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Abstract. Conservation of biodiversity is desirable for a variety of ecological, economic and other reasons. Whereas economics do not necessarily rank top of the list, the neglect thereof will inevitably lead to the failure of achieving conservation objectives. If wildlife and protected areas do not contribute to poverty reduction but instead limit available resources which otherwise could be used to alleviate poverty, then their conservation has no political future. They will not be able to compete with other forms of land use. Sustainable financing should mainly be self-generated, as wildlife is a productive renewable resource. Permanent subsidies by outside sources should remain the option only in well-justified individual cases when all other income-generating possibilities have been exhausted.
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1. Finance as Core Conservation Problem

The upkeep of national parks, game reserves and similar protected wildlife areas goes hand in hand with a considerable effort. Depending on the objectives for protecting an area, the costs of developing infrastructure and keeping a reasonable management regime average between 50 and 300 US$ per km² annually. In small protected areas the costs per unit area can even be much higher.

Considering the total size of areas under protection in developing and in transformation countries the effort of upkeep adds up to enormous sums, which are usually neither covered by income nor, because of other priorities, by public budgets. Some countries have placed 10 to 25% of their land surface under strict protection. The positive economic impact of such areas on the economy are significant in countries such as Tanzania and South Africa, but low in others, which have little tourism such as in Central Asia.

Empirical studies prove a distinct correlation between financial investment and successful protection. On the other hand practical experience shows that inefficient and corrupt administrations can also easily consume high financial inputs and investment without tangible results. It is not necessarily true that a lot of money helps a lot! Adequate financing is therefore a prerequisite but not in itself sufficient.

It should also not be forgotten that finance is only „a“ and not „the“ core conservation problem as it is so often assumed to be but seldom queried. In many practical cases much more could be achieved with the available finance if only the money was spent more wisely and if the management was more efficient.

Nevertheless in reality many protected areas are seriously under-funded and cannot meet their goals. Surveys show that only a few are raising even close to the income required to cover expenditure. Most aid projects have not managed to change this. Presently there seems to be a general consensus that there is little hope that Central Asia’s wildlife protected areas will ever be self-supporting.

In many countries, significant wildlife populations continue to exist outside protected areas. Basic protection of this wildlife by the respective authorities entails further expenditure over and above that of the protected...
areas. Unfortunately the reality of most countries is that these means are lacking, and effective anti-poaching outside protected areas is even less of a reality than within.

2. “Use It or Lose It”?

Just as development cooperation followed the principle of “help for self-help”, so too was it undisputable to economists that conservation of wildlife and other natural resources should also orientate itself on basic economic principles. Wildlife and protected areas can be economically used and consequently have the potential to generate income in a sustainable manner which can finance their upkeep and contribute at the same time to the welfare of people, in particular of the rural dwellers sharing the same areas. Income, so the doctrine goes, was to cover expenditure as much as possible. Natural resources, which generate income, have a higher chance of being conserved by people, perpetually striving to meet their needs, than those resources, which solely entail costs. Despite simplifying it a bit too much, the slogan “use it or lose it” sums it up nicely.

Of course such a principle cannot be applied in absolute terms. It is not valid in each and every case. Not every protected area, not every type of biodiversity, can be utilized or is able to finance itself.

As a general rule protection and utilization are not fundamental contradictions. The World Conservation Union (IUCN) defines “conservation” to mean both the protection and sustainable use of natural resources including wildlife. International conventions and declarations, such as the Convention on Biological Diversity, give nations the right to utilize their natural resources including wildlife in all consumptive and non-consumptive forms.

Sustainable use options for game are many and varied. These include photo tourism, hunting, game ranching, meat production, use of by-products and live capture. Empirical experience shows that a combination of different forms of utilization usually renders the highest income. In some instances environmentally friendly game utilization can bring equal or even greater revenues per unit area than other land use options, e.g. agriculture. It is possible to design all these forms of use in an environmentally friendly or – in the case of over-utilization – an unsustainable manner.

Where organized properly, however, the so-called consumptive use of game has contributed to the protection of species and habitats and increase of wildlife numbers. In this way, endangered or near-extinct species have been saved through a combination of protection and utilization.

Controlled tourist hunting is an especially revenue-rich form of utilization, which impacts relatively little on the environment. For emotional and ideological reasons, however, hunting is often excluded as an option for income generation. Opponents of utilization have joined together in large and financially powerful groups that are able to exert wide public and political influence.

In systems in which utilization is not permitted, wildlife represents costs only to the landowner and not any income. Those however who inflict only costs on the proprietor or user of land and yet deny them the benefits are with certainty contributing to the extinction of wildlife.

By putting a value on a resource, an incentive is created to protect it in order to be able to reap benefits in the long-term. Some countries have outlawed hunting (e.g. India or Kenya) in order to protect their wildlife. Such bans have always been fictional as they have not been able to halt the on-going massive illegal utilization. Empirical data from countries with hunting bans show that these have by no means contributed to the protection of wildlife. On the other hand, in countries where game has been given a value this has either led to an increase or at least slowed down the decrease in wildlife numbers.

A precondition for the long-term success of any system of utilization is that a considerable share of the income is reinvested into protection and management and further that the landowner can profit from the game on the land.

3. How to Reduce the Deficits

In principle the system “use it or lose it” has had a high degree of success. Nevertheless the income to be realized in many areas does not suffice to protect wildlife and its habitats and to additionally generate revenues for landowners and the state. As was mentioned earlier, it is also important to take into account that some species or biospheres are so rare, endangered or sensitive that they are not suitable for utilization.

In such cases it is inevitable that ways be sought to close the financial gap between income and expenditure. Once again, the aspect of cost should be considered first. More often than not, one should start by improving financial planning and spending and by lowering expenditure. Under a strict financial management regime, less external finance is needed to close the deficit. The same applies to spending levels. If funds are scarce, not everything that might be desirable in such fields as research, monitoring or infrastructure should be financed. Economic investment has to be subjected to cost-benefit considerations. “Can we afford tourism?” is a question which must be asked in relation to national parks which are under-utilized, but at the same time nevertheless cause high investment and running costs. Sometimes the entire revenue from tourism is not sufficient to finance a fraction of the road network put in by a donor for the use of the tourists. This may all sound blatantly obvious; however there are many real life examples where such simple principles have been ignored.

Many governmental and parastatal structures assigned with the task of managing protected areas are ineffective. They tend to be overstaffed, lacking in transparency, and are constrained in decision making by excessive bureaucratic constraints. They are burdened with many tasks over and above their capabilities that would be best left to the private sector.

In many cases it would make sense to privatise entire protected areas. Biodiversity protection need not be compromised if a park, having been badly managed by the state and running at a loss, is managed by the private sector with professional staff, can be prevented if management plans; long-term lease agreements and regular eco-audits are put in place.

If the management and protection of wildlife on communal and private lands is entrusted into the hands of those who own or hold the land, i.e. the communities and the landowners, then this would also lead to a reduction of management costs for governmental institutions. In this way a “Community-based Conservation Programme” can not only increase the conservation status of such areas but can also reduce public spending.

State departments are generally reluctant to privatise, as they would thus be deprived of sources of revenue and lose both influence and power. They much prefer external financing schemes, which after all permit deficits to be covered with few strings attached. There is also minimum pressure to conform, thus allowing those responsible to continue as before.
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4. Creative Financing to Stimulate without Oppressing Efforts

The question whether wildlife “can pay its way” has often been raised. The answer is simple: Under certain conditions, wildlife can make a substantial contribution to its own conservation, but there are circumstances in which it cannot.

The following wildlife areas should be self-supporting under normal circumstances:

• National Parks with attractive wildlife populations suitable for mass tourism and located in politically stable countries.
• Small prime wildlife protected areas in private hands suitable for high price/low volume tourism.
• Relatively small areas offering a special attraction which is in high demand.
• Well-managed hunting areas.

Wildlife outside protected areas can equally be sustained, if the population pressure is not too high, some amount of proper control is in place, and rural communities are allowed to use their wildlife in a regulated system and on a sustainable basis for their own benefit.

It has to be accepted that many other wildlife-protected areas need some kind of permanent outside subsidies. The hope to finance them with so-called “eco-tourism” has turned out to be an illusion for a number of reasons.

What form this external funding should take is not a subject of this paper? Different types of innovative conservation funding, mainly in the form of “Trust Funds”, are presently being developed. The important fact is that such outside funding should only complement and not substitute efforts of self-reliance and that the above-mentioned economic principles are adhered to. Conservation finance must be tied to achievement. It must not bankroll the non-performers. Otherwise they get rewarded and the performers are punished.

This is easy to postulate, but difficult to secure in practice. Whether we like it or not, proper controls by those who provide the funds and therefore have the foremost interest that they are put to proper use, are indispensable. It is presently a trend, mostly borne by frustration over the lack of success of classical project aid, to provide assistance increasingly in the form of budget finance and basket funding. This might be regarded as modern and politically correct by some; however, it is difficult to see how such systems, with their limited and indirect control, could work better. After all lack of funds is not the main conservation bottleneck, but rather organizational and management deficits.

There is another issue that should be mentioned here, as it is only a minority of conservationists who seem to be aware of it: Multiple use approaches normally lead to higher revenues from wildlife and protected areas. Without controlled hunting it will not be possible in most cases to earn sufficient revenues for conservation. This does not imply that prime National Parks should be turned into hunting reserves. But in most countries there are enough buffer zones and other areas, many of them neglected, which are suitable. In some cases, it is advisable to protect an area as a hunting reserve instead of a National Park. Even in situations where wildlife populations are relatively depleted, some careful use is possible and wildlife populations will recover fast as long as the habitat is still available for wildlife and some degree of protection against illegal exploitation is put in place with the money earned from hunting.

The hunting areas can be remote. They do not have to be scenic, and they do not necessarily need to have spectacular and abundant wildlife populations. Also, management and the infrastructure needs are less than in sophisticated tourist areas. Hunting carried out in this way, if it is well controlled and the off-takes are within sustainable limits, can have more of eco-tourism character than many of the photographic ventures.
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