/regional/municipal) protected areas			
- co-managed protected areas			
- others			
<b>10. Financial data collection needs</b>			Specify main data gaps identified from this analysis:  Specify actions to be taken to fill data gaps <sup>20</sup> .

## FINANCIAL SCORECARD – PART II – ASSESSING ELEMENTS OF THE FINANCING SYSTEM

Component 1 - Legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks					COMMENT
<b>Element 1 – Legal, policy and regulatory support for revenue generation by PAs</b>	None (0)	A Few (1)	Several (2)	Fully (3)	
(i) Laws or policies are in place that facilitate PA revenue mechanisms					Specify the revenue generation mechanisms that are not permitted under the current legal framework
(ii) Fiscal instruments such as taxes on tourism and water or tax breaks exist to promote PA financing					
<b>Element 2 – Legal, policy and regulatory support for revenue retention and sharing within the PA system</b>	No (0)	Under development (1)	Yes, but needs improvement (2)	Yes, satisfactory (3)	
(i) Laws or policies are in place for PA revenues to be retained by the PA system (central and site levels)					Specify % to be retained:
(ii) Laws or policies are in place for PA revenues to be retained at the PA site level					Specify % to be retained:
(iii) Laws or policies are in place for revenue sharing at the PA site level with local stakeholders					Specify % to be retained:
<b>Element 3 – Legal and regulatory conditions for establishing Funds (endowment, sinking or revolving)<sup>21</sup></b>					
	No (0)	Established (1)	Established with limited capital (2)	Established with adequate capital (3)	
(i) A Fund has been established and capitalized to finance the PA system					
	None (0)	A few (1)	Several (2)	Sufficient (3)	
(ii) Funds have been created to finance specific PAs					
	No (0)	Partially (1)	Quite well (2)	Fully (3)	
(iii) Funds expenditures are integrated with national PA financial planning and accounting					
<b>Element 4 – Legal, policy and regulatory support for alternative institutional arrangements for PA management to reduce cost burden to government</b>	None (0)	Under development (1)	Yes, but needs improvement (2)	Yes, Satisfactory (3)	
(i) There are laws or policies which allow and regulate concessions for PA services					

(ii) There are laws or policies which allow and regulate co-management of PAs					
(iii) There are laws or policies which allow and regulate local government management of PAs					
(iv) There are laws which allow, promote and regulate private reserves					
<b>Element 5 – National PA financing policies and strategies</b>					
(i) There are key PA financing policies for:	No (0)	Yes, but needs improvement (2)	Yes, satisfactory (3)		
- Comprehensive, standardized and coordinated cost accounting systems (both input and activity based accounting)					
- Revenue generation and fee levels across PAs					Specify the tariff levels for the PAs
- Allocation of PA budgets to PA sites (criteria based on size, threats, business plans, performance etc)					List the budget allocation criteria
- Safeguards to ensure that revenue generation does not adversely affect conservation objectives of PAs					
- PA management plans to include financial data or associated business plans					
(ii) Degree of formulation, adoption and implementation of a national financing strategy <sup>22</sup>	Not begun (0)	In progress (1)	Completed (3)	Under implementation (5)	
<b>Element 6 – Economic valuation of protected area systems (ecosystem services, tourism based employment etc)</b>	None (0)	Partial (1)	Satisfactory (2)	Full (3)	
(i) Economic valuation studies on the contribution of protected areas to local and national development are available					Provide summary data from studies
(ii) PA economic valuation influences government decision makers		(eg within Ministry of Environment)	(eg within other sectoral Ministries)	(eg within Ministry of Finance)	
<b>Element 7 – Improved government budgeting for PA systems</b>	No (0)	Partially (2)	Yes (3)		
(i) Government policy promotes budgeting for PAs based on financial need as determined by PA management plans					
(ii) PA budgets includes funds to finance threat reduction strategies in buffer zones (eg livelihoods of communities living around the PA) <sup>23</sup>					

FINANCIAL SCORECARD – PART II – ASSESSING ELEMENTS OF THE FINANCING SYSTEM

(iii) Administrative (eg procurement) procedures facilitate budget to be spent, reducing risk of future budget cuts due to low disbursement rates					
(iv) Ministry of Finance plans to increased budget, over the long term, to reduce the PA financing gap					
<b>Element 8 – Clearly defined institutional responsibilities for financial management of PAs</b>	None (0)	Partial (1)	Improving (2)	Full (3)	
(i) Mandates of public institutions regarding PA finances are clear and agreed					
<b>Element 9 – Well-defined staffing requirements, profiles and incentives at site and system level</b>	None (0)	Partial (1)	Almost there (2)	Full (3)	
(i) There is an organizational structure with a sufficient number of economists and financial planners in the PA authorities (central, regional and site levels) and sufficient authority to properly manage the finances of the PA system					Explain their roles:
(ii) PA site manager responsibilities include, financial management, cost-effectiveness and revenue generation <sup>24</sup>					
(iii) Budgetary incentives motivate PA managers to promote site level financial sustainability (eg sites generating revenues do not experience budget cuts)					
(iv) Performance assessment of PA site managers includes assessment of sound financial planning, revenue generation, fee collection and cost-effective management					
(v) There is auditing capacity for PA finances					
(vi) PA managers have the possibility to budget and plan for the long-term (eg over 5 years)					
<b>Total Score for Component 1</b>					<p><b>Actual score:</b></p> <p><b>Total possible score: 95</b></p> <p><b>%:</b></p>

Component 2 – Business planning and tools for cost-effective management					
Element 1 – PA site-level business planning					
	Not begun (0)	Early stages (1)	Near complete (2)	Completed (3)	Comment
(i) PA management plans includes conservation objectives, management needs and costs based on cost-effective analysis					The rating should be based on quality of management plans
(ii) PA management plans are used at PA sites across the PA system					Specify the percentage of PAs that have management plans
(iii) Business plans, based on standard formats and links to PA management plans and conservation objectives, are developed across the PA system <sup>25</sup>					
(iv) Business plans are implemented across the PA system (degree of implementation measured by achievement of objectives)					
(v) Business plans for PAs contribute to system level planning and budgeting					
(vi) Costs of implementing management and business plans are monitored and contributes to cost-effective guidance and financial performance reporting					
Element 2 – Operational, transparent and useful accounting and auditing systems					
(i) There is a transparent and coordinated cost (operational and investment) accounting system functioning for the PA system					
(ii) Revenue tracking systems for each PA in place and operational					
(iii) There is a system so that the accounting data contributes to system level planning and budgeting					
Element 3 – Systems for monitoring and reporting on financial management performance					
(i) All PA revenues and expenditures are fully and accurately reported by PA authorities to stakeholders					
(ii) Financial returns on tourism related investments are measured and reported, where possible (eg track increase in visitor revenues before and after establishment of a visitor centre)					
(iii) A monitoring and reporting system in place to show how and why funds are allocated across PA sites and the central PA authority					

## FINANCIAL SCORECARD – PART II – ASSESSING ELEMENTS OF THE FINANCING SYSTEM

(iv) A reporting and evaluation system is in place to show how effectively PAs use their available finances (ie disbursement rate and cost-effectiveness) to achieve management objectives					
<b>Element 4 – Methods for allocating funds across individual PA sites</b>	No (0)	Yes (2)			
(i) National PA budget is allocated to sites based on agreed and appropriate criteria (eg size, threats, needs, performance)					
(ii) Funds raised by co-managed PAs do not reduce government budget allocations where funding gaps still exist					
<b>Element 5 – Training and support networks to enable PA managers to operate more cost-effectively</b>	Absent (0)	Partially done (1)	Almost done (2)	Fully (3)	
(i) Guidance on cost-effective management developed and being used by PA managers					
(ii) Inter-PA site level network exist for PA managers to share information with each other on their costs, practices and impacts					
(iii) Operational and investment cost comparisons between PA sites complete, available and being used to track PA manager performance					
(iv) Monitoring and learning systems of cost-effectiveness are in place and feed into system management policy and planning					
(v) PA site managers are trained in financial management and cost-effective management					
(vi) PA financing system facilitates PAs to share costs of common practices with each other and with PA headquarters <sup>26</sup>					
<b>Total Score for Component 2</b>					<b>Actual score:</b>  <b>Total possible score: 61</b>  %:

Component 3 – Tools for revenue generation by PAs					
	None (0)	Partially (1)	A fair amount (2)	Optimal (3)	Comment
<b>Element 1 – Number and variety of revenue sources used across the PA system</b>					
(i) An up-to-date analysis of revenue options for the country complete and available including feasibility studies;					
(ii) There is a diverse set of sources and mechanisms, generating funds for the PA system					
(iii) PAs are operating revenue mechanisms that generate positive net revenues (greater than annual operating costs and over long-term payback initial investment cost)					
(iv) PAs enable local communities to generate revenues, resulting in reduced threats to the PAs					
<b>Element 2 – Setting and establishment of user fees across the PA system</b>					
	No (0)	Partially (1)	Satisfactory (2)	Fully (3)	
(i) A system wide strategy and action plan for user fees is complete and adopted by government					If PA sites have tariffs but there is no system strategy score as partial
(ii) The national tourism industry and Ministry are supportive and are partners in the PA user fee system and programmes					
(iii) Tourism related infrastructure investment is proposed and developed for PA sites across the network based on analysis of revenue potential and return on investment <sup>27</sup>					
(iv) Where tourism is promoted PA managers can demonstrate maximum revenue whilst not threatening PA conservation objectives					
(v) Non tourism user fees are applied and generate additional revenue					
<b>Element 3 – Effective fee collection systems</b>					
	None (0)	Partially (1)	Completed (2)	Operational (3)	
(i) System wide guidelines for fee collection are complete and approved by PA authorities					
(ii) Fee collection systems are being implemented at PA sites in a cost-effective manner					
(iii) Fee collection systems are monitored, evaluated and acted upon					
(iv) PA visitors are satisfied with the professionalism of fee collection and the services provided				Not applicable	This can be done through visitor surveys

Element 4 – Marketing and communication strategies for revenue generation mechanisms	None (0)	Partially (1)	Satisfactory (2)	Fully (3)	
(i) Communication campaigns and marketing for the public about tourism fees, conservation taxes etc are widespread and high profile at national level					
(ii) Communication campaigns and marketing for the public about PA fees are in place at PA site level					
Element 5 – Operational PES schemes for PAs <sup>28</sup>	None (0)	Partially (1)	Progressing (2)	Fully (3)	
(i) A system wide strategy and action plan for PES is complete and adopted by government					
(ii) Pilot PES schemes at select PA sites developed					
(iii) Operational performance of pilots is monitored, evaluated and reported					
(iv) Scale up of PES across the PA system is underway					
Element 6 – Concessions operating within PAs <sup>29</sup>	None (0)	Partially (1)	Processing (2)	Fully (3)	
(i) A system wide strategy and implementation action plan is complete and adopted by government for concessions					
(ii) Concession opportunities are operational at pilot PA sites					
(iii) Operational performance (environmental and financial) of pilots is monitored, evaluated, reported and acted upon					
(iv) Scale up of concessions across the PA system is underway					
Element 7 – PA training programmes on revenue generation mechanisms	None (0)	Limited (1)	Satisfactory (2)	Extensive (3)	
(i) Training courses run by the government and other competent organizations for PA managers on revenue mechanisms and financial administration					
<b>Total Score for Component 3</b>					<b>Actual score:</b> <b>Total possible score: 71</b> %:

Total Score for PA System	
Maximum Total Score	227
Actual score as a percentage of the total possible score	
Percentage scored in previous year <sup>30</sup>	

SIGNATURE<sup>31</sup>: \_\_\_\_\_

DIRECTOR OF PROTECTED AREAS SYSTEM

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>1</sup> The baseline year refers to the year the Scorecard was completed for the first time and remains fixed. Insert year eg 2007.  
<sup>2</sup> Insert in footnote the local currency and exchange rate to US\$ and date of rate (eg US\$1=1000 colones, August 2007)  
<sup>3</sup> X refers to the year the Scorecard is completed and should be inserted (eg 2008). For the first time the Scorecard is completed X will be the same as the baseline year. For subsequent years insert an additional column to present the data for each year the Scorecard is completed.  
<sup>4</sup> Insert in footnote the local currency and exchange rate to US\$ and date of rate  
<sup>5</sup> Comment should be made on robustness of the financial data presented (low, medium, high)  
<sup>6</sup> This section unravels sources of funds available to PAs, categorized by (i) government core budget (line item 1), (ii) additional government funds (line item 2), and (iii) PA generated revenues (line item 3).  
<sup>7</sup> Such as a conservation departure tax or water fees re-invested in PAs  
<sup>8</sup> This data should be the total for all the PA systems to indicate total revenues. If data is only available for a specific PA system specify which system  
<sup>9</sup> Note this will include non monetary values and hence will differ (be greater) than revenues  
<sup>10</sup> This could include fees for licenses, research etc  
<sup>11</sup> This includes funds to be shared by PAs with local stakeholders  
<sup>12</sup> In some countries actual expenditure differs from planned expenditure due to disbursement difficulties. In this case actual expenditure should be presented and a note on disbursement rates and planned expenditures can be made in the Comments column.  
<sup>13</sup> Low to be defined by country expectations and needs  
<sup>14</sup> Complete this per PA system and add rows as necessary for each PA system for which needs are estimated  
<sup>15</sup> Optimal scenarios should include costs of expanding the PA systems to be fully ecologically representative  
<sup>16</sup> Financing needs as calculated in (8) minus available financing total in (6)  
<sup>17</sup> This will likely be zero but some PAs may have undisbursed funds and some with autonomous budgets may have deficits  
<sup>18</sup> This data is useful to show the direction and pace of the PA system towards closing the finance gap. This line

can only be completed if a long term financial analysis of the PA system has been undertaken for the country  
<sup>19</sup> As future costs are projected, initial consideration should be given to upcoming needs of PA systems to adapt to climate change which may include incorporating new areas into the PA system to facilitate habitat changes and migration  
<sup>20</sup> Actions may include (i) cost data based on site based management plans and extrapolation of site costs across a PA system and (ii) revenue and budget accounts and projections  
<sup>21</sup> This element can be omitted in countries where a PA system does not require a Trust Fund due to robust financing within government  
<sup>22</sup> A national PA Financing Strategy will include targets, policies, tools and approaches  
<sup>23</sup> This could include budgets for development agencies and local governments for local livelihoods  
<sup>24</sup> These responsibilities should be found in the Terms of Reference for the posts  
<sup>25</sup> A PA Business Plan is a plan that analyzes and identifies the financial gap in a PA's operations, and presents opportunities to mitigate that gap through operational cost efficiencies or revenue generation schemes. It does not refer to business plans for specific concession services within a PA. Each country may have its own definition and methodology for business plans or may only carry out financial analysis and hence may need to adapt the questions accordingly.  
<sup>26</sup> This might include aerial surveys, marine pollution monitoring, economic valuations etc.  
<sup>27</sup> As tourism infrastructure increases within PAs and in turn increases visitor numbers and PA revenues the score for this item should be increased in proportion to its importance to funding the PA system.  
<sup>28</sup> Where PES is not appropriate or feasible for a PA system take 12 points off total possible score for the PA system  
<sup>29</sup> Concessions will be mainly for tourism related services such as visitor centres, giftshops, restaurants, transportation etc  
<sup>30</sup> Insert NA if this is first year of completing scorecard.  
<sup>31</sup> In case a country does not have an official national Protected Areas system, the head of the authority with most responsibility for protected areas or the sub-system detailed in the Scorecard, should sign.





Energy & Environment Group  
Bureau for Development Policy  
United Nations Development Programme

304 East 45th Street  
New York, New York 10017  
<http://www.undp.org/>