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**SECTION 1 – FOR PROPOSED FINANCE SOLUTIONS**

**The preparatory stage** (If the solution is in the preparatory stage less details will be expected. Only the **white sections in the table must be filled**, the grey sections will be filled at the next stage).

**Full implementation stage** (If the solution enters in the full implementation stage, more details are expected. The **white and the grey sections must be filled** with as many details as possible)

**Scaling up existing BIOFIN finance solution** (If the solution was already being implemented under the previous phase by BIOFIN and the objective is to scale it up the proposal needs to be also developed to reflect this. **White and the grey sections must be filled** with as many details as possible)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proposal Summary** | |
| Title of the Finance Solution | **Growing protected area own revenue** |
| Concise Description (Approx 150 words) | In South Africa, there is a network of protected areas which is managed in a governance arrangement of national and provincial entities, provincial authorities, private owners and community-based protected. Biodiversity conservation is a concurrent function between national and provincial authorities and each management authority manages its own network of protected areas. Historically protected areas were established to protect South Africa’s rich wildlife as a primary objective, and as a secondary objective to generate revenue. Currently protected areas have 2 main revenue sources 1) Budget allocation from treasury and 2) fees and permits.  Over the years, revenue generated from protected areas has therefore declined considerably and the impact of COVID 19 has put funding of protected areas into sharp focus.  Success in generating own revenue is highly variable among the different conservation authorities in South Africa. Across conservation authorities, only South African National Parks has generated in excess of 51% of their budget from own revenue. Of the provincial conservation agencies, the North West Tourism Board generated own review making up 37% of total revenue for the year 2018, followed by Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife (EKZNW) with 29%. The remaining conservation agencies own revenue was under 13% of total revenue for this period (2018/19). The lack of other agencies’ ability to collect substantial site-based revenue is a concern in terms of managing the risk of future budget cuts in allocations.  As South Africa advances the expansion of protected areas to meet national objectives and global imperatives, there is an opportunity for sustainable utilisation of natural resources in order to also grow revenue generated by protected areas. In the 2018 BIOFIN funded study ‘making a case for protected areas in the Northern Cape’, which used an ecosystem evaluation methodology, it was revealed that protected areas have a strong potential to generate additional revenue. This potential is limited by institutional weaknesses such as inadequate number of staff, low and year on year declining budget allocation, lack of investment in protected areas and lack of integration between the department and other entities in the province that could support and promote growth in revenue from protected areas.  The aim of this solution is to develop and implement mechanisms to increase the rate of own revenue growth for protected management authorities which is particularly important given the significant government budget constraints. The solution will focus on the following Management Authorities: KZN Ezemvelo Wildlife (EKZNW), Limpopo Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism (LEDET), Northern Cape - Department of Environment and Nature Conservation (DENC), Eastern Cape Parks and Tourism Agency (ECPTA). The solution entails gathering key data on own revenue stream activities, undertaking assessments of key income streams, identifying enabling institutional arrangements and responsive management strategies, improving governance and efficiency and improving business models for conservation authorities, including partnerships with the communities and the private sector.  Fig1: Map of South Africa indicating the four provincial Management Authorities to be included in this Finance Solution  Diagram, map  Description automatically generated |
| Contribution to SDGs | **Goal 8 Decent work and economic growth**: Nature tourism is the quickest growing tourism sector, providing important opportunities. Well managed and sufficient protected areas can provide jobs and contribute to economic growth  **Goal 15 Life on land**: Well managed protected areas can contribute towards conservation and restoration efforts  resources, as internationally agreed.  **Goal 17 Partnerships for the goals**: Well managed Protected areas can create platforms for working with multiple stakeholders within a landscape, to achieve sustainable development at site and landscape level |
| Contribution to Aichi Targets / National Targets | **AICHI 11:** Well-governed and effectively managed protected areas are a proven method for safeguarding both habitats and populations of species and for delivering important ecosystem services.  **NBSAP 1.** Management of biodiversity assets and their contribution to the economy, rural development, job creation and social well-being is enhanced. |
| Implementing / Strategic partners (if other than UNDP) | BIOFIN will work with Provincial conservation management authorities and agencies KZN Ezemvelo Wildlife (EKZNW), Limpopo Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism (LEDET), Department of Environment and Nature Conservation (DENC), Eastern Cape Parks and Tourism Agency (ECPTA); and national institutions DFFE and SANParks. |
| Start and End Date | 2021 – 2024 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Finance Results** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Solution Category/ies from the [BIOFIN Catalogue](http://www.biodiversityfinance.net/finance-solutions) | Cost Effectiveness measures, Earmarking and retention of biodiversity revenues (self-income); Enhance public budget execution |
| Relevant Finance Result(s) | 1) Mobilizing Resources 2) Delivering Better |
| Estimated Finance Result | Based on the BFP it was assumed that own revenues could increase gradually to 12.5% above 2016 levels within 10 years in real terms and net of costs (i.e. an additional amount of ~R260 million by 2026 across all conservation authorities) |
| Finance Source | Public/Private |
| Sector | Conservation |
| Instrument Type | (Mixed) Regulatory and Market |

Note: if Private sector please check due diligence requirements / guidelines at [this LINK](https://popp.undp.org/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/BERA_Partnerships_UNDP%20Private%20Sector%20Risk%20Assessment%20Tool%20Guideline%20March%202016.docx)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Budget (USD)** | | |
| **Total resources required:** | USD 315 000 | |
| **Total resources allocated:** |  | |
| **BIOFIN** | USD 210 000 |
| **Gef 5** | USD 60 000 |
| **Government: DFFE** | USD 45 000 |
| **Government of South Africa**  **In-kind (not calculated)** |  |
| **Unfunded:** | | 0 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Main Proposal and approach** | |
| 1. Background information (150 words approx.) | The Biodiversity Expenditure Review (BER) conducted by BIOFIN provides data on government funding allocations and own or commercial revenues generated for most of the conservation authorities[[1]](#footnote-1). Data based on 2015 indicates that SANParks performed best, funding 51% of their expenditure through own revenue in 2015, followed by Northwest Parks (37% own revenue) and Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife (29% own revenue). The Northern Cape, Mpumalanga and Limpopo conservation authorities generated the lowest level of own revenues. Average own revenues were approximately 20% of total income for the conservation authorities considered if each management authority is given an equal weighting. It increases to 37% if a gross average is measured due to the dominance of SANParks. With respect to recent growth, between 2009 and 2015, SANParks and iSimangaliso were able to grow own revenues strongly at annual rates of 4% to 6% above inflation. Own revenue for Cape Nature and the Eastern Cape Parks and Tourism Board approximately matched inflation while own revenues decreased by more than 10% per annum in real terms in Mpumalanga and Limpopo.  One of the mechanisms used by National Treasury to allocate more public funds, is the ability to generate revenue. In the ‘making a case study for the Northern Cape’, there were low levels of publicity on, and utilisation of, protected areas, limiting revenue generating opportunities. The economic valuation of ecosystem services in this study estimated that the value of services from the protected areas in the Northern Cape was around R1, 2 billion per annum. This needs to be supported by annual investment in public funds of approximately R25m per annum. The study also found that the Northern Cape province has large potential for biodiversity offsets which can offset the cost to damage to the environment in the region.  Data in the BER shows that success in generating own revenue, and its individual components or sources, is highly variable. The need for Management Authorities to increase own revenue generation is well recognised along with the understanding that each management authority faces very different circumstances. The main revenue sources for protected areas range from gate fees, the sale of wildlife products such as permits and licences for hunting of wildlife and collection of species (where permissible) and wildlife recreational services including accommodation and sale of souvenirs.  A study conducted on Making the case for protected area funding in the Northern Cape Province showed that some of the challenges to increased revenue from protected areas include:   * High overhead costs: salaries make up the bulk of expenses leaving very little to push toward conservation outputs to maintain the proteted area and to invest in revenue generating activities; * Low budgets: Protected Areas have expressed that the budgets they receive are inadequate to cover their running and conservation costs; * Lack of adequate personnel: Protected Areas have reported losing staff members and the positions not being filled placing strain on the remaining personnel. This situation leaves personnel stretched to capacity with no time to strategise revenue generating finance models.   Another reason why revenue generation remains low in protected areas is the lack of integration between the department and other entities in the province that could support and promote growth in revenue from protected areas.  This finance solution will investigate additional activities that can be further developed and packaged for additional revenue sources to contribute to sustaining protected areas and supporting making a case for biodiversity in the following Management Authorities KZN Ezemvelo Wildlife (EKZNW), Limpopo Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism (LEDET), Department of Environment and Nature Conservation (DENC), Eastern Cape Parks and Tourism Agency (ECPTA).  This finance solution is also integrated with the work on rationalisation of protected areas to improve governance of protected areas and further work on resource mobilisation where a number of actions have been identified in commercialisation, fiscal reforms and partnerships.  Through the GEF5 co-financing, finance scorecards have been completed for Limpopo Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism (LEDET) and Eastern Cape Parks and Tourism Agency (ECPTA). Initial meetings have been held with Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife (EKZNW) and Department of Environment and Nature Conservation (DENC). |
| 1. Objective(s) and Results expected (100 words approx..) | 1. To improve the financial sustainability of the network of protected areas in four provinces by optimizing and diversifying revenue streams and by improving cost efficiencies.  2. To support Protected Areas Management Authorities (PAMAs) in identifying new mechanisms for sourcing revenue to fulfil their conservation management objectives in a manner that ensures the social and economic benefits derived from PAs are fully realized. |
| 1. Gender Aspects | Involvement of women in the design of the finance solutions   * Gender representativity in the implementation of the finance solution at all levels. * Identification of revenue streams where there is gender participation. |
| 1. Business Case (Approx 150 words) | The urgency associated with having to show gains in own revenue generation by protected areas has been on the increase and is likely to intensify in the prevailing fiscal environment. There is a need to demonstrate revenue generation to enhance motivation for increase in funding for protected areas. The experience gained in making a case for protected areas in the Northern Cape motivates for mechanisms to grow protected areas own revenue. The experience of SANParks and select other conservation authorities demonstrates the potential to grow own revenues at rates that comfortably exceed inflation (current inflation is approximately 4%).  The Finance Solution will have the following benefits:   * Enhance and generate additional revenue through the identification of blockages and formulation of sustainable finance strategies which will outline activities that will result in increased revenue generation. Activities will include gate fees, sale of tourism products and services such as accommodation. * Through these will be created (or financed sustainably) for local communities and * Increase investments in maintenance and further infrastructure development for ecosystem restoration and conservation.   Additionally, tourism contributes roughly 3.1% to the national GDP and 4.5% of all jobs in the country. Tourism continues to grow strongly, particularly in the nature-based tourism sub-sector which relies on protected areas as attractions[[2]](#footnote-2). Conservation authorities such as Limpopo, Eastern Cape, KwaZulu Natal and Northern Cape have the potential to grow their share of tourism within protected areas. |
| 1. Structure of the Finance Solution (100 words approx.) | This finance solution aims to identify and support the implementation of a mix of regulatory and market-based interventions that conservation authorities can implement, such as enhancement of revenue collection and retention, and development of a tourism product offering that can be developed for commercialisation. It will also include motivation for valuing ecosystem services that protected areas provide to motivate for more public expenditure allocation. Conservation authorities will be able to generate more revenue through improved regulatory governance and implementing of revenue raising activities. |
| 1. Description of Activities and Milestones (150 words approx.) | **Year 1: 2021 Set up task team and assess governance and infrastructure**   1. BIOFIN will support DFFE to establish task teams in Provincial Management Authorities to facilitate the standardised information gathering and to act as forums to discuss and develop ideas. 2. BIOFN and GEF 5 will facilitate completion of financial scorecards using (FSC) indicators for the Management Authorities. With the support of GEF 5, financial scorecards for Eastern Cape Parks and Tourism Agency (ECPTA).and Limpopo Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism (LEDET) will be undertaken. BIOFIN will support the completion of financial scorecards for KZN Ezemvelo Wildlife and Department of Environment and Nature Conservation (DENC). The scorecards have 2 parts which facilitate the collection of data on the broad headings below:   **Part I: Basic Information on, & Financial Analysis of, the PA System**   * Available finances * Expenditures * Financing needs & gap   **Part II: Assessing elements of the financial system (Qualitative self-scoring : METT like tool)**   * Component 1: Legal, policy & regulatory support * Component 2: Business planning & tools for cost-effective management * Component 3: Tools for revenue generation by PAs  1. Through the CEO’s Forum, will establish a community of practice on financing Protected Areas which will include public and private sector actors. The CEO’s Forum meets bi-annually to discuss amongst others best practice protected areas management and financial sustainability of protected areas and strategies for protected areas to contribute to the economy and GDP. The proposed interventions through this project will be discussed at the community of practice. The Protected Areas financing forum which will include all management authorities and meet quarterly or through existing mechanisms as a peer-to-peer learning network to share lessons learnt. 2. BIOFIN and DFFE will identify sustainable financing options for each Provincial Management Authority, including detailed action plans to implement them 3. DFFE working with National Treasury supported by BIOFIN will develop and implement a consistent accounting and financial reporting framework for Management Authorities that are better aligned with business principles and address the need to ring-fence financial reporting of Management Authorities within provincial departments. This will also include engagement with respective treasuries on appropriate mechanisms for revenue retention.   **Year 2 and 3: 2022-3 Develop income streams and identify revenue sources.**   1. DFFE and Management Authorities supported by BIOFIN will develop and finalise the sustainable financing strategy for each management authority. 2. Management authorities will implement actions and activities identified in the financial sustainable strategy. DFFE will monitor and evaluate of progress of the implementation of the sustainable financing strategy. 3. DFFE supported by BIOFIN will engage and work with provincial Treasuries and National Treasury on appropriate mechanisms for revenue retention. 4. BIOFIN will support DFFE and Management Authorities to Unpack and develop a suite of income generating activities and apply to each conservation MA. 5. BIOFIN and DFFE, working with National Treasury, will mechanisms for revenue accounting such as establishing trading/cost recovery accounts as well as strategies for the retention of unspent allocated funds from the annual budget.   Year 4: 2024 **Work on improving revenue generation and retention mechanisms**   1. DFFE will work with Management Authorities to develop appropriate governance mechanisms that facilitate revenue generation and retention 2. BIOFIN will develop a guidebook and other knowledge products (lessons learnt document) on revenue generation for all provincial authorities. |
| 1. Institutional Arrangements (100 words approx.) | * BIOFIN Core Team will support the coordination and implementation of the project * BIOFIN Core Team and National Treasury will support the development of financial reporting frameworks and revenue retention mechanisms together with Provincial Treasuries * Provincial Management Authorities will be project custodians and implementers through their provincial Task Teams. * Provincial Task Teams for each province to gather information and develop ideas on development of sustainable financing strategy as the guiding tool and support implementation thereof. * The BIOFIN Project Steering Committee to oversee and monitor the implementation of the project on the bi-annual basis until the end of the project and present in various intergovernmental forums such as Protected Areas-CEO Forum, UNDP-GEF, Working Group 1 |
| 1. Main risks and management response for solution implementation (100 words approx..) | * + Protected Areas Management Authorities not willing to participate in the process for fear that it may expose institutional structural issues. This will be mitigated by involving high level DFFE decision makers who can enable participation from the Management Authority,   + Significant capacity constraints within provincial protected area management structures may hinder effective implementation of own revenue options successfully and ability to implement the recommended new, innovative options to diversify incomes. This will be mitigated by establishing a task team which meets regularly and shares lessons from different provinces. Additionally opportunities for public-private partnerships will be explored to support initiatives such as tourism development over the longer term.   + Dwindling protected area budgets may create difficulties for undertaking new initiatives that require staff time and often capital investment. This will be mitigated by involving National and Provincial Treasury so that they can provide input and understand that sufficient Protected Area budget will provide higher returns on investment if the Protected Area system is geared up to generate revenue.   + Lower than expected tourism growth due to the COVID19 pandemic. This will be mitigated by encouraging tourism agency to build partnerships in marketing and publicity, and setting realistic targets. |
| 1. Sustainability and institutionalization (100 words approx..) | The development of sustainable financing strategies for each of the four Management Authorities will provide a long-term framework on which to develop revenue generation activities which will provide a level of financial sustainability for management authorities into the foreseeable future. Additionally, the revenue generation activities will incentivize management authorities to generate more revenue. Management authorities will reduce relative reliance on government transfers for day to day operations. The establishment of the task teams and the Protected Area Financing Forum will provide a forum for peer-to-peer learning network and build capacity within the management authorities. This finance solution links to the work on rationalization of protected which looks into improving institutional governance and actions identified in the overall resource mobilisation plan which is being finalised. |
| 1. M&E (100 words approx.) | The impact of this finance solution will be assessed by the increase in own revenue generated. Key performance indicators developed at the start of the project will be used for monitoring the implementation of the financial solution. Provincial and national treasuries will provide support in financial governance and provide guidance on mechanisms for revenue retention. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Impacts of the solution will be assessed by the national team and reported to the global team every 6 months as part of the progress reporting process and focusing on the main indicators listed below: | | |
| **Global/Headline Indicators** | | |
| Indicator | Baseline | Target |
| Increased generated revenues for biodiversity conservation or sustainable use /  Increase in revenue generated and retained by protected areas in four provinces | In 2016, these four provincial conservation management authorities generated R 388.72 million in own revenue (detail for each Management authorities below): | 4 % above inflation increase in own revenue for each target Management Authority by 2026 *(this target is taking into account a concern of the impact of COVID-19 on revenue in the short term)*  12,5% above inflation increase in own revenue for each Management Authority by 2030.  *Donor tagged as: Catalyzed* |
| * Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife:   R251 millions of own revenue for FY2015/2016  ~ USD 17 Million | Own revenue Ezemvelo KZN – ZAR 386 million BY 2026  ~USD 27 million |
| * Northern Cape - Department of Environment and Nature Conservation:   R2.22 millions of own revenue for FY2015-2016  ~USD 153,600 | ZAR 3 million by 2026  ~USD 209,000 |
| * Limpopo Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism:   R124.5 millions of own revenue for FY2015-2016  ~USD 8 million | ZAR 191 million by 2026  ~USD 13 million |
| * Eastern Cape Parks and Tourism Agency (ECPTA):   R134 millions of own revenue for FY2019/2020  ~USD 9 million | ZAR 176 million BY 2026  ~USD 12 million |
| Stakeholders with increased basic knowledge on the specific finance solution by participating in trainings and workshops | 0 in 2021 | At least 50 by 2024, at least 10 being women |
| Stakeholders with increased practitioner knowledge on growing protected area own revenue through direct participation to the implementation of the finance solution. | 0 in 2021 | 10 by 2024 (at least 2 being women) |
| **Project monitoring indicators/milestones** | | |
| Indicator | Baseline | Target |
| Provincial protected area Management Authority sustainable financial strategies developed including detailed action plans | No existing strategies for Management Authorities | At least 4 strategies developed with detailed relevant action plans and implemented by each respective Management Authorities by 2024 |
| Interprovincial task team established to discuss sustainable financing strategies | No existing interprovincial task team | Interprovincial task team meets at least 4 times to discuss the sustainable financing solutions by 2024 |
| Business plans for alternative revenue streams completed for 4 Management Authorities | 0 by 2021 | At least 4 business plans developed by 2023 |
| Financial Scorecards completed for 4 Management Authorities | 0 by 2021 | At least 4 Financial Scorecards completed by 2022 |

**SECTION 2 – FOR FINANCE SOLUTIONS APPROVED BY TECHNICAL ADVISOR ONLY**

Please provide the following information which will be included in next Workplan/Budget revision (or use actual Workplan document):

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Action Plan and Budget** | | | | | | | |
| **Activities** | **Timeframe** | | | | **Responsible actor/s** | **Funding source** | **Costs[[3]](#footnote-3) (USD)** |
| 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 |
| **Preparatory activities (includes feasibility studies, stakeholder engagement, etc.):** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Convene task teams for each MA and establish forum | X | X | X | X | DFFE | DFFE | 25 000 |
| Complete Financial Score Card (FSC) | X | X |  |  | DFFE/Provincial Management Authorities | BIOFIN GEF 5 | 60 000 (GEF 5)  + 5 000 (BIOFIN) |
| **Implementation** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Develop and Implement a sustainable financing strategy for each target management authority. | X | X | X | X | DFFE  BIOFIN | BIOFIN | 80 000 |
| Unpack and develop a suite of income generating activities and apply to each conservation management authorities. |  | X | X |  | BIOFIN | BIOFIN | 125 000 |
| Establish and convene meetings of the Protected Areas Financing Forum |  | X | X |  | BIOFIN  DFFE | BIOFIN | - |
| Develop and implement a revenue retention strategy with National Treasury |  | X |  |  | DFFE  BIOFIN | DFFE | 20 000 |
| **TOTAL** | | | | | | | 315,000 |

**Annex 1: BIOFIN Scoring and Screening Questions**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Questions** | **Indicative marks for scoring (1-5)** | **Score** |
| 1 | Is there a positive record of implementation? | 1= no, or limited records of success  3= successful pilots  5= yes, high potential of scalability | 5 |
| 2 | Will it generate, leverage, save, or realign a large volume of financial resources? | 1= minimal scale  2= <5 per cent of current expenditures / needs  3= 5-15 per cent of current expenditures / needs  4= >20 per cent of current expenditures / needs  5= game changer | 4 |
| 3 | Will financing sources be mobilized in a compatible timeline with needs? | 1 = no, the mobilization is not aligned with needs  3 = likelihood of being mobilized in alignment with needs  5 = yes, forthcoming and compatible schedules | 3 |
| 4 | Will financing sources be stable and predictable? | 1 = no, the source of revenue may be highly unstable and vulnerable to external factors  3 = likelihood of being reasonably stable and predictable source  5 = yes, very stable and predictable | 3 |
| 5 | Do the persons or entities paying have a willingness and ability to pay or invest? | 1 = no  3 = possibly  5 = yes | 3 |
| 6 | Are the financial risks adequately managed (e.g. exchange rate, lack of investors, etc.)? | 1 = no, high risks remain  3 = moderate risks  5 = yes, low residual risks | 3 |
| 7 | Are start-up costs onerous in comparison to the expected financial returns? | 1 = very costly (compared to returns)  3 = moderate (compared to returns)  5 = very low/minimal (compared to returns) | 3 |
| 8 | Does the solution improve incentives to manage biodiversity and ecosystems sustainably? (see Chapter 1). | 1 = not clear  3 = likely  5 = most certainly | 5 |
| 9 | Will the financial resources remain targeted to biodiversity over time? | 1 = not clear, high risk of misallocation  3 = likely, administrative provisions  5 = yes, strong legal provisions | 3 |
| 10 | Are risks to biodiversity (e.g. disrespect of mitigation hierarchy) low or easily mitigated? How challenging would it be to develop safeguards? | 1 = high risks, no easy mitigation  3 = reasonable risks, mitigation possible  5 = low risks, easy safeguards | 5 |
| 11 | Will there be a positive social and economic impact (e.g. jobs, poverty reduction and cultural)? | 1 = no  3 = moderate  5 = strong positive impact | 5 |
| 12 | Would there be a positive impact on gender equality, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits? | 1 = no  3 = moderate  5 = strong positive impact | 5 |
| 13 | Have risks of significant unintended negative social consequences been anticipated and managed? | 1 = no, high risks remain  3 = moderate and manageable  5 = yes, minimal residual risks | 5 |
| 14 | Will it be viewed as equitable and will there be fair access to the financial and biodiversity/ecosystem resources? | 1 = no, risk of inequitable outcome  3 = maybe  5 = yes | 5 |
| 15 | Is it backed by political will? | 1 = no, resistance from key stakeholders  3 = maybe  5 = yes, with public statements in support | 5 |
| 16 | Have political risks been anticipated and managed? | 1 = no, high risks remain  3 = moderate and manageable  5 = yes, minimal residual risks | 5 |
| 17 | Is buy-in among stakeholders (i.e. potential investors/ decision makers, implementers, and beneficiaries) sufficiently strong to counter potential opposition? | 1 = no  3 = partial buy-in  5 = yes, strong buy-in | 5 |
| 18 | Do the managing actor(s) have sufficient capacity? Can they rapidly acquire it? | 1 = no, severe capacity gap  3 = moderate capacity gap  5 = yes, strong capacity | 3 |
| 19 | Is it legally feasible? How challenging will any legal requirements be? | 1 = no, new law is required  3 = new regulations required  5 = yes, new regulations are not needed | 5 |
| 20 | Is it coherent with the institutional architecture, can synergies be achieved? | 1 = no, limited or no synergies / coherence  3 = potential synergies  5 = yes, fully coherent / large synergies | 5 |

1. This document refers to ten conservation authorities: SANParks, the national conservation authority, which manages National Parks, and the nine provincial conservation authorities, operational in the nine provinces of South Africa [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. If the global sanitary crisis impacted strongly the sector, a majority of experts expect international tourism to return to pre-pandemic 2019 levels in 2024 and current trends show that tourism based on nature will be one of the top priority for tourists. <https://www.unwto.org/taxonomy/term/347> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Please add budget years if needed. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)