

## CEPF in the Vilcabamba-Amboró Corridor

CEPF's 5-year investment (2001-2005) in the Vilcabamba–Amboró Conservation Corridor of the Tropical Andes Hotspot aimed to strengthen civil society participation in biodiversity conservation and sustainable development, with an emphasis on expanding and ensuring effective management of the protected area system.

As outlined in the external evaluation of CEPF (Wells et al. 2006<sup>1</sup>), during this 5-year period, CEPF made a critical difference. Prior to our engagement, conservation at the corridor scale was nascent. Conservation projects were typically focused on isolated initiatives, and local and bi-national collaboration was weak. No common goal existed to integrate the large number of protected areas along the length of the corridor. Today, the panorama is different and more encouraging, although serious challenges remain.

The 5- and 10-year conservation outcomes identified for this corridor included expanding the protected area system from 10.5 million hectares to 14.029 million hectares<sup>2</sup>. At the time the baseline was established, only 3 million hectares of existing protected areas were deemed effectively protected. The 5- and 10-year outcomes would expand the secured (effectively protected) protected areas in the corridor by 11 million hectares to a total of 14.029 million hectares.

The table below illustrates how CEPF investments helped bring 4,413,209 million hectares of new land under protection and upgraded protected area status for an additional 677,026 hectares. Impact on the total area under improved security and management has also been significant. The development and implementation of management plans was supported and put in place for 4,846,062 million hectares of protected areas. Development and implementation of management plans was also a fundamental part of CEPF support for the creation of new protected areas or the upgrade of existing protected areas to a higher level of protection. In total, significant progress has been achieved toward 92.7% of the outcomes. The detailed summary of these outcomes achieved is provided as an attachment.

Protected Area Complex	Baseline 2001 <sup>2</sup>		5-Year Status		
	Hectares of Declared Protected Area	Hectares Secured within Declared Area	New or Expanded Protected Areas and Secure	Area with Upgraded Protected Area Status and Secure	Additional hectares declared at the time of baseline but not secure, now with improved management and security
Vilcabamba-Manu Complex	3,491,698	1,550,700	3,775,209	402,336	
Tambopata-Pilón Lajas Complex	4,511,745	883,000	78,000	274,690	2,987,166
Cotapata-Amboró Complex	2,520,200	638,000	560,000		1,858,896
<b>Total:</b>	<b>10,523,643</b>	<b>3,071,700</b>	<b>4,413,209</b>	<b>677,026</b>	<b>4,846,062</b>

<sup>1</sup> Wells, M, L. Curran, and S. Qayum, 2006. Report of the Independent Evaluation of the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund

<sup>2</sup> Baseline totals reflect revision as detailed in 8/6/2005 memo and attachments to Michael Wright

<b>Baseline declared and secure:</b>	3,071,700 ha
<b>New or expanded and secure:</b>	4,413,209 ha
<b>Upgraded status and secure:</b>	677,026 ha
<b>Additional hectares declared at baseline but not secure, now with improved management and security:</b>	4,846,062 ha
<b><i>Progress toward goal of 14,029,643 ha declared and secure protected areas:</i></b>	<i>13,007,997 ha</i>

However, while the gains have been substantial, the 10-year goal assumes that improved security (effective management) includes appropriate levels of financing for all protected areas, including through long-term financing mechanisms such as endowment funds. A significant amount of work is still required in this area and at the present time we can only claim to be well under way to achieving the 10-year goal but not yet there.

In addition, while CEPF helped to create national-level awareness and support for conservation in the corridor, robust community-level support for conservation still remains to be secured. Local support for conservation can be pursued by buttressing environmental education activities and by cultivating and growing successful sustainable development models started by CEPF. Several protected areas have established participatory management mechanisms through CEPF grants, yet these mechanisms remain weak because important stakeholder groups have not fully engaged. At the same time, the central government environment agencies of SERNAP in Bolivia and of INRENA in Peru are plagued by personnel changes and budgetary shortfalls. As a result of this fluidity, local and international NGOs have filled important gaps and provided vital leadership for conservation. However, for sustainability of conservation efforts, many still need strengthening.

New threats from mega-projects, unplanned development, and agricultural expansion have also emerged and expanded. For example, in the core sector of the corridor of the Apolobamba-Madidi-Tambopata-Bahuaha Complex, large-scale mechanized gold mining is on the drawing board. The construction of the Inter-Oceanic Highway and a 4,200 km waterway and four hydroelectric dams in the Madera River are part of the South American Infrastructure Integration Initiative, a continent-wide effort to integrate infrastructure. These large-scale development projects pose direct and serious challenges in the corridor, and put at risk the impressive gains made in the most important protected areas of the corridor. The absence of civic participation in decision making on these projects and little interaction between stakeholders jeopardize the sustainability of the corridor.

### **Critical Need for the Future**

The critical need in the corridor now is to strengthen in-country conservation capacity by fostering participatory dialogue mechanisms, further developing integrated land-use plans, and engaging stakeholders at all levels in mega-project development. Several activities are urgently required and are under consideration for a CEPF consolidation approach in the corridor:

#### *1. Strengthening and consolidating protection and management of priority protected areas*

While significant achievements have been realized, this priority needs to be strengthened through two objectives: Updating and further implementing management plans for priority protected areas where CEPF has previously invested, and creating sustainable (long-term) financing mechanisms.

The update and implementation of protected area management plans needs to support local mechanisms for stakeholder participation, particularly through local management committees. In Bolivia, where several protected areas have updated management plans, weak technical and financial capacity continues to hamper implementation. Based on the strategies outlined in the management plans and an assessment of current protected areas and SERNAP capacities, financial sustainability, capacity building, and implementation plans need to be updated and management committees consolidated in Madidi National Park, Pilón Lajas, and Apolobamba, Machiguenga, and Ashaninka communal reserves, and Manu National Park.

Protected area financing mechanisms are critical to augment governmental budgets and ensure long-term sustainability of the protected area network. CEPF supported several innovative measures to help with the budget deficit, including the Peru Debt-for-Nature Swap and national trust funds in the two countries. However, these investments are ultimately short-term and would need to be extended or replicated for the long term. The aim is to work together with partners to ensure a combination of dynamic management plans, participatory management mechanisms, and long-term financing for effective management of the protected area system. CEPF is collaborating with multiple partners, including CI's Global Conservation Fund, the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation's Andes Amazon Initiative, and KfW (the German Development Bank), to explore the best institutional mechanisms to achieve this final result.

*2. Increased civil society capacity to foster the integration of biodiversity conservation with development processes*

It is necessary to ensure that development processes, and particularly extractive industry and transport infrastructure, avoid degrading the environment and harming local communities. Where possible, opportunities for sustainable development and biodiversity conservation benefits should be sought. Building a dialogue with infrastructure companies to gain support for, and investment in, conservation is imperative. Moreover, successful engagement on the Inter-Oceanic Highway could provide civil society with the leverage needed to influence the financing, design and construction of other large infrastructure projects. The opportunity exists to mitigate the environmental impacts of large hydrocarbon projects, encourage an integrated conservation-development vision, and facilitate stakeholder engagement at all levels. This approach is critical at this juncture as extractive industries and infrastructure expand.

Related efforts need to support:

- (i.) Land-use plans for selected municipalities in targeted priority areas, seeking integral land-use planning with a vision of sustainable resource management, biodiversity conservation, and appropriate infrastructure development; and
- (ii.) Consolidation of activities in production landscapes by the exchange of best practices and lessons learned. Land-use planning should be promoted in municipalities around Apolobamba, Madidi and Pilón Lajas protected areas in Bolivia and in municipalities and regional governments around Tambopata, Bahuaja Sonene, Manu, and Otishi protected areas and also Machiguenga and Ashaninka communal reserves in Perú.

We believe that the gains achieved to date and the lessons learned over the first phase of CEPF provide a strong foundation for meeting the challenges that confront one of the most important conservation corridors in the hotspot, if not in the world.

**Tropical Andes – Detailed 5-Year Summary Table**

	<b>Protected Area</b>	<b>New or Expanded</b>	<b>Upgraded Protected Area Status</b>	<b>Additional Hectares Declared at Time of Baseline but not Secure, now with Improved Management and Security</b>
Vilcabamba-Manu Complex	Amarakaeri Communal Reserve		402,336	
	Alto Purus National Park	2,510,694		
	Purus Communal Reserve	202,033		
	Manu National Park	215,538		
	Los Amigos Conservation Concession	137,598		
	Ashaninka Communal Reserve	184,468		
	Matsiguenga Communal Reserve	218,905		
	Otishi National Park	305,973		
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>3,775,209</b>	<b>402,336</b>	
Tambopata – Pilon Lajas Complex	Pilon Lajas Biosphere Reserve	78,000		
	Tambopata National Reserve		274,690	
	Bahuaja-Sonene National Park			1,091,416
	Madidi National Park			1,895,750
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>78,000</b>	<b>274,690</b>	<b>2,987,166<sup>1</sup></b>
Cotapata – Amoro Complex	Altamachi Departmental Park	560,000		
	Carrasco National Park			622,600
	Isiboro-Secure			1,236,296
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>560,000</b>		<b>1,858,896</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>4,413,209</b>	<b>677,026</b>	<b>4,846,062</b>

<sup>1</sup> Revised based on revision to baseline totals detailed in 8/6/2005 memo and attachments to Michael Wright

## Improved Management Effectiveness of Protected Areas

Protected Area Complex	Protected Area	Hectares Impacted
Vilcabamba-Manu Complex	Amarakaeri Communal Reserve	402,336
	Ashaninka Communal Reserve (formerly Apurimac Restricted Zone)	184,468
	Matsiguenga Communal Reserve (formerly Apurimac Restricted Zone)	218,905
	Otishi National Park (formerly Apurimac Restricted Zone)	305,973
	Los Amigos Conservation Concession	137,598
	Alto Purus National Park (formerly Alto Purus Reserved Zone)	2,510,694
	Purus Communal Reserve (formerly Alto Purus Reserved Zone)	202,033
	Manu National Park	215,538
		<b>4,177,545</b>
Tambopata – Pilon Lajas Complex	Bahuaja Sonene National Park (includes part of former Tambopata-Candamo Reserved Zone)	1,091,416
	Tambopata National Reserve (formerly Tambopata-Candamo Reserved Zone)	274,690
	Madidi National Park	1,895,750
	Pilon Lajas Biosphere Reserve	78,000
		<b>3,339,856</b>
Cotapata – Amoro Complex	Altamachi Departmental Park	560,000
	Carrasco National Park	622,600
	Isiboro Secure National Park	1,236,296
		<b>2,418,896</b>
	<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>9,936,297</b>