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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Protected Areas Conservation Trust (PACT) is a statutory organization established in 1996 as a Trust Fund under the Protected Areas Conservation Trust Act, No. 15 of 1995. PACT contributes to the financing of Belize’s National Protected Areas System comprising 103 terrestrial and marine sites. These protected areas are administered by Government agencies and NGOs and CBOs under co-management agreements.

In 2015, the PACT Act (2003, amended 2011) was amended and significantly expands the functions of the Trust beyond protected areas financing via grants, to having direct responsibility for protected areas system planning, financing, coordination and monitoring and evaluation. This requires that PACT prepares itself institutionally to undertake these new functions, starting with an assessment of PACT’s current capacity and a gap analysis to determine the institutional changes required to execute and fulfill its new legal mandate. International Financial Consulting Ltd. (IFCL) was commissioned to undertake this assignment which is the subject of this report. The report offers an overall review of PACT’s governance structure, reviews the operations of PACT, offers an in-depth diagnostic assessment highlighting the key challenges and gaps which need to be overcome to fulfil PACT’s new mandate and concludes with a summary assessment of PACT as an institution, and key recommendations.

A. Main Findings

Supporting Policies
The importance of the country’s natural resources for its development is recognized in the Vision for Belize documented in the National Development Framework for Belize 2010-2030. The Framework includes the adoption and implementation of the National Protected Areas Systems Plan and the strengthening of the legal and administrative framework for protected areas. The change in the legislation satisfies this intent. The Growth and Sustainable Development Strategy (2016-2019) also commits to continue the sustainable management of Belize’s coastal zone and protected areas system to build climate resilience, ensure water and food security, reduce disaster risk, and preserve Belize's natural and cultural heritage.

The National Policy on Protected Areas in Belize (2005 and updated in 2015) includes three policy statements with respect to financing. They do not however, specifically refer to PACT as a financing mechanism for the management of protected areas system. The Policy therefore does not seem to be specifically aligned with the PACT legislation which preceded it.

Board Charter
The PACT Act prescribes the general parameters of the operation of the Board and defines its composition. The 2003, 2011 amendment and 2015 versions of the Act stipulate that the Board “shall have the executive control and management of the affairs of the Trust, and shall exercise and perform the functions, powers and duties of the Trust on its behalf, and shall be responsible for its effective and efficient administration”. International best practice relating to governance
of statutory bodies however, recommends that Boards focus on setting strategic direction, safeguarding resources and monitoring and reporting performance to key stakeholders. The PACT Board acts in an executive capacity, demonstrated by the high number of Board meetings per year. During 2016, the Board convened 18 times under regular or special circumstances. PACT’s Board Manual (March 2011) makes a clear distinction between the Board’s governance/oversight role and an operational role, however, this is not reflected in Board practice. PACT currently does not have a current approved Board Charter, as per best practice.

**Governance Structure**

The 2015 Amendment revised the governance structure and abolished the Advisory Council, replacing it with a Technical Committee and adding a Finance and Audit Committee. These have been established along with a Grant Review Committee and a Strategy Committee. The PACT Foundation, whose establishment is mandated in the Act to “…be the philanthropic fundraising arm of PACT, with its own Board of Directors” has not yet been established despite budgetary allocations approved in 2013/2014 and 2014/2015. The Honorary Board, also prescribed in the legislation to publicly promote the trust and raise funds has never been established.

The 2015 Amendment significantly altered the structure of the Board and appointment of Directors. Whereas the original act specified organizations from which NGO/CBO directors were to be drawn from and provided flexibility as to the appointment of Government representatives from relevant Ministries, the revised Act is now more prescriptive as to Government representatives and less so about NGO/CBO representation. The Act assigns named positions within specific Ministries to sit on the Board; extends term limits to three years; and gives the Minister power to appoint the Chairman of the Board. While the former Board recognized the need for Directors to be appointed based on filling competency requirements above representation, they were unsuccessful in having this reflected in the Amended Act.

**Strategic Planning**

PACT is currently operating under its third Strategic Plan (2011-2016). This Strategic Plan contains 6 Guiding Principles and 6 Strategic Objectives, four of which pertain directly to PACT’s intent to become a model Trust Fund; and thirty-four (34) strategic actions. Strategic priorities were focused on growing and sustaining the fund and improving overall fund management; improving the allocation, management and impact of grant funds; improving institutional linkages and stakeholder relations; and improving strategic leadership and overall management. Overall, PACT’s performance in meeting its strategic objectives over the last 5 years is mixed, with the most progress being made in the area of grant management and allocation followed by some progress towards improving the overall management of the Fund and achieving enhanced institutional capacity. PACT was less successful in effecting critical changes to improve financial sustainability, stakeholder relationships and the governance structure.

**Monitoring and evaluation**

In practice, PACT was not compliant with some of the requirements of the 2011 legislation. There is monitoring of individual projects, but an independent field audit of all PACT projects has never taken place. Institutional assessments conducted every five years could be considered a comprehensive evaluation of the administration and operations of the Trust. For the current Strategic Plan, PACT utilizes a Performance Monitoring Tool or ‘Institutional Report Card’ to assess its performance against the Strategic Objectives and actions outlined in the Plan.
Public Accountability
PACT has complied with the preparation of annual audited reports which are posted on its website; however, as of the date of this report, PACT has not yet posted the audited report for FY 2015/16 ending March 31, 2016.

Grant Programme
Since its inception, PACT has financed 471 projects valued at BZ$31,278,259.07. Prior to the Amendment, the grant portfolio consisted of small, medium and large grants, planning grants and capacity building grants. After the Amended legislation came into force, the Board approved a transitional Investment Manual (August 2016) to guide PACT’s grant-making strategy for 2016/2017. The new strategy includes only five grant categories (Single Investments, Multiple Investments, Extra-ordinary investments and Environmental Support and Capacity Building Investments). PACT has moved from a ‘grant-making’ perspective to an ‘investment’ perspective, while the grant application forms have benefited from some revision, the generic grant application processes remain the same and are not tailored to the size or complexity of the grant. The elimination of the Advisory Council has concentrated review to internal actors and the review process no longer has the benefit of an external perspective. Document requirements for accountability are often redundant and grant administrative processes could be streamlined.

Human resources
PACT is recognized as an employer of choice, and staff are reportedly comparatively well-paid with excellent benefits. A detailed manual covers all relevant policies and procedures has been updated but lacks formal board approval. The approved organizational structure of PACT (2010) has not been updated although changes have been proposed and new positions recruited and filled. There has been significant turn-over of senior level staff over the past five years including three Executive Directors, one of whom was promoted internally but who was never confirmed. The post of Associate Director of Finance has been vacant for five months and the Chief Operations Officer post, which was filled in 2015, became vacant a year after and has since been declared ‘closed’ subsequent to the resignation of the last COO. The vacancy of these two posts has placed significant demands on the Executive Director and, by extension, the Accountant within the Finance Department. In respect of employee intra-relations, there is insufficient staff cohesion and inter-departmental cooperation.

Expenditure by PACT on salaries and benefits over the past three years as a percentage of total administrative expenditure declined from 65% to 59% between 2013 and 2016. Staff salaries and benefits as a percentage of programme expenses declined annually from a high of 52% in 2013 to 29% in 2016, though this was due to increased programme spending rather than decreased spending on human resources.

Information Technology
PACT utilizes Information Technology to some degree, (e.g. Quick Books accounting software, social media platforms) however, there is scope for improvement. Despite the intent to introduce Grant Management Software, it has not yet been procured. Meanwhile, PACT has introduced ID cards, linked to its HR system, which is still under development.

Marketing and Communication
PACT’s website primarily provides background information on the organization, the grant programme, projects supported, and is a repository for corporate documents. PACT utilizes
Twitter, Facebook, YouTube and Instagram as the primary outreach about projects funded, PACT’s activities and general items of interest. All platforms are kept up to date and contain a variety of current information, high quality graphical content, videos and opportunities for public engagement. There is scope for social media to be optimized and a wider audience driven to the sites.

**Financial Management**
PACT’s record of careful fiduciary management has led to a positive international reputation resulting in PACT being asked to administer funds from external sources and deriving income for fiduciary services. From PACT’s revenue of BZ$ 5,331,913.75 the Trust spent BZ$3,915,718 on average between 2013 and 2016. PACT distributed on average BZ $2,332,256.75 per year in grants. Over the past four years the grant portfolio has grown from BZ $1,619,406 in 2012 to BZ $3,192,651 in 2016.

PACT is perceived by stakeholders to have high administrative overhead costs. The 2011-2016 Strategic Plan target to reduce administrative expenses as a percentage of annual revenue to a maximum of 20% from 29% has not been met. In 2016 the ratio was 25%. In 2013, it cost PACT $0.81 to deliver every $1.00 of grants. By 2016 this declined to $0.47 but is still high. The decline is a result of increasing the grant envelope rather than increasing efficiencies. The last audit report showed net account receivables for 2015 and 2014 amounting to BZ$1.279M and BZ$1.185M respectively, representing approximately 25% of the total collected annually from conservation fees and cruise ship head tax. Delays in receipt of these funds have impacts PACT’s cash flow and ability to allocate higher amounts to its grant portfolio.

**External Stakeholder Relations**
PACT generally has a good funder/grantee relationship with NGOs and CBOs. They are appreciative of PACT’s efforts, though somewhat frustrated with documentation and reporting requirements. PACT is however not sufficiently engaged with international partners and funding agencies. Although there is permanent representation of tourism interests on PACT’s Board there is room for greater strategic alliances to advance mutual objectives. PACT has a functional relationship with the Forestry and Fisheries Departments. Fisheries and Forestry do not sit with the GRC when reviewing proposals; however, dependent on whether the applicant is submitting a proposal that affects either marine or terrestrial PAs, Fisheries or Forestry must review the document and provide an endorsement letter. If either declines to support the proposal, it is a red flag for Board. There is also limited buy-in by the Departments to the new legislation, to which both are opposed.

Under the current strategic plan, the strategic objective to improve and consolidate inter-institutional linkages and stakeholder confidence was not achieved.

**B. Diagnostic Assessment**

**Key Challenges**
Even if there were no change to the legislation, PACT would have had to overcome a number of key challenges which are now magnified with the expansion of PACT’s mandate. The team has identified nine key challenges:
1. **Consistency in leadership and management:** As a result of high turnover of PACT Board Chairs, the Board itself, and Executive Director, PACT has been in a state of ongoing transition and needs to become a more stable institution with more consistent executive and governance leadership.

2. **Role of the Board:** The Legislation’s definition of the function of the Board is somewhat inimical to international best practice. The Board is operating as an Executive Board, although PACT is staffed to carry out executive and management functions.

3. **Capacity Gap for New Mandate:** PACT’s current organizational structure is inadequate for its new mandate. PACT will need to do determine its core business under the new mandate and key internal competencies required, and structure and staff the organization appropriately. Additional non-core or highly technical skills will need to be outsourced as needed.

4. **Active Fundraising & Trust Fund Growth:** PACT has not yet been able to grow the Trust Fund. PACT’s culture is that of a passive recipient of funds rather than an active fundraiser, despite the widening gap between revenue and NPAS financing needs. With the decreased allocation from the cruise ship head tax and additional functions now assigned to PACT, it must begin to source and mobilize additional sources of revenue.

5. **Stakeholder relationships:** With the change in the legislation and new mandate, there is an environment of stakeholder uncertainty and distrust in the new regime. This is a significant challenge that PACT must overcome as it is thrust into a more central role of NPASSP oversight and financing.

6. **Administrative Costs:** PACT lacks efficiency in managing administrative costs to deliver its grant/investment programme. The expanded mandate for PACT will require increased efficiencies and different ways of working.

7. **Streamlining grant administration processes:** PACT expends the same level of effort to administer for small capacity development grants as it does for its conservation grant programme and has inefficient grant administration processes. This imposes a huge administrative burden on grantees and PACT staff.

8. **Impact Assessment / M&E:** There has been minimal attention or allocation of resources to measuring and assessing PACT’s impact and implementing a proper monitoring and evaluation system and public reporting on the impact of PACT’s grant programme.

C. **Conclusions and Recommendations**

*Summary Assessment of PACT*

The team examined 10 dimensions of PACT’s institutional capacity. PACT is strongest in those skills directly related to its grant making function, and fair in most other dimensions. Its greatest weakness is in impact measurement and M&E.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning and Implementation</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Measurement</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming and Grant Cycle Management</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources management and capacity</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and Communications</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Management</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Stakeholder Relations</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Recommendations:**

1. The Board must delegate management functions as allowed by the Act, while focusing on its oversight and fiduciary roles as trustees of a public trust. The Board should reduce the number of meetings held and address outstanding activities such as updating the Board Charter, Board manual and publishing annual reports. The Board needs to allow management to run the organization and hold them accountable for the results.

2. The Board should consider expanding the membership of the Grant Review Committee to include external parties, and consider additional technical committees with external representation to oversee and support resource mobilization, NPAS coordination and planning, and change management.

3. PACT needs to fairly quickly build capacity to execute its new mandate. PACT should identify core business competencies and develop and approve a new organizational structure and job descriptions, based on this ‘core business’ analysis.

4. PACT should put in place a strategy and M&E framework to undertake impact measurement and organizational performance measurement, and assign specific responsibility (through job descriptions) to an appropriate position in the PACT Secretariat.

5. PACT will need to engage with the critical stakeholders through structured and independently facilitated consultations to bring clarity to (a) the intent and contents of the Act; (b) the nature of the optimal institutional arrangements to bring effect to the Act and (c) to assuage the fear of change.

6. PACT should develop TORs for the development of a resource mobilization strategy that will guide identification of new sources of revenue and optimization of existing sources. This strategy should be largely implemented in-house.

7. PACT will need to develop an investment strategy which is more responsive to the need of the system, while not marginalizing small NGOs and CBOs. The Wildtracks Rationalization report should be utilized as a starting point.
8. The application process for small capacity building grants (if continued) should be simplified and approval authority delegated to the GRC rather than the Board of Directors, who should set criteria and provide oversight.

9. Human Resource administration and IT responsibility may be better placed under a Chief Operating Officer, rather than the Executive Director.

10. PACT should undertake a targeted marketing campaign to increase awareness and utilization of the sites by Belizean citizens. Additionally, PACT could partner with the Ministry of Tourism to enhance the branding and marketing of the protected areas system, as this underpins the tourism sector and will advance mutual objectives.

11. The grant cycle management system and administrative processes should be rationalized to be more in line with comparator grant-making institutions who manage equivalent or higher volumes and values of grants with fewer staff.

12. PACT needs to control discrentional spending such as staff overtime, catering, and vehicle deployment. Fewer Board meetings will also help to reduce costs.

**Conclusion**

For PACT to manage this transition successfully, a deliberate change management strategy is required which needs to be carefully managed, preferably by independent outsourced expertise and resources invested in this process.

PACT will need to allocate resources to finance a range of organizational restructuring and transitional activities as extra-ordinary expenses. Going forward, PACT’s budget must be expanded to meet the requirements of its new mandate. It is therefore imperative that as a priority, PACT focus on maximizing revenue options available under the Act, while seeking to minimize current costs.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Assignment Objectives

The Protected Areas Conservation Trust (PACT) is Belize’s national conservation trust fund, and was established in 1996 under the Protected Areas Conservation Trust Act, No. 15 of 1995, creating the institution as a Statutory Board. This placed the Government of Belize at the forefront of financing biodiversity conservation and natural resources management, a position maintained in the Caribbean for at least the past 25 years.

The PACT Institutional Assessment is one deliverable of a suite of three as defined in the Terms of Reference (found in Annex A), to develop the 2017-2021 NPAS Strategic Plan, the 2017-2021 PACT Strategic Plan and the 2017 PACT Institutional Assessment. These documents are necessary to support the implementation of changes to key pieces of legislation concerning the financing of the protected areas system of Belize and the management of Belize’s National Protected Areas System (NPAS). International Financial Consulting Ltd. (IFCL) was commissioned to undertake this assignment.

As of 2015, the main legal underpinnings for the management and conservation of Belize’s protected areas system are now based on the Protected Areas Conservation Trust (Amendment) Act 2015 and the National Protected Areas System Act, 2015. The PACT Act No. 18 of 2015 provides for a significant expansion of the functions of the Trust. The expansion of PACT’s mandate requires that PACT prepares itself institutionally to undertake the functions prescribed under the new Act. This requires reviewing its strategic plan covering the period 2011-2016; facilitating, as prescribed by the amended PACT Act, the preparation of a 5-year strategic plan for the National Protected Areas System, as well as the development of a 5-year strategic plan for PACT; and importantly, assessing PACT’s current capacity, identifying and determining the gaps between what exists and what is required by PACT to execute and fulfill its new legal mandate. The latter is the subject of this report.

1.2. Methodology

The institutional assessment was prepared based on: (i) a review of the new legislation and the new mandate and requirements of PACT; (ii) feedback from a series of consultations involving 77 Stakeholders of the National Protected Areas System; (iii) strategic planning sessions with PACT’s Board and Staff; (iv) a review of relevant background and operational documents; (v) interviews with PACT staff and (v) observations of PACT’s operations and analysis by the International Financial Consulting Ltd (IFCL) team.

Stakeholder consultations took place between January 25 and February 15 (inclusive of a field mission from January 25 to February 4 2017 and subsequent remote Skype meetings). The consultations were undertaken following an approved Consultation Strategy prepared by IFCL. The principle behind IFCL’s Consultation Strategy was to engage as many critical Stakeholders as possible, grouped according to stakeholder function or interest and:
• Ascertain the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats surrounding the implementation of the National Protected Areas System Plan, and the effective operation of PACT, particularly to identify where these applied to the new mandate of PACT under the amended PACT Act (SWOT Analysis);

• Identify the external political, economic, social, technological, legal and environmental influences that might enable or inhibit the effective implementation of the NPAS Plan, and the mandate of PACT (PESTLE Analysis); and,

• Probe PACT’s Board and Staff for a self-assessment of the current institutional strengths and weaknesses of PACT; and Stakeholders’ views about the responsiveness of PACT and the quality and effectiveness of Trust’s interactions with them.

The results of the Consultations were documented in a Consultation Report prepared by IFCL submitted on February 17, 2017.

As required by the TOR, the team reviewed and assessed the following institutional characteristics of PACT, examining:

• Institutional Environment
  • Legal Arrangements and Governance
  • Regulatory Environment
  • Administration and Finance
  • Technology and Information
  • Political Influences
  • Constituency Analysis

• Institutional Identity and Motivation
  • Identity of PACT
  • Vision, Mission, Culture and Guiding Principles

• Institutional Capacity
  • Strategic Leadership
  • Advisory Council/Honorary Board
  • Human Resources
  • Inter-institutional linkages
  • Comparative Project Audits

• Positioning, Effectiveness and M&E informed by:
  • A SWOT Analysis for PACT
  • PACT’s Institutional Performance Report Card

1.3. Challenges in Conducting the Assignment

There were no significant challenges to this assignment. The PACT Board and Staff1 were very supportive and cooperative and responded quickly to requests and queries. One weakness however, was the unavailability of Annual Reports from 2013/14 onwards. This meant that the

1 Special thanks is extended to Dennisia Francisco, Executive Director, and the PACT Team for all their support.
team was not able to compare or roll up results and data on the activities and performance of PACT for the period covered by the current strategic plan (2011-2016).

1.4. Structure of Report

This report does not follow the same structure of the previous institutional assessment which relied significantly on stakeholder surveys. Rather, input was received from multiple sources including face-to-face consultations, interviews with staff and documentary analysis. The recent change in mandate for PACT necessitated a more comprehensive and forward-looking institutional analysis, including key recommendations.

Chapter 2 reviews the history of PACT, to frame its current context. The contextual review looks at its role within the NPAS, including an analysis of the new legislation, and provides a map of key stakeholders.

Chapter 3 offers an overall review of PACT’s governance in regards to the National Policy Framework, its governing legislation, Board Charter and governance structure, strategic planning, monitoring and evaluation, and public accountability.

Chapter 4 reviews the operations of PACT, delving into how the grant programme works, call for proposals and grant appraisal processes, and monitoring and evaluation. It also reviews PACT’s policies and procedures, human resources, IT systems, marketing and communications, and financial management, as well as PACT’s external stakeholder relations.

In light of where PACT stands in its current context, chapter 5 builds on the overview offered in chapters 2-4 to offer an in-depth diagnostic assessment. This assessment identifies and highlights the key gaps and further analyzes the root cause of these gaps in order to address them.

Chapter 6 provides a conclusion on the assessment of PACT as an institution, and key recommendations for initiatives to close the gaps, which will feed into the Strategic Plan for PACT.
2. BACKGROUND

2.1. History of PACT and its role in the National Protected Areas System

Starting before Independence in 1981, Belize had developed a strong system of legislative, institutional and financial arrangements to protect and manage its vast wealth of natural and cultural resources. The first protected area was declared in Belize several decades ago, and more have been steadily added since then.2

The original concept for the establishment of PACT originated in 1992 as part of a Revenue Generation Strategy for Protected Areas of Belize with the support of the United States Agency for International Development and the World Wildlife Fund for Nature. A survey of tourists3 showed that they would be willing to pay as much as US$20 as a tax if they knew it would go toward the conservation of Belize. The Government decided to impose a more modest US$3.75 tax on passengers departing Belize by air or via land borders. As cruise shipping increased and became a significant tourism market segment, PACT also became the recipient of a 20% commission from the cruise ship passenger head tax (later reduced to 15% in 2015) to fund conservation efforts. Through this innovative financing mechanism, Belize was able to generate revenues for conservation which were received, managed and distributed by PACT.

PACT was established after several years of consultation and meetings with various non-government organizations, government departments, private sector and international conservation organizations. PACT’s office was officially opened on June 6, 1996. Its stated mission was to contribute to the sustainable management and development of Belize’s natural and cultural heritage by providing effective funding support to protected areas.

The late 1990s was a time of great conservation activity. The early beginnings of a National Protected Areas Plan occurred in the 1990’s when WWF and USAID collaborated in a National Resource Management and Protection Project (NARMAP). That resulted in an initial National Protected Areas System Plan (NPASP) published by Programme for Belize with assistance from the Inter-American Development Bank.4 Further development of Belize’s National Protected Area System Plan took place over 2003-2005, and was overseen by the inter-ministerial Protected Areas Task Force. It sought to provide a coherent approach to protected area establishment and management on a national scale, and was based on widespread consultation, representing the consensus view among those stakeholders directly involved or affected by protected areas in Belize. Today Belize’s protected areas form a national system of 103 terrestrial and marine protected areas, including forest reserves, nature reserves, national parks, marine reserves, private reserves, wildlife sanctuaries, natural monuments, bird sanctuaries, spawning aggregation reserves and archaeological reserves.

---

2 History of Protected Area Designation, Co-management and Community Participation in Belize: Colin A. Young, Ph.D., and Dr. Robert Horwich, Ph.D.
3 Ibid
4 Ibid.
Funds received by PACT from the Conservation Fee and Cruise Ship Head Tax finance Belize’s National Protected Areas System (NPAS). These protected area sites are administered by a variety of Government agencies including the Forest Department, Fisheries Department and Institute of Archaeology (under the National Institute of Culture and History). There is a strong management regime that includes partnerships between the Government of Belize and co-management NGO/CBO organizations. PACT provides grants to these management entities to fund some of the costs required to manage the sites per the National Protected Areas System plan and approved co-management plans in the case of NGOs and CBOs.

2.2. Current Context

At the end of 2016 when this assignment was initiated, the new NPAS Act and PACT Act had been gazetted for over one year. The new Acts significantly changed the mandate of PACT and the scope of management of the NPAS. The PACT Board is treating 2016/2017 as a transitional year for the Board to commission the strategic plans and institutional assessment and for them to assist CBOs and NGOs in strengthening their institutions and Boards as they prepare for PACT’s transition into its new functions.

The Stakeholders’ consultations, undertaken by IFCL under this assignment, revealed limited buy-in for some aspects of the Acts. The process of amending the Acts was viewed by some Stakeholders as insufficiently consultative. There is dissatisfaction amongst Stakeholders – government and non-government – with the manner in which the legislation was developed and promulgated. In their view, both the process and the product were flawed.

Certain stakeholders expressed their interpretation that the PACT Act gives exceptional powers to PACT to ‘run’ the National Protected Areas System, which they believe PACT is currently ill-equipped to do. This has implications for PACT’s approach to engender buy-in and implement the new requirements under the Acts. The institutional assessment and accompanying Strategic Plans for both NPAS and PACT will take this into account and incorporate strategic actions designed to overcome this initial resistance from Stakeholders.

2.2.1. New Legislation

As indicated earlier, the 2015 PACT Act (Amendment) significantly expanded PACT’s functions. The revised Act was gazetted on 24 October 2015 and provides for a new definition of protected areas and a new composition of the Board; expands the functions of the Trust; provides for the appointment of a Finance and Audit Committee, Technical Committee and other ad hoc committees; among other adjustments to enhance the operations of the Trust.

2.3. Key Stakeholders

Under the previous Act, PACT was essentially a Trust which collected revenues from third parties as prescribed in the legislation, provided grants to eligible conservation organizations, managed an endowment, an investment portfolio, and donor funds on behalf of third parties, and fulfilled its reporting and public accountability obligations. Thus, PACT’s main stakeholders were those
involved in PACT’s governance, management, financing and investment activities; as well as grantees or persons who benefited from the management of protected areas financed by PACT. PACT’s Stakeholder map from the 2013 Act is represented in Figure 1. The green boxes refer to PACT’s management and oversight functions. The stakeholders with whom PACT has to interface to fulfill this role are listed beside the boxes. Similarly, listed below the blue boxes are the stakeholders representing the beneficiaries of the grant programmes.

**Figure 1: PACT’s Role and Main Stakeholders (PACT Act 2003)**

With the change in both the NPAS Act and PACT Acts, PACT’s stakeholder map becomes more complex, and, due to PACT’s expanded mandate, is inextricably linked to the NPAS stakeholder map as all NPAS stakeholders are now PACT stakeholders.

PACT now has new stakeholders and will need to engage stakeholders in a different way and invest significantly more resources in stakeholder engagement and coordination. The new PACT Stakeholders are represented in Figure 2. In this map, green boxes represent the management, oversight and fiduciary functions. The blue boxes are now expanded to represent the concept of “investments”, rather than beneficiaries of the grant programme. A new set of roles and partners in the circles has been added in yellow to represent the NPASP Execution.
This institutional assessment will examine how PACT currently engages with stakeholders and what adjustments need to be changed to allow it to fully engage with current and new stakeholders to fulfil its new mandate.
3. GOVERNANCE

3.1 National Policy Framework

The Government of Belize recognizes the importance of the country’s natural resources for its development in “Horizon 2030”, the National Development Framework for Belize 2010-2030. This is clearly reflected in the Vision for Belize by the Year 2030:

“Belize is a country of peace and tranquility, where citizens live in harmony with the natural environment and enjoy a high quality of life. Belizeans are an energetic, resourceful and independent people looking after their own development in a sustainable way.”

The Vision is informed by Stakeholders’ views that “the natural environment is valued and protected as the basis for all economic activity and therefore development planning is based on the principles of environmental sustainability”. Along with a healthy population, a healthy environment is recognized as the “bricks and mortar” necessary for national development.

Among the strategies to incorporate environmental sustainability into development planning and strengthen protected areas management is the specific action to “Adopt and implement the National Protected Areas Systems Plan and strengthen the legal and administrative framework for protected areas”. The change in the legislation satisfies this intent of the Development Framework.

The Growth and Sustainable Development Strategy (2016-2019) also commits to continue the sustainable management of Belize’s coastal zone and protected areas system to build climate resilience, ensure water and food security, reduce disaster risk, and preserve Belize’s natural and cultural heritage.

The National Policy on Protected Areas in Belize (2005) “attempts to capture the essence of the role of protected areas and their importance to Belize’s economic development by providing a set of policy statements that should be considered in decision making involving these areas”. There are three policy statements with respect to financing: (i) funding of protected areas shall be encouraged through collaboration with relevant stakeholders; (ii) the concept of cross-subsidization shall be recognized as a means of funding since some protected areas have more revenue generation potential than others and (iii) the protected areas system shall seek to maintain itself financially and to contribute to Belize’s national development. It does not however, specifically refer to PACT or a Trust Fund as a financing mechanism for the management of protected areas system, even though PACT was established as a Trust Fund for Protected Areas in 1996. The Policy therefore does not seem to be specifically aligned with the PACT legislation which preceded it.
Summary: Policy Framework
The significance of the country’s natural resources and protected areas for its development is recognized in key policy frameworks: The National Development Framework for Belize 2010-2030 and the Growth and Sustainable Development Strategy (2016-2019).

3.2 Legislation

Several pieces of legislation provide the legal foundation for the declaration and establishment of protected areas: The National Protected Areas System Act (2015) which repealed the National Parks System Act; the Forest Act, the Fisheries Act and the National Institute of Culture and History Act. Belize is also a signatory to legally binding multilateral environmental agreements, including the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Convention on World Heritage Sites, Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially As Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention), the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (Land Degradation), the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, among others.

The PACT Act 1995 was the foundation legislation for the creation of PACT as a Trust Fund to finance conservation of natural and cultural resources. The original Act established PACT as a Trust Fund to “encourage and promote, for the benefit of Belize, the provision, protection, conservation and enhancement of the natural and cultural resources of Belize. The original legislation made no specific reference to the National Protected Areas System which had not yet been established. The original Act was revised in 2003 and 2011 amendments (Chapter 218) and then in 2015.

The amendment significantly broadens PACT’s mandate beyond protected areas financing via grants, to more direct responsibility for protected areas system planning, financing coordination and monitoring and evaluation.

3.2.1. Legislated Functions of PACT under the Amended PACT ACT

The specific functions of the Trust under the amended Act are:

a) to facilitate the development of five-year strategic plans for the National Protected Areas System and facilitate their implementation;

b) to review management plans for each protected area to ensure consistency with the National Protected Areas System Plan and priorities set for the National Protected Areas System;

c) to promote coordination of, and collaboration within, the National Protected Areas System;

d) to monitor and report on the National Protected Areas System by:
   i. Establishing a system for monitoring and evaluation to determine if the National Protected Areas System is meeting its objectives;
ii. Reviewing and approving reports to be conducted at least every five years on the performance of the National Protected Areas System including the financial scorecard and management effectiveness of the national protected areas system.

e) to ensure the financial sustainability of the National Protected Areas System by:
   iii. Setting strategic priorities for the development, mobilization and allocation of financial resources for the National Protected Areas System;
   iv. Allocating financial resources across the National Protected Areas System based on the criteria established for the system;
   v. Developing and approving standards, guidelines and procedures to ensure efficient use of financial resources within the National Protected Areas System;
   vi. Serving as the lead entity for moving the National Protected Areas System towards financial sustainability; and
   vii. Coordinating the implementation of all strategies aimed at making the National Protected Areas System financially sustainable.

f) Conducting periodic protected areas management capacity assessment, prioritizing capacity needs for managing the system and ensuring that the right resources and partnerships are developed to create this capacity;

g) Promoting public understanding, appreciation and awareness of the national protected areas system through the implementation of a communication strategy for the national protected areas system;

h) Funding activities included under the Schedule, in such a manner that funds are allocated first to primary activities then to secondary activities as described in the Schedule;

i) Serving as the national implementing entity for multilateral and international funding sources related to the sustainable management of natural resources, climate change and other environment related issues, in collaboration with other relevant agencies as necessary;

j) Accessing regional and international funds in regard to natural resources, biodiversity and other related matters;

k) Performing such other functions that are necessary or expedient to enable it to carry out its functions under this Act.

This extensive list compares with the original functions of the Trust which were limited to distributing grants to assist the undertaking of research, studies or other activities relating to the nationwide effort to establish, operate, maintain and enhance protected areas, and other natural and cultural protected resources for the purposes of conservation, maintenance of biodiversity, protection of ecological processes and for recreational enjoyment.
3.2.2. Legislated Revenue Streams

The PACT Trust Fund is a dedicated Fund separate from any general funds of the Government. The PACT Act (2003, 2011 amended), prescribes a range of revenue streams to finance the Trust Fund:

a) Revenues from a conservation fee of BZ$7.50 collected from every non-Belizean person departing from any air, land or sea border point (with the exception of exempted persons under the Departure Tax of Act, airline crew and residents of border towns and villages);

b) 20% of all concession fees on concession arrangements within protected areas made by the management of protected areas;

c) 20% of all recreation-related licenses fees in conjunction with protected areas;

d) 20% of cruise ship passengers head tax;

e) All income derived from the investment of money by or on behalf of the Trust under this Act;

f) All income derived from the administration of property held by or on behalf of the Trust;

g) Any money paid to the Trust in the form of an annuity or with an express direction by the donor that it is to be applied as income;

h) All other money no forming part of the Endowment Fund; and,

i) Any other money lawfully contributed, donated, or bequeathed to the Trust of received by the Trust from any other source.

The 2015 Amendment made two significant adjustments – (i) it reduced the commission on the Cruise Ship Passenger Head Tax from 20% to 15% and it expands the scope for PACT to collect license and permit fees, while reducing the ability of protected areas managers to retain fees for direct use in managing the protected area.\(^5\) Presently, only the conservation fee, commission from cruise ship head tax, and income earned on investment (cash deposits) of PACT’s revenue are currently being collected and utilized. The other income streams as stipulated in the original and amended Act have never been collected since PACT’s establishment. Consequently, PACT is not fulfilling its potential to more adequately fund the NPAS. As of 2014, the financing gap for basic management of the NPAS was estimated at US$11.1M.\(^6\)

\(^5\) The 5% difference is applied to an Environmental Tourism Fund to maintain and upgrade public areas in Belize City in support of enhancing the cruise ship visitor experience;

\(^6\) National Protected Areas System Plan 2015;
3.2.3. Endowment Fund

The 2003 Act (2011 amendment) mandates the establishment of an Endowment Fund, in which no less than 5% of the annual total revenue of the Trust should be allocated to the Fund. PACT is responsible for determining the management and investment of the Fund and for maintaining records of income and expenditure and preparing and submitting and annual audit report to the Board. At the beginning of the period covered by the 2011-2016 Strategic Plan, the Principal balance of the Fund was BZ $4,791,141.00. By November 2016, this had increased by BZ $1,197,950.00 or 25% to BZ $5,989,091.00. Over the period, the Endowment Fund grew by an average of 5.5% per year; however, the diversification of investments planned for have not yet taken place.

The Amendment prescribes primary and secondary activities that qualify for PACT funding. Primary activities now include NGO’s core costs, GOB and NGO capital costs for ‘green oriented’ infrastructure projects within protected areas, which were not specifically included in the original PACT Act. Secondary activities for the most part remain as originally scheduled in the 2003 Act (2011 amendment) under the following headings, save for the inclusion of funding of project administration costs and mitigation and adaptation projects added under the category of community development around protected areas.

i. Protected Areas Management and Conservation
ii. Protected Areas Promotion and Development
iii. Environmental Education and Awareness/Outreach
iv. Community Development around Protected Areas

Summary: Legislation
The revision of the PACT Act has significantly prescribed wider mandate and more strategic responsibilities for PACT. However, key revenue generating provisions in the previous Act were not taken advantage of fully. Consequently, PACT is not fulfilling its potential to more adequately fund the NPAS.

3.3 Board Charter

The PACT Act prescribes the general parameters of the operation of the Board and provides details on the term of office of Directors, constitution of a quorum, notices of meetings, chairing of meetings, delegation of powers, and the power of the Board to make rules of the Trust (such as regulating the proceedings of the Board, regulating the terms and conditions of employment of the Executive Director and other staff, and regulating the manner in which the Trust Fund shall be dealt with).

Both the 2003 and 2015 versions of the Act stipulate that the Board “shall have the executive control and management of the affairs of the Trust, and shall exercise and perform the functions, powers and duties of the Trust on its behalf, and shall be responsible for its effective and efficient administration”. This might suggest that the Board was intended to have a more operational role which is at odds with best practice oversight and governance functions of Boards in general in
which there is a clear distinction between its fiduciary responsibilities and protection of public/stakeholders’ interests, and executive control and management.

International best practice relating to governance of statutory bodies recommends that the Board should focus on setting strategic direction, safeguarding resources and monitoring and reporting performance to key stakeholders. It should not, however, play a role in day-to-day administration, but should delegate the day-to-day fulfillment of its Strategic Plan to management. It should hold management accountable for this responsibility and set clear accountability objectives for the Executive Director. Under Section 10 of the 2003, 2011 amendment and 2015 Acts, the legislation allows for the Board “in respect of any particular matter or class of matter, and in writing, delegate to any director or to the Executive Director of the Trust, any of its functions under the Act” except (i) approving annual budgets or programme of activities; (ii) making regulations; (iii) carrying out activities which require off budget expenditures”. It also specifies the Executive Director to be responsible to the Board for the “efficient and economical administration of the Trust.”

While these provisions allow delegation of the Board’s responsibility for executive management, PACT presently does not have a ‘current and approved’ Board Charter consistent with the Amended legislation. International best practice is that the Boards of public bodies should publish a Charter that details the Board’s roles and responsibilities and the governance processes used to fulfill them. Prior to the passage of the 2015 Amendment, a Board Charter was drafted under the “Strengthening National Capacities for the Operationalization, Consolidation, and Sustainability of Belize’s Protected Areas System” (SNC.PAS) Project of the Government of Belize, with support from the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The Charter was never updated or adopted by PACT after the Act was finalized and passed.

The Board currently utilizes a Board Manual, last updated in March 2011 to support the 2011-2016 Strategic Plan and the 2003 Act (2011 amendment). The ultimate role of the Board of Directors as outlined in the Board Manual is the protection of public interest. “At its core the Board of Directors’ job is to ensure that the Trust fulfils its role as the country’s conservation trust based on good governance, fiscal responsibility, accountability and sound policy guidelines for decision making.” The manual states the Board’s responsibilities as:

1. Selecting the Executive Director;
2. Assessing the Executive Director’s performance;
3. Reviewing and authorizing plans and Trust commitments;
4. Ensuring Compliance with the PACT Act;
5. Oversight of implementation of PACT’s Strategic Plan;
6. Evaluation of the Trust’s performance; and,
7. Evaluation of its own performance as a Board of Directors.

The Manual notes: “While a Board of Directors should both govern and support its organization, this should not be mistaken for supervision of management and staff as this can easily lead to micro-management of the affairs of the Trust which is ineffective, inefficient and counter-productive to the efforts of the Executive Director and management structure of the Trust.” The expectation is that there will be four Board meetings per year. The Manual further elaborates the relationship between the Board and the Executive Director.
The Board Manual therefore makes a clear distinction between the Board’s governance/oversight role and an operational role, however, this is not reflected in Board practice. The approach to the Board acting in a more operational capacity is demonstrated by the high number of Board meetings in 2016 and in 2015. During 2016, the Board convened 18 times under regular or special circumstances. These meetings are in addition to meetings of Board Committees, reducing PACT’s capacity and time availability to manage operations. This imposes an administrative burden on the PACT Secretariat to service the Board and its Committees, potentially at the expense of resource mobilization and developing and maintaining stakeholder relationships. Additionally, because Board members are given a stipend per seating, the large number of Board meetings incurs a financial cost to PACT. Over the past four years, total expenditure on Board meetings was BZ $347,300, averaging BZ $86,825 per year.

The Manual includes a Code of Conduct (Ethics), which acknowledges the challenges of overlapping relationships due to the small population of Belize. The Manual addresses issues such as avoidance of micromanagement of the Trust, avoiding conflicts of interest, personal responsibility for oversight, participation and mutual respect, board member behavior, confidentiality, compensation, gifts and gratuities, fiduciary responsibilities and avoidance of political activity. Some aspects of the Code of Conduct however, have not been adopted.

### Summary: Board Charter

PACT currently does not have a current approved Board Charter. The PACT Act prescribes the general parameters of the operation of the Board to have the executive control and management of the affairs of the Trust, while being responsible for its effective and efficient administration. PACT’s Board Manual (March 2011) makes a clear distinction between the Board’s governance/oversight role and an operational role. International best practice relating to governance of statutory bodies recommends that Boards focus on setting strategic direction, safeguarding resources and monitoring and reporting performance to key stakeholders. The PACT Board acts in an executive capacity, demonstrated by the high number of Board meetings per year. During 2016, the Board convened 18 times under regular or special circumstances.

### 3.4 Governance Structure

The PACT Act (2003, 2011 amendment) established a number of bodies with various oversight and support functions for PACT. The primary body is the Board of Directors whose structure is prescribed by the PACT Act. The Act also prescribed the establishment of an Advisory Council and an Honorary Board. The 2015 Amendment revised the Governance structure.

#### 3.4.1 Parent Ministry

Shortly before the close of fiscal year 2011-2012, PACT was re-aligned under the newly-created Ministry of Forestry, Fisheries, and Sustainable Development. The governance and oversight role of the Minister is prescribed in the legislation. His primary role is to appoint the Chairman of the PACT Board from amongst its members, two Board members nominated by umbrella NGO organizations and a director with expertise in financial management. The Minister may also by regulations (i) after consultation with PACT, provide for the collection of user fees and visitor fees to be paid to PACT and (ii) empower PACT to regulate concession agreements within protected areas. The Minister also receives an annual financial report and audited statements from PACT.
which are to be presented to both Houses of Parliament. Finally, the Minister can amend the Schedules prescribing activities that qualify for funding by PACT.

3.4.2 Board of Directors

The 2015 Amendment significantly altered the structure of the Board and appointment of Directors. Whereas the original act specified organizations from which NGO/CBO directors were to be drawn from and provided flexibility as to the appointment of Government representatives from relevant Ministries, the revised Act is now more prescriptive as to Government representatives and less so about NGO/CBO representation. The Act assigns named positions (or their nominees) within specific Ministries to sit on the Board, extends term limits to three years, and gives the Minister power to appoint the Chairman of the Board. Previously the Chair was appointed by the Directors. Table 1 illustrates the change in the composition of the Board.

Table 1: Mandated Board Composition of PACT 2015 versus PACT 2003 (2011 amendment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Composition per PACT Act 2015</th>
<th>Board Composition per PACT Act 2003 (2011 amendment)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 members including the Executive Director as an ex officio member without the right to vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 4 CEOs (or his nominee) from Ministries responsible for protected areas, tourism, economic development, national emergency management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Financial Secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• University of Belize representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1 representative from the largest private sector umbrella organization representing the tourism industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1 NGO representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1 CBO representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Finance expert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Executive Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 members including the Executive Director as an ex officio member without the right to vote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3 representatives appointed by the Minister, from ministries responsible for terrestrial and marine protected areas, archeological sites and tourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Financial Secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1 NGO representative from BAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1 NGO representative from BACONGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1 CBO representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1 member representing BTIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1 representative from BNTOA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Finance expert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Executive Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result of the Board composition and Terms of Office legislated by the previous Act, over the period of time covered by the current strategic plan (2011-2016) PACT has had three Board Chairs. Between 2010/2011 and 2012/2015, there has been turnover of around 50% of Directors every other year. The more significant turnover has largely been of the Government representatives, including Board Chairs. The most significant turnover occurred between 2015 and 2016 with the change in the legislation in which there was a complete turnover of the Board of Directors. Prior to the change in legislation, there was more consistent representation from the Belize Audubon Society, National Institute of Culture & History, BACONGO, and the appointed finance expert, many of whom served for four years.

Best practice literature is fairly supportive of the concept of setting term limits for Boards of Directors, particularly of statutory government entities. Leading practice suggests that setting a term of three or four years, renewable once is a reasonable and effective approach for most public agencies. Therefore, the two-year term for the Board which obtained before the Act was amended, most likely did not give sufficient time for new directors to become oriented, and for

the Board to operate effectively as team. Thus the change in the legislation in the term of office from 2 to 3 years and eligibility for re-appointment are positive developments. The legislation is, however, silent on limits for reappointment.

With respect to Board composition of public bodies, best practice also recommends that Boards should be made up of individuals who, collectively, have the required competencies and personal attributes to carry out their responsibilities effectively. Board members should also be independent from management and have no material interest in the organization. It is also recommended that Boards have a committee that develops a competency matrix that is updated annually, when vacancies arise and is used to identify competency “gaps” on the board. Finally, the Board should have a succession plan to recommend to Government the orderly turnover of directors.\(^8\)

A former Board of Directors, in the current strategic plan (2011-2016) attempted to implement some of these best practices by including 4 distinct actions to improve PACT’s governance mechanisms, namely:

1. Modifying the structure of the Board to reflect a composition and role better suited to the purpose of PACT as a national Trust;
2. Developing individual profiles for Board members and amending the Act to appoint Directors based on skills and expertise and not on representation alone;
3. Updating the Board of Directors Manual and implementing a strategic Board development programme; and,
4. Implementing a conflict of interest policy which limits organizations serving on the Board from receiving grants during their term of service.

Of these four actions, however, only items 3 and 4 have been implemented, and only partially. The Board Manual was updated however the Board Development Programme was not affected. It is important to note however, that PACT would have been limited in its efforts to change the Board composition and appointment of Directors as this would require the endorsement of the Government of Belize in order to amend the Act.

### 3.4.3 Advisory Council

Prior to the 2015 Amendment, PACT Act (2003, 2011 amendment) prescribed the establishment of an Advisory Council, an eleven (11) member body with broad based representation from NGOs, academia and Government as well as subject matter experts. The functions of the Council were to (a) advise the Board on technical, administrative and other matters; (b) coordinate the preparation of the National Strategic Trust Plan; (c) advise the Board on areas of improvement of the Trust’s Grant award programme; (d) evaluate project proposals according to agreed selection criteria; (e) advise the Board on potential projects that are eligible for grant funding; (f) advise the Board on any other matter to help the Board perform its functions and administer the Trust efficiently and effectively and (g) perform any other duties. The Advisory Council operated until

---

\(^8\) Government of British Columbia. Board Resourcing and Development Office of the Premier, Province of British Columbia. 2005
the legislation repealed it. Some functions are now undertaken by the Grant Review Committee, which does not include external representation.

### 3.4.4 Honorary Board

Under Section 15 of the PACT Act 2003 (2011 amendment), an Honorary Board consisting of between three and five persons is to be appointed by the Board to: (a) enhance and portray the role of the Trust to members of the general public or particular groups; (b) create and build a positive image of the Trust; and (c) assist domestically and internationally to raise funds for the use of the Trust. Members were to be prominent persons such as the Governor General or representatives of prominent and established national and international organizations. There is no specific reference to the Honorary Board in the new legislation, however, neither was Section 15 amended or repealed so it is fair to conclude that it still stands and is applicable. The previous Institutional Assessment makes no reference to the Honorary Board, nor do any Organizational Charts of PACT seen by the Team. The team was advised that this Honorary Board has never been activated.

### 3.4.5 Protected Areas Conservation Trust Foundation

The 2003 Legislation mandates the creation of a Foundation to receive gifts and donations which cannot be received directly by the Trust Fund, and to raise funds to promote conservation and management, for the sustainable use of natural and cultural resources of Belize. The Legislation confers autonomy of the Foundation from the Government and PACT itself. The 2003 Act names representatives from specific NGOs to the Board of the Foundation as well as representatives selected by PACT and the parent Ministry. The Executive Director is an ex-officio member of the Foundation. The Board of the Foundation is not to exceed 11, however representatives from other bodies can be named to the Board through “contractual or other legally binding relationships”.

The PACT Foundation however, has never been constituted as prescribed. In 2001 PACT established an independent Foundation to receive funds from the Tropical Forest Conservation Act (TFCA) Debt for Nature Swap between the Governments of the United States and Belize, with private support from The Nature Conservancy. The Debt for Nature Swap (DNS) was announced in August 2001 and was the first of its kind under the TFCA. This subsidized DNS provided for the reduction of Belize’s official debt of US$9.7 million to the U.S. by half, in exchange for payments by the Government of Belize to local conservation organizations and a contribution of US$1.3 million in private funds raised by The Nature Conservancy. Originally, only three named local non-governmental organizations (NGOs) would be beneficiaries of these funds. This was however, not accepted by the Government of Belize and conservation stakeholders. Consequently, The Nature Conservancy proposed the creation of a foundation linked to PACT (called the PACT Foundation) that would award grants to other local conservation NGOs. This caused some confusion with the Foundation intended under the PACT Act. TFCA funds are now administered by PACT through the Belize Nature Conservation Foundation.

---

The 2011-2016 Strategic Plan included a strategic action to “Establish a PACT Foundation to be the philanthropic fundraising arm of PACT, with its own Board of Directors that is strategically structured to maximize access to funding from philanthropic sources”. A budgetary allocation was approved by the Board in 2013/2014 and 2014/2015 to support the establishment of the Foundation, however this did not materialize and the Foundation has not yet been established.

### Summary: Governance Structure

PACT’s governance arrangements are complex. The 2015 Amendment significantly altered the structure of the Board and appointment of Directors. Whereas the original Act specified organizations from which NGO/CBO directors were to be drawn from and provided flexibility as to the appointment of Government representatives from relevant Ministries, the revised Act is now more prescriptive as to Government representatives and less so about NGO/CBO representation. The Act assigns named positions within specific Ministries to sit on the Board; extends term limits to three years; and gives the Minister power to appoint the Chairman of the Board. While the former Board recognized the need for Directors to be appointed based on filling competency requirements above representation, they were unsuccessful in having this reflected in the Amended Act.

The PACT Foundation, whose establishment is mandated in the Act to “be the philanthropic fundraising arm of PACT, with its own Board of Directors” has not yet been established despite budgetary allocations approved in 2013/2014 and 2014/2015. The Honorary Board has never been established.

### 3.5 Board Committees

A major change to PACT’s governance arrangements was the repeal of Section 18 in the principal PACT Act which established the Advisory Council. In its place the 2015 Amendment established the following Board Committees.

**3.5.1 Finance and Audit Committee**

The primary functions of this committee are to assist with the Board’s oversight of (a) the conduct of the Trust’s internal financial, accounting and reporting processes; (b) the Trust’s financial reporting to external partners; (c) the Trust’s system of internal controls and risk assessment and management; (d) the Trust’s compliance with legal and regulatory requirements and (e) ensure that the qualifications of those carrying out, the independence required to and the performance of the Trust’s internal audit function. The composition of the committee includes the PACT Board Chair, the Board’s appointed finance expert, the Financial Secretary or his nominee and two other board members. In 2016, Finance and Audit committee met 15 times in 2016.

**3.5.2 Technical Committee on Protected Areas**

Appointed by the Board, the 3-5 person Technical Committee on Protected Areas (“Technical Committee”) advises the Board on: (a) the management of the Protected Areas System and related legislation and regulation; (b) the five year strategic plan for the National Protected Areas System; (c) emerging protected areas system issues and (d) the implementation of the National Protected Areas Policy and Plan and the on-going management of the NPAS. The Chair of the Committee is appointed by the Board. Members are to possess at least 10 years of experience in protected areas management with a minimum Master’s Degree in a specified relevant field. The
members of the Committee were recently named, but at the time of this assessment, the Committee had not yet been convened.

3.5.3 Administrative, Technical and Scientific Committees
The 2015 Amendment makes provisions for the appointment of committees made up of members of the Board qualified to advise the Board on administrative, technical or administrative matters.

The current Board has established additional committees in keeping with its new mandate. This are discussed below.

3.5.4 Grant Review Committee
The Grant Review Committee essentially fills a gap created by the elimination of the Advisory Council which was responsible for review and evaluation of project proposals. The Committee comprises Board members representing University of Belize, Ministry of Tourism & Culture; CBO representative and an alternate to address any conflicts of interest. The Executive Director sits on the Committee but does not have voting rights. The Committee was established to support the approval of grants for the 2015/2016 Grants Cycle. This committee met 10 times in 2016.

3.5.5 Strategy Committee
The Board established a Strategy Committee to develop and review comprehensive Terms of References for strategic plans, assessments and consultancies necessary for PACT to realize its new legislative mandates. The intent is for this committee to be an ad-hoc committee for the Fiscal Year 2016/2017, after which its future existence will be assessed. The Committee is charged with developing TORs and evaluate consultancy bids for (i) The Five-Year Strategic Plan for the National Protected Areas System; (ii) National Strategic Protected Areas Conservation Trust Plan/ PACT’s Five Year Strategic Plan; (iii) The Institutional Assessment of the Protected Areas Conservation Trust; (iv) a Communications Strategy for PACT’s Transitory Phase; (v) willingness to Pay Survey/ Assessment; and (vi) Fundraising Strategy for PACT. The Committee was also charged to develop the 2016/2017 call for proposal criteria for PACT Investment Opportunities. Where specific expertise is deemed necessary other non-Board members may be co-opted to provide technical input and recommendations. The Strategy Committee met 7 times in 2016.

Summary: Board Committees
PACT has a total of 5 Board Committees. The 2015 Amendment revised the Governance structure and abolished the Advisory Council, replacing it with a Technical Committee and added a Finance and Audit Committee. These have been established along with a Grant Review Committee and Strategy Committee.

3.6 Strategic Planning
PACT is currently operating under its third Strategic Plan (2011-2016) which was commissioned by the Prime Minister and the Board of Directors and endorsed by the Cabinet. The current plan is described as a ‘forward thinking’ agenda to guide PACT in its development during the next five years as a “relevant and effective National Trust” which will deliver through financing “clear and tangible benefits to the natural heritage, economy and people of Belize”.
The current Vision and Mission Statements of PACT (to be updated in the Strategic Plan 2017-2021) are:

**Vision:** “PACT is a strategic partner in the funding, management, and sustainable development of Belize’s natural and cultural resources for the benefit of Belizeans and the global community”

**Mission:** “To contribute to the sustainable management and development of Belize’s natural and cultural heritage by providing effective funding support to protected areas”

The Strategic Plan of 2011-2016 contains six Guiding Principles:

1. Equity, transparency, accountability, and good governance are hallmarks of PACT;
2. The success of PACT as a National Trust Fund is dependent on its ability to continuously grow the fund;
3. Being responsive to protected areas and constituents’ needs is a permanent campaign of PACT;
4. Networking and engagement with constituents on a local, national and global scale is indispensable for PACT to deliver its mission;
5. PACT continuously sets new standards of efficiency in grant-making and delivery; and,
6. Effective communications is a key function of the day to day operations of PACT.

The Strategic Plan identifies six Strategic Objectives, four of which pertain directly to PACT’s intent to become a model Trust Fund.

1. Develop and Implement Mechanisms to Grow and Sustain the Fund in order to Progressively Increase the Impact of the Trust on Protected Areas and Natural Resources Management in Belize;
2. Achieve Enhanced Institutional Capacity;
3. Improve the Allocation, Management and Impact of PACT Grants;
4. Improve the Overall Management of the Fund;
5. Improve and Consolidate Inter-Institutional Linkages and Stakeholder Confidence; and,
6. Improve the Strategic Leadership and Overall Governance of the Board.

Thirty-four (34) actions are summarized below. An overall assessment is given for achievement of each Strategic Objective and is indicated by a ‘traffic light’ schema. Red indicates that the strategic objective has not been met; yellow indicates there has been some progress towards meeting the objective and green indicates the strategic objective has largely been or has been completely met. This assessment is based on the “Update of PACT’s Strategic Objectives and Actions from the 2011-2016 Action Plan”, document review and consultations with stakeholders.10

---

10 Update provided by PACT Secretariat was prepared in April 2016.
### Table 2: Strategic Objectives and Specific Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Objectives</th>
<th>Specific Actions</th>
<th>Overall Progress¹¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Grow and sustain the Fund to progressively increase the impact on Protected Areas and Natural Resources Management in Belize | • Invest in low risk investment portfolio  
• Establish a Development Office to develop and implement fundraising strategy  
• Establish a PACT foundation with its own Board of Directors  
• Increase revenues from existing sources  
• Pursue payment for environmental services | ▣ ▣ ▣ |
| To Achieve Enhanced Institutional Capacity                                           | • Strengthen capacity of PACT in proposal writing, project skills, grant management and fund management  
• Improve service delivery, reduce redundancy and improve efficiency through better integration of staff roles  
• Support capacity building of grantees  
• Institute tailor-made mentorship assistance for grantees  
• Discontinue degree scholarship grants and award 1 or 2 high profile degree level scholarships per year | □ □ □ |
| Improve the Allocation, Management and Impact of PACT Grants                         | • Review and streamline PACT priority areas to optimize investments in areas of national priority, capitalize on emerging funding opportunities and maximize grant impact.  
• Conduct cost-benefit analysis of protected areas management; evaluate administrative and on-the-ground investments in Pas and determine true core costs for PA management  
• Adopt a policy to meet 50% of qualifying protected areas core costs included in large grant requests, providing that remaining 50% is covered from other sources  
• Introduce Grant Management Software  
• Review and modify application policies to allow large grants to multiple organizations  
• Update Grants manual to address differences in institutional capacity and size of grant  
• Develop and adopt a PACT investment policy that guides PACT’s investments | ▣ ▣ ▣ |
| Improve the Overall Management of the Fund                                           | • Limit PACT Administrative expenses to a maximum of 20% of annual revenue within three years  
• Eliminate employee loans and encourage voluntary savings programme  
• Develop cost driver for allocation and recovery administrative expenses  
• Develop general fund management policy | ▣ ▣ ▣ |
| Improve and Consolidate Inter-Institutional Linkages and Stakeholder Confidence      | • Implement PACT 2009-2013 Communication Strategy  
• Identify, pursue and establish formal strategic alliances with at least 6 local and international partners  
• Pursue partnerships to capitalize on leveraging opportunities and optimize use of available resources  
• Establish Micro-grant programme for sustainable income generating activities in buffer communities  
• Develop Constituent engagement policy | ▣ ▣ ▣ |

¹¹ Consultant’s assessment based on management consultations and analysis of financial/non-financial data
Strategic Objectives | Specific Actions | Overall Progress
---|---|---
**Improve the Strategic Leadership and Overall Governance of PACT**
- Develop Constituent database and map to facilitate Constituent engagement
- Modify Board structure to reflect a composition consistent with the identity and purpose of PACT as a National Public Trust, with the Board providing strategic oversight in fund development, allocation and management.
- Develop individual profiles for each Board member and amend Act to require appointment based on skills/profile and not on representation alone.
- Update Board of Directors Manual and implement a Strategic Board Development Programme.
- Strategically position PACT to serve as fiduciary manager of emerging National Protected Areas Authority
- Amend the PACT Act to protect the Fund from appropriation outside of the scope of the PACT Act
- Implement Conflict of Interest Policy that limits organizations represented on the Board accessing grants
- Strategically position PACT to help establish a sustainable funding base for protected areas through skillful engagement of the PACT Foundation.

Source: IFCL Analysis of Performance Against Strategic Plan 2011-2016

Although the majority of the objectives supported Trust Fund growth, development and utilization, the early strategic priorities were focused on streamlining the organization for enhanced operational and financial efficiency and improving institutional capacity through the establishment of a PACT Foundation and Development Office, introducing Grant Management Software, reducing PACT’s administrative expenses and restructuring the Board of Directors. Priorities for the latter years focused on programmatic enhancements such as developing a tailor-made Mentorship Programs for grantees, and a Micro-Grant Program in buffer communities, utilizing Cost-Benefit Analysis of protected areas management to truly assess protected areas management ‘core costs’ at multiple levels of management, in order to try to meet fifty percent (50%) of protected areas core costs.

Summary: Strategic Planning

Overall, PACT’s performance in meeting its strategic objectives over the last 5 years is mixed, with the most progress being made in the area of grant management and allocation, followed by some progress towards improving the overall management of the Fund and achieving enhanced institutional capacity. PACT was less successful in effecting critical changes to improve financial sustainability, stakeholder relationships and governance structure.
3.7 Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

3.7.1 Legislative Requirements
Under the PACT Act 2003, the Board of PACT was mandated to arrange for an annual evaluation of the Trust’s administration and operations, and such evaluation was meant to coincide with the annual audit. Furthermore, every three years, a comprehensive evaluation of the administration and operations of the Trust, along with a field audit of projects supported by the Trust would be conducted. These would be independently undertaken by a team appointed by the Minister of Finance, of no more than five professionals from relevant technical fields. The law addressed potential conflict of interest whereby any person associated with the Trust as a member of the Board, Finance and Audit Committee or any other Board Committee or beneficiary cannot serve as a member of the evaluation team. These evaluation reports were to be submitted to the Minister, Board and Honorary Board.

In practice, PACT has not been in compliance with some of the requirements of the legislation. While there is monitoring of individual projects, an independent field audit of projects does not take place. Institutional assessments conducted every five years alongside the last and current strategic planning exercise may be considered a comprehensive evaluation of the administration and operations of the Trust.

3.7.2 PACT Performance Evaluation
An Annex to the 2011-2016 Strategic Plan is a Performance Monitoring Tool or ‘Institutional Report Card’ which is intended to allow PACT to assess its performance against the Strategic Objectives and actions outlined in the Plan. The Tool includes performance indicators and targets, means of verification and critical assumptions. The team was provided with an undated version which reviewed the performance against some of the established indicators up to March 2016.

3.7.3 Operational Requirements
At the portfolio level, evaluations of research and small grants are to be undertaken every two years, while medium and large grants are to be assessed every three years. The team was advised that the last portfolio evaluation was undertaken in 2011 encompassing 6 large grants valued at BZ$ 3,859,162, funded by PACT between January 2004 and December 2010, executed by a government agency, academic institution and four NGOs. This exercise examined both the performance of the individual projects as well as the extent to which the projects contributed to the achievement of PACT’s strategic objectives and the objectives of the NPASSP. The evaluations also assessed PACT’s management of the grants and lessons learned and how those lessons could be used to improve the way PACT does business.

PACT has not undertaken the evaluation of the impact of PACT’s small grant portfolio, capacity development programme or research grants. Under the Amended PACT Act, PACT is mandated to assume responsibility for M&E for the entire system, and will be required to prepare and submit periodic reports on the state of protected areas in Belize. This will require a significant increase in M&E capacity within PACT if it is to coordinate the preparation of such reports as required by law.
Summary: M&E
In practice, PACT was not compliance with some of the requirements of the 2003 legislation (2011 amendment). There is monitoring of individual projects, but an independent field audit of projects did not take place. Institutional assessments conducted every five years could be considered a comprehensive evaluation of the administration and operations of the Trust. For the current Strategic Plan, PACT utilizes a Performance Monitoring Tool or ‘Institutional Report Card’ to assess its performance against the Strategic Objectives and actions outlined in the Plan.

3.8 Public Accountability

The PACT Act 2003 prescribed that an annual audit of accounts shall be carried out by an independent auditing firm to be appointed by the Board. Such reports were to be submitted to the Board. The Board in turn was required to prepare an annual statement of the assets and liabilities of the Trust and submit this to the Central Bank of Belize. There was no legal requirement for public posting of the Audited report, or public presentation of an Annual Report of the Trust’s operations. PACT however, does this on its website.

The new legislation now requires that no later than 6 months from the end of each year, PACT should submit to the Minister responsible for Protected Areas, an account of its transactions throughout the preceding year and an audited statement. These are to be printed and laid on the table of both Houses. Furthermore, the Trust is now to publish and submit a Report on the state of protected areas in Belize including management effectiveness and financial scorecard results every three years. The new Act therefore elevates public accountability of PACT and requires accountability of the PACT Board to the Minister and the Parliament.

In practice, PACT has largely complied with the preparation of annual audited reports and annual reports. Annual reports prepared by the Trust include information on approved projects, grants programme expenses and the financial performance throughout the year. These reports covering the years 2000/01 to 2012/2013, and independent audit reports covering FY 2000/01 to 2014/2015 are posted on the PACT website. PACT has not prepared an annual report for the last three years. The public posting of the audited report for FY2015/16 ending March 31, 2016 is still outstanding, as of the date of this report. Although the Annual Reports list projects funded during the year under review, there is no comprehensive listing of projects financed by PACT available from the website. This would further enhance PACT’s transparency and public accountability.

Summary: Public Accountability

PACT has largely complied with the preparation of annual audited reports which are posted on its website; however, PACT has not prepared an annual report for the last three years. The public posting of the audited report for FY2015/16 ending March 31, 2016 is outstanding.
4. PACT OPERATIONS

4.1. PACT Grant Programme Description

PACT’s grant making programme can be described as a responsive, competitive approach to financing the funding needs of the National Protected Areas System. PACT established its original Small Grant Programme in 1997, starting with small grants, which since then has evolved to include small grants, medium grants, large grants, planning grants, environmental fellowships, capacity development grants, environmental support grants, and other grant investments. According to PACT’s website, since inception, PACT has financed 471 projects valued at BZ$31,278,259.07. Because of the lack of Annual Reports from 2013/2015 onwards, the team could only report that for the period under review for the current strategic plan, 30 grants were financed with PACT funds in 2011/2012 and 14 were financed in 2012/2013.

4.1.1. Current Grant Types

At the beginning of the period covered by the current strategic plan, the capacity building grants programme was comprised of 4 grant types: research grants, capacity development grants (individual professional development grants and local workshop/seminar grants) and environmental fellowship grants (formerly the Scholarship programme). PACT does not fund total project costs – applicants must demonstrate counterpart support, in particular the ability to cover a large portion of administrative costs.

Table 3 summarizes the characteristics of each grant window up to 2016 after which the programme was modified as a result of the introduction of the new legislation. Table 3 indicates the grant programme currently in force.

Table 3: Grant Programme in force 2011-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Window</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
<th>Grant size</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Grants</td>
<td>Not clearly stated</td>
<td>CBOs</td>
<td>&lt; BZ$60,000</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Grants</td>
<td>To support projects in one or more NPAS sites</td>
<td>NGOs, Government Agencies (single or joint)</td>
<td>&lt; BZ$200,000</td>
<td>24 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Grants</td>
<td>Direct contribution to NPAS and its connectivity with other regional management regimes</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;BZ$400,000</td>
<td>24 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Planning Grants</td>
<td>Stakeholder consultations and/or problem analysis towards project planning, conceptualization, design and preparation</td>
<td>CBO, NGOs, Government Agencies</td>
<td>&lt;BZ $5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Fellowships</td>
<td>Financial assistance to professionals to support tuition, registration, books, room and board, fees and thesis development</td>
<td>Mid-career or senior professionals</td>
<td>&lt;BZ$40,000</td>
<td>Duration of course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grant Window | Purpose | Beneficiary | Grant size | Duration
---|---|---|---|---
Research Grants | Graduate or post-graduate pure, applied or policy-driven research | Graduate or post-graduate students, researchers and local organizations | <BZ$20,000 | 24 months
Capacity Development Grants | Attendance/execution of short term courses/seminars, workshops and conferences (locally, regionally, internationally) | Individuals and organizations | <BZ$10,000 (individuals) <BZ$25,000 (organizations) | N/A
Environmental Support Grants | Short term projects, activities or initiatives that promote conservation | Associations, groups and schools | <BZ$10,000 | 
Financial Aid Grants | Tuition and material/books support for tertiary level degree students 1-2 semesters | Tertiary Students in final year of study | <BZ$500-2,000 | 1-2 semesters

After the Amended legislation came into force, the Board approved an Investment Manual (August 2016) to guide PACT’s grant-making strategy for 2016/2017 which is considered by PACT to be a transitional year which overlaps the timeframe covered by the current and upcoming strategic plans. The new strategy includes only five grant categories and 3 investment priorities: (i) institutional and governance strengthening; (ii) financial sustainability and resource mobilization and (iii) protected areas management plans and other necessary actions to meet co-management agreement requirements. PACT has made nominal steps to move from a ‘grant-making’ perspective to an ‘investment’ perspective. During the period 2016-2017, the Board declared it a ‘transitional year’ and it put forward an ‘investment envelope’ of BZ$ 1.2 million dollars for projects in Single and Multiple categories. These were complemented by the regular categories of Extra-ordinary investments and Environmental Support and Capacity Building Investments which had a budget of their own. Despite the intent for PACT to cover 50% of core costs, the current board has decided to finance only 20% of the projects’ core costs. The new investment approach is summarized in Table 4.

Table 4: Transitional year investment strategy (2016-2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Window</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
<th>Grant size</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Investment</td>
<td>Grants directly contribute to execution of NPASP and other national plans</td>
<td>CBOs/NGOs/ Government Agencies</td>
<td>&lt; BZ$100,000</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Investment</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 or more CBOs/NGOs and/or Government Agencies</td>
<td>&lt; BZ$400,000</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-Ordinary Investment</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>CBOs/NGOs/ Government Agencies</td>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Development Grants</td>
<td>Attendance/execution of short term courses/seminars, workshops and conferences (locally, regionally, internationally)</td>
<td>Individuals and organizations</td>
<td>&lt;BZ$10,000 (individuals) &lt;BZ$25,000 (organizations)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Support Grants</td>
<td>Short term projects, activities or initiatives that promote appreciation, enhancement</td>
<td>Associations, groups and schools who have not received grants</td>
<td>&lt;BZ$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Grant Window

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Window</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
<th>Grant size</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Fellowship</td>
<td>Protection of natural resources</td>
<td>Mid-career or senior professionals</td>
<td>&lt;BZ$50,000</td>
<td>Duration of course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>Financial assistance for post-grad or professional training in specific fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.1.1. Third Party Grants

PACT also administers third party grants on behalf of other grant funds. These are as follows:

**Mesoamerican reef Fund (MARFUND)**

The Mesoamerican Reef Fund is a private, nonprofit financial mechanism for conservation for use in Belize, Guatemala, Honduras and Mexico. MarFund’s mission is to conserve the resources and natural processes in the Mesoamerican Reef region for the benefit of present and future generations through management; technical and financial support for priority areas; and issues such as water quality, sustainable tourism, sustainable fisheries and institutional strengthening.

PACT administers the fund for Belize and invites applicants to submit proposals in response to a “Call for Proposals” advertised at least once a year. Grants are awarded up to $100,000.00.

**Belize Nature Conservation Foundation – BNCF (Formerly PACT Foundation)**

PACT serves as the administrator of the BNCF which is a separate legal entity. The BNCF is financed from payments from the Government of Belize for a Debt-for-Nature Swap negotiated under the Tropical Forest Conservation Act. The interest generated from the proceeds are intended to finance registered management organizations of terrestrial protected areas to carry out projects in the areas of general park management and protection, environmental education, equipment, training and research. Prospective grantees submit proposals in response to “Calls for Proposals” which are advertised at least once a year for grants up to $39,000.00.

#### 4.1.2. Call for Proposals and Grant Appraisal Processes

On an annual basis, PACT sets its funding priorities and advertises “Calls for Concepts” or “Calls for Proposals”, depending on the grant type. Under the Call for Concepts, the project concept is vetted by PACT and must be accepted before the applicant is invited to submit a project proposal and logical framework. Project proposals submitted are reviewed and assessed on the basis of applicant eligibility, institutional capacity to execute, stakeholder involvement, availability of co-financing, technical and financial feasibility and contribution to the NPASP. The grant appraisal process does not explicitly include site/field visits by PACT staff to the protected area site, however, PACT staff may provide technical assistance to the applicants during proposal development if warranted.

The previous and current grant application and appraisal process generally follow the same generic steps. The main difference between the previous process and the current is substitution of the Advisory Council by the Grant Review Committee. The former was completely independent of the Board, while the GRC now comprises only Board members.

---

12 The other three NGOs covered by this Agreement - Belize Audubon Society, Programme for Belize, and the Toledo institute for Development and Environment are not eligible to receive these funds from PACT.
4.1.3. Single and Multiple Investments
For the current transitional year, following the submission of an acceptable completed proposal, PACT’s internal screening committee (ISC) reviews and prepares a report for the Grant Review Committee. The ISC comprises the Executive Director, Associate Director Finance (with the Accountant acting during vacancy), Associate Director of Grants and Grants Officer. The Chief Operations Officer is also a member of the Committee, however at present the seat is vacant. The GRC evaluates the proposals and presents a recommendation to the Board of Directors. The Board of Directors makes the approval decision either by meeting, or by e-mail round robin. The Board can decide to fully or only partially fund a proposal.

4.1.4. Extraordinary Investments
In the case of Extraordinary Investments which take place outside regular grant cycle the request for funding must detail the reason for the request and include a budget and workplan. The manual is not clear on the exact nature of this funding window and seems to be in place to deal with unexpected emergencies and unanticipated needs that fall outside of the grant application and approval cycle.

4.1.5. Environmental support and capacity building investments
PACT funds short term environmental support and capacity building investments. These are awarded on a first come, first served basis and are appraised using the standard application form and appraisal process.

4.2. Grant Administration
Once the grant is approved, PACT advises the applicant and an Investment Agreement is prepared. The workplan and budget are integral annexes to this Agreement. The Agreement is signed by both parties during an Investment Award Ceremony after which is generally followed an inception meeting. This meeting clarifies roles and responsibilities, reporting and monitoring and evaluation requirements and any other pertinent issues.

For Single and Multiple investments during the transition year, these projects follow a two-disbursement schedule in which 60% of the approved budget is initially disbursed and the remaining 40% is disbursed on acceptance of a satisfactory report. Extraordinary investments have individual disbursement schedules per project needs.

Grantees are responsible for reporting on the use of funds, and submitting supporting documents to PACT. Each reporting package must include:

1. Completed narrative report form
2. Completed financial report form accompanied by:
   - Copies of receipts
   - Copies of monthly bank statements and/or cancelled cheques
   - Bank reconciliations
   - Detailed expense sheet
   - Counterpart funding form
3. Completed procurement report form that documents services, equipment and fixed assets procured and service contracts.

These narrative and financial reports are reviewed by the grant officer and accounting clerk respectively, and feedback provided to grantees regarding any required revisions. Once they are satisfied, a report is submitted to the Associate Director of Grants and to the Associate Director Finance (however, with the ADF post being vacant, the Accountant receives the report), the Accountant, then to the Executive Director for final approval.

4.2.1. Project and Portfolio Monitoring

At the project level, PACT allocates funds for monitoring, evaluation and communication for single and multiple investments (BZ $1,500 and BZ $6,000 respectively). This represents a significant reduction in the M&E allocation from the previous grant programme which allowed BZ $3-5,000 for small and medium grants to 5% of the project budget for large grants. These funds are included in the approved project budget but are retained by PACT to cover M&E costs.

PACT’s monitoring and evaluation activities are conducted by PACT staff and include two scheduled field visits, generally at the fourth month of implementation and at the end of programme execution. Where necessary, additional field visits are undertaken and may include the GRC, Board of Directors, Forestry or Fisheries Department staff, and the media.

In general, the visits (i) evaluate the progress through a review of objectives or targets, and obtain feedback from target groups about how the project is affecting them; (ii) review or discuss problems, delays or adverse conditions that may impact implementation; (iii) verify financial reporting and ensure there is good record keeping; and (iv) clarify any issues. This is documented in a field visit report which is shared with the grantee. If progress is deemed unsatisfactory, the grantee is asked to provide a plan for corrective action. This must be approved by PACT. Where necessary, the project can be terminated by the Board.

Projects are closed once an end of project report is prepared and approved, and a project completion and assessment report is prepared jointly by the grantee and PACT grant staff. The report is submitted to the Chief Operations Officer and Executive Director with a recommendation for closure. The manual specifies that an external evaluation of all investments awarded will be undertaken at the end of the investment cycle.

Figure 3 illustrates the generic grant application and administration processes that all grants administered by PACT are subject to, as described in the preceding sections.
Summary: Grant Programme & Administration

Prior to the Amendment, the grant portfolio consisted of small, medium and large grants, planning grants and capacity building grants. After the Amended legislation came into force, the Board approved a transitional Investment Manual (August 2016) to guide PACT’s grant-making strategy for 2016/2017. The new strategy includes only five grant categories (Single Investments, Multiple Investments, Extra-ordinary investments and Environmental Support and Capacity Building Investments). PACT has moved from a ‘grant-making’ perspective to an ‘investment’ perspective, however the generic grant application processes remain the same and are not tailored to the size or complexity of the grant. The elimination of the Advisory Council has concentrated review to internal actors and the review process no longer has the benefit of an external perspective. Document requirements for accountability are often redundant and grant administrative processes could be streamlined.

4.3. Human Resources

PACT staff are reportedly comparatively well-paid with excellent benefits. Human Resources administration is the responsibility of the Executive Director, with administrative support from the Administrative Officer. There is a detailed Human Resources Manual (updated 2012) that has not been formally approved by the Board. The manual covers policies and procedures for issues
such as recruitment, disciplinary procedures, termination and resignation, salaries and benefits, employee responsibilities, performance appraisal procedure, allowances, vehicle policy, among others. The Manual deals with the recruitment of staff below Senior Management which is the responsibility of the Executive Director. However, except for the hiring of an Internal Auditor, which is also the purview of the Board, PACT Boards have been involved in the recruitment and hiring process of lower level staff. This is in contravention of the Board Manual.

The approved organizational structure of PACT carried over from the last Strategic Plan is dated 2010. Although changes have been proposed which include the addition of a Chief Operations Officer, the Board has not updated or approved a new Organizational chart; neither is PACT currently staffed as indicated on the approved organizational chart which is reproduced and shown as Figure 4. The team was advised that not all job descriptions are up to date, and the policy for updating job descriptions is inconsistent. Although the core organizational structure of PACT has been more or less consistent (Executive Director reported to by Finance, Grants and Administrative heads); over the period of the last strategic plan (2011-2016), there have been changes in both positions and personnel which reflect the sense of ‘persistent transition’ reported by PACT’s staff.

**Figure 4: Organizational Chart (approved 2010)**

The current staff complement of PACT is 15 which includes:

- An Executive Director;
- Executive Assistant reporting to the Executive Director;
- Accountant – under whom fall 2 accounts clerks, a procurement officer and a junior accounts clerk;
- Associate Director – Grants under whom fall 2 grant officers;
• Administrative Officer – under whom fall an Administrative Assistant, Office Assistance/Driver and General Helper; and,
• Communications Officer reporting to the Executive Director.

The main difference between the approved and current organizational structure is the size of the Grants Department which had 6 positions compared with the current complement of three. The Procurement Officer specifically supports PACT’s administration of both World Bank-funded projects. The team was advised that it is intended that this position will be absorbed into the structure once these projects end in view of the fact that PACT intends to serve as a National Implementing Entity and will be responsible for programmatic investments throughout the NPAS.

There has been significant turn-over of senior level staff over the past five years. There have been three Executive Directors between 2011 and 2016; two of whom were promoted internally (of which one remained acting and never confirmed as ED). There has also been turn-over of the Associate Director of Finance and Associate Director of Grants. Although not on the approved organization chart, a Chief Operations Officer was recruited, but the incumbent recently left the organization. Both COO and Associate Director of Finance positions remain vacant. Their departure and delay in filling the vacant posts have placed significant demands on the Executive Director. The strategic planning exercise revealed that there is insufficient staff cohesion and inter-departmental cooperation.

The reduction in the number of grant staff reflects the changing nature of PACT’s grant-making program and efforts to contain administrative costs. Expenditure by PACT on salaries and benefits over the past three years as a percentage of total administrative expenditure range declined from 65% to 59% between 2013 and 2016. Staff salaries and benefits as a percentage of programme expenses declined annually from a high of 52% in 2013 to 29% in 2016, though this was due to increased programme spending rather than decreased spending on human resources. The addition of an Associate Director, Development and Marketing, Chief Operations Officer and Associate Director Finance will result in an increase PACT’s administrative costs. Administrative costs are also likely to increase in order as additional human resources are needed for PACT to fulfil its new mandate.

**Summary: Human Resources**

PACT is recognized as an employer of choice, and staff are reportedly comparatively well-paid with excellent benefits. There has been significant turn-over of senior level staff over the past five years, leading to PACT operating in an on-going state of transition. Administrative cost ratios have declined, but this is largely due to increasing program expenditure.

### 4.4. Information Technology (IT)

PACT utilizes Information Technology to some degree, however, there is scope for improvement. For accounting purposes, PACT utilizes Quickbooks for both project and corporate accounting.
Despite the strategic action to introduce Grant Management Software to assist in the tracking of grantee progress and compliance with PACT Grant Policies, the software has not yet been procured. Although such software is available, a decision was made to wait on the development of a comprehensive M&E system which has not yet materialized. There is no provision for on-line applications at this time.

PACT Staff and Board believe there are opportunities to maximize the use of information technology in a range of functions including external communication; staff intranet, fundraising tools, and grant application and administration tools and databases.

As indicated below, PACT also utilizes social media for marketing and communications.

**Summary: IT**

PACT utilizes Information Technology to some degree, but there is scope for improvement. Despite the intent to introduce Grant Management Software the software has not yet been procured.

**4.5. Marketing and Communications**

PACT operates a website which provides information about the Trust and its programmes. It is fairly static in its content and primarily provides background information on the organization, Board and staff, the grant programme, projects supported, and is a repository for corporate documents such as annual Audits and Annual Reports.

PACT uses social media, primarily Twitter, Facebook, YouTube and Instagram as the primary outreach about projects funded, PACT’s activities and general items of interest. All platforms are kept up to date and contain a variety of current information, high quality graphical content, videos and opportunities for public engagement. PACT has 94 followers on Instagram and 15 subscribers to its You-Tube Channel. There is scope for social media to be optimized and a wider audience driven to the sites.

**Summary: Marketing & Communications**

PACT’s website primarily provides background information on the organization, the grant programme, projects supported, and is a repository for corporate documents. PACT utilizes social media as the primary outreach about projects funded, PACT’s activities and general items of interest. All platforms are kept up to date and contain a variety of current information, high quality graphical content, videos and opportunities for public engagement. There is scope for social media to be optimized and a wider audience driven to the sites.

There needs to be deeper engagement and communication with the general public to encourage and promote conservation and raise awareness of PACT, which should be a household name in Belize.
4.6. Financial Management

PACT’s financial year runs April 1 to March 31. Audited reports are publicly available to 2014-2015.

PACT’s record of careful fiduciary management has led to a positive international reputation. This has been evidenced by PACT being the beneficiary of funds from external sources such as the TFCA through the Belize Nature Conservation Fund (BNCF) and the MARFund. More recently, PACT has been accredited as the national implementing entity (NIE) status for the Adaptation Fund and provides fiduciary services on behalf of two World Bank-funded grant. The 5-year, USD$6M Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA Project); funded by World Bank/Global Environment Facility is executed by the NPAS Secretariat. The Marine Conservation and Adaptation Project (MCCAP) is a five year US$5.53 million project funded by the World Bank’s Adaptation Fund.

The team reviewed and analyzed financial statements for the years 2012/2013 to 2015/2016. PACT has collected an average of BZ$ 5,331,913.75 in revenue from the conservation fee, commission fee, interest income and other sources. PACT’s management fees from fiduciary services come from three main sources. It receives 15% of the grants budget from the Belize Nature Conservation Fund, US$37,400 from the MARFUND KfW project (Phase I and II), and $80,000 for management fees from the MCCAP and KBA projects funded by the World Bank. These latter amounts are total fees spread over the life of these special projects.

From PACT’s revenue of BZ$5,331,913.75 the Trust spent BZ$3,915,718 on average, which included a collection administration fee, administrative expenses, grant programme expenses and other expenses. PACT distributed on average BZ$2,332,256.75 per year in grants. Over the past four years the grant portfolio has grown from BZ$1,619,406 in 2012 to BZ$3,192,651 in 2016.

PACT is perceived by stakeholders to have high administrative overhead costs. The 2011-2016 Strategic Plan set a target for PACT to reduce its expenses as a percentage of revenues to a maximum of 20% of annual revenue within the next three years. In 2012 this ratio was 29%. This has reduced over the last four years, and by 2016 the ratio was 25%. This however is 2% higher than the ratio for 2015 which represented the lowest year. The 20% target has therefore not yet been met. If one examines the cost of PACT to deliver its grant programme, the ratios are not favourable. In 2013, it cost PACT $0.81 to deliver every $1.00 of grants. By 2016 this declined to $0.47 but is still high. The decline in the ratios is a result of increasing the grant envelope rather than increasing efficiencies. The only annual decrease in administrative costs occurred between 2013 and 2014; by 4%. The following year in 2016, administrative costs increased by 12% to BZ$1,509,218.

There are opportunities to reduce administrative costs. By way of comparison, the Belize GEF Small Grant Fund with an annual grant budget of approximately BZ$1M per year operates with two staff members with administrative support from UNDP. While it is important to note in the case of the GEF Small Grants Fund the voluntary National Steering Committee participates in monitoring and evaluation activities, grant cycle management, promotion and networking is handled by two people. In Jamaica, the Forest Conservation Fund, a US$16M trust fund established under the TFCA operated with a Secretariat of 5 persons, with outsourced accounting
services. The team also observed areas in which tighter spending controls may be required, such as staff overtime, catering for meetings (we observed on several occasions significant over-ordering of food), use of multiple vehicles for the same event and paper management and storage. Additionally, less frequent Board meetings will also help to reduce costs.

The team reviewed the last audit report and noted net account receivables for 2015 and 2014 amounted to BZ$1.279M and BZ$1.185M respectively. While the financial statements are a snapshot in time, any delays in receipt of these funds have an implication on PACT’s cash flow. This amount would represent approximately 25% of the total collected annually from the conservation fee and cruise ship head tax.

**Summary: Financial Management**

PACT’s record of careful fiduciary management has led to a positive international reputation resulting in PACT has been asked to administer funds from external sources and deriving income for fiduciary services. However, PACT is perceived by stakeholders to have high administrative overhead costs. In 2013, it cost PACT $0.81 to deliver every $1.00 of grants. By 2016 this declined to $0.47. The decline is a result of increasing the grant envelope rather than increasing efficiencies.

### 4.7. PACT External Stakeholder Relations

PACT engages with stakeholders primarily within a funder/grantee relationship. With the change in legislation however, and PACT’s expanded mandate to coordinate, monitor and evaluate implementation of the NPAS and expand the Trust Fund, PACT while have to engage with NPAS stakeholders in different contexts and under different circumstances. Under the current strategic plan, Strategic Objective 5 was to improve and consolidate inter-institutional linkages and stakeholder confidence. IFCL’s earlier assessment was that there is little progress towards achieving this objective. Given that relationships are established at a personal level before they can be ‘institutionalized’, the high turnover of Executive Directors over the past 5 years has no doubt contributed to this result. This will be a key area for improvement.

The team’s assessment of the relationship between PACT and key stakeholder groups was determined from feedback from the consultation and field mission, and discussion with key individuals.

#### 4.7.1. NGOs and CBOs

The Consultations found that in general there are good relationships between PACT and NGOs and CBOs. Grant staff in particular interact with them on a more regular basis, and as there is fairly low turnover, this allows personal relationships to be more easily maintained. There is an appreciation by CBOs especially of PACT’s financial support for their programmes and recognition that conservation projects funded by PACT have mean meaningful and have had high impact. CBOs in particular were highly appreciative of grant support for capacity development through APAMO and more recently, core funding. It is clear from PACT’s social media campaign that there

---

13 This was the structure of FCF prior being absorbed by the Environmental Foundation of Jamaica
is a high level of interaction and electronic engagement between PACT and grantees which results in NGOs/CBOs’ projects being promoted on PACT’s Facebook, You Tube and Twitter channels.

Feedback from some NGOs and CBOs indicated concerns however. These include:

- the perception that PACT’s administrative costs are too high, and that PACT should become more efficient and cut administrative costs.

- some CBO/NGO stakeholders also feel that the documentation and eligibility requirements to apply for grants are onerous and it is unclear why PACT needs such levels of disclosure from applicants, compared to other funders. There was the sense conveyed that it was easier to access conservation grants from externally-funded sources compared to PACT, which is Belizean and belongs to Belize.

- the perception that PACT staff do not understand the on-the-ground realities and challenges faced by CBOs and NGOs, particularly the challenge in managing protected areas with limited funds for core costs. Although NGOs and CBOs were happy to see that core costs can now be covered with the change in legislation, they are however, disappointed in the 20% limit set by the Board, which they feel is inconsistent with the spirit of the Act, and insufficient to address capacity issues and cover grant administrative costs.

- NGOs and CBOs also voiced some frustration about the administrative burden imposed by PACT for reporting, particularly project expenditure reporting and record keeping.

There was a high level of dissatisfaction with respect to the extent of consultations around the amended legislation. Some of this appeared to be directed at PACT, and there is a fair level of uncertainty about how PACT will be able to transition from its former to current mandate as they are unclear what changes will be made to PACT’s organizational structure to facilitate this transition.

4.7.2. Fisheries and Forestry Departments

As key government agencies in the management of the national protected areas system, PACT has a functional relationship with both Departments. Additionally, both organizations are also grant recipients.

Under the previous Act, both entities were represented on the Advisory Council and thus played a key role in advising and recommending to the Board of Directors projects that should be funded by PACT. With the Advisory Council now defunct, there is no structured opportunity for participation in PACT’s decision making /grant deliberations which may be contributing to a deteriorating relationship. There is opposition and limited buy-in to the new legislation by key Stakeholders in both departments. PACT’s new mandate to ‘oversee’ implementation of the National Protected System Plan is interpreted to mean that these departments now have a reporting relationship to PACT, to which they are resistant. As with NGO and CBO stakeholders, there is a perception of insufficient consultations around the legislation and what comes next, which is directed to PACT.
4.7.3. International Partners and Funding Agencies

PACT is not sufficiently engaged with international partners and funding agencies. Although PACT specifically intended to: (i) pursue and establish formal institutional alliances with at least 6 local and international partners in specific themes that bring strategic benefits to PACT and Belize; and (ii) actively pursue partnerships with other local and foreign organizations and optimize use of resources, this has not occurred.

4.7.4. Tourism Interests

There is an intrinsic relationship between PACT and tourism interests as a result of the legislation which mandates tourism representation on the PACT board, and the critical link between protected areas management and the health and sustainability of the tourism industry. Through the Belize Tourism Industry Association and the Ministry of Tourism, this interest been present on PACT’s board since inception. Despite this however, there is room for greater strategic alliances between PACT and tourism interests to advance mutual objectives of sustainable development of tourism sites in protected areas for income generation, and conservation and biodiversity protection. There is an underlying tension between protected areas and tourism interests with respect to the issue of entrance fees and other revenue generating mechanisms that may be considered by PACT to finance the protected areas system via tourism revenues. While the issue has been under discussion for some time, it been challenging to come to a mutually beneficial agreement.

4.7.5. NPAS Secretariat

The NPAS Secretariat is located in the Ministry of Forestry Fisheries and Sustainable Development. It was established as an ad hoc unit in 2010 to coordinate the implementation of the National Protected Areas System Plan and has been assigned specific implementation responsibilities in the System Plan. Some of these responsibilities however, overlap with PACT’s new mandate and the Secretariat has limited human resources to carry out these roles. Currently the Secretariat is staffed by a Programme Director.

The nature of the relationship between PACT and NPAS has primarily been based on PACT providing grants to NPAS.

While the new NPAS Act establishes an NPAS Advisory Council, the Secretariat itself is not established by legislation. Under that Act, it is the Minister’s responsibility to develop policies and plans for the National Protected Areas System. He may however, “from time to time, appoint or engage experts or persons having technical or special knowledge necessary for the purpose of assisting the Council to discharge its functions under the Act.” Although the NPAS Advisory Council established under the NPAS Act has been appointed, it had not yet been convened during the period of this assessment; thus there is no existing relationship with PACT. There is however, some amount of confusion about institutional arrangements now required to effect both Acts; and the optimum and functional relationships between PACT, (including the PACT Board and Technical Committee), NPAS Advisory Council, and the Ministry. There is a need to re-shape the relationship between PACT and the NPAS Secretariat beyond that of a donor-recipient relationship.
Summary: External Stakeholder Relations

Under the current strategic plan, the strategic objective to improve and consolidate inter-institutional linkages and stakeholder confidence was not achieved. While PACT generally has a good relationship funder/grantee relationship with NGOs and CBOs, it is not sufficiently engaged with international partners and funding agencies. Although there is permanent representation of tourism interests on PACT’s Board there is room for greater strategic alliances to advance mutual objectives. PACT has a functional relationship with the Forestry and Fisheries Departments. With the Advisory Council now defunct, there is no structured opportunity for their participation in PACT’s decision making/grant deliberations which may have contributed to a deteriorating relationship. There is also limited buy-in by the Departments to the new legislation, to which both are opposed.

4.8. Overall Internal Capacity of PACT

The scope of PACT’s expanded role is demonstrated in Table 5 which maps the new functions prescribed by the Legislation with PACT’s current internal capacity. This capacity includes skills and competencies provided by both the PACT Secretariat, Board and Sub-committees.

Table 5: Capacity Gap Analysis for New Mandate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New functions under the amended legislation (2015)</th>
<th>Existing Function?</th>
<th>Competency required</th>
<th>Currently within PACT?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NPAS planning and coordination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate development of five-year strategic plans for NPAS and facilitate implementation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Coordination/stakeholder management, technical background in PA management</td>
<td>Partially, (can facilitate development of NPAS Strategic Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review management plans for each protected area to ensure consistency with the NPASP and priorities set for NPAS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Technical background in PA management</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote coordination of, and collaboration within, the NPAS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Coordination/Stakeholder management, technical background in PA management</td>
<td>Yes, via the Board of Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NPAS Monitoring and Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish M&amp;E system to determine NPAS is meeting its objectives</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Technical background in PA management</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and approve NPAS performance reports at least every five years including the financial scorecard and management effectiveness of NPAS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Technical background in PA management</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct periodic protected areas management capacity assessment, prioritizing management capacity needs and ensuring the right resources and partnerships are developed to create this capacity</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Technical background in PA management</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### New functions under the amended legislation (2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Competency required</th>
<th>Currently within PACT?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial sustainability of the National Protected Areas System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set strategic priorities for the development, mobilization and allocation of financial resources for NPAS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Strategic Management, fundraising,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate financial resources across the NPAS based on established criteria</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Strategic management, administrative and financial management, fiduciary oversight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and approve standards, guidelines and procedures to ensure efficient use of financial resources within the NPAS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Administrative and financial management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve as the lead entity for moving the NPAS towards financial sustainability</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Technical background in PA financing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate implementation of all strategies aimed at making the NPAS financially sustainable.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Coordination/Stakeholder management, technical background in PA financing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote public understanding, appreciation and awareness of the NPAS through the implementation of a communication strategy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Environmental education and communication skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments in NPAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate funds first to primary activities then to secondary activities as described in the Schedule;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Administrative and financial management, fiduciary oversight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve as the national implementing entity for relevant multilateral and international funding sources for sustainable management of natural resources, climate change and other environment related issues, in collaboration with other relevant agencies as necessary;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Administrative and financial management, fiduciary oversight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access relevant and available regional and international funds</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Networking, fundraising</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. DIAGNOSTIC ASSESSMENT

5.1. Key Challenges

Even if there were no change to the legislation, PACT would have had to overcome a number of key challenges to enable it to function as a model trust fund. These challenges are now magnified with the expansion of PACT’s mandate. Given the mixed results in the implementation of the current strategic plan, it is apparent that PACT is not operating at optimum capacity and is not generating optimum results. The team has identified eight key challenges which it believes need to be addressed.

1. Consistency in leadership and management
2. Role of the Board
3. Capacity Gap for New Mandate
4. Active Fundraising & Trust Fund Growth
5. Stakeholder relationships
6. Administrative Costs
7. Streamlining grant administration processes
8. Impact Assessment / M&E

1. Consistency in leadership and management

PACT has been in a state of ongoing transition and needs to become a more stable institution with more consistent executive and governance leadership.

The sense of uncertainty and transition has primarily resulted from a continuous turnover of key leadership and governance positions. Over the last 6 years, PACT has fallen under 3 Ministers. The appointment of two Executive Directors from within over four years, one who remained in an acting position, could not have engendered a spirit of high morale and sense of direction within the staff, but rather resulted in a ‘wait and see’ mode, inertia, and low staff morale. It also appears that during this period, senior staff operated as a ‘management committee’ and once the incumbent Executive Director was appointed, were reluctant to revert to the ED having full authority to make management decisions.

The incumbent Executive Director has been in place for two years (2 January 2015 – 2 January 2017), which is insufficient for the sense of transition to be overcome. The position of Executive Director is a contract position which is renewed after performance appraisal. While there are merits to this approach, this can also serve to promote a sense of impermanence in that position which contributes to the sense of transition.

At the governance level, the PACT Board was chaired by three Chairmen in five years with acting Chairs in between appointments. The turn-over at the level of the Chair would have served to affect board dynamics, and perhaps resulted in a ‘stop and start’ situation as the new Chair climbed the learning curve to get up to speed and establish a leadership posture.
Additionally, a two-year term of office for the Board would have been insufficient for optimum functioning of the Board. By the time learning curves are overcome, Board dynamics and relationships with the Executive Director are established and there is a settling in to address strategic issues, turnover occurs and the process starts all over again with a new Board.

The change in the legislation extending the tenure of the Board to three years is a positive development, as is the confirmation of appointment of the current Executive Director. At the time of this institutional assessment, a replacement Chairman had not yet been appointed after over 2 months. Thus, this strategic planning exercise of which the institutional assessment is a part, has not had the input of the incoming Chairman, which may have implications for buy-in.

2. Role of the Board
   The Legislation’s definition of the function of the Board is somewhat inimical to international best practice as it seems to prioritize executive, rather than oversight and strategic functions. Although the Board manual makes the distinction between governing the organization and supervision/micromanagement of management and staff, this is not reflected in current Board practice.

   The Board is operating as an Executive Board, although PACT is staffed to carry out executive and management functions. Based on the sheer number of meetings, for PACT’s limited scope of operations as a grant-making entity, the Board is too involved at the operational level. In 2016, there were 18 meetings of the current Board, representing an average of 1.5 meetings per month of the full Board. Subcommittees met 20 times for the year. As a result, the Secretariat is spending precious time servicing the Board and sub-committees, rather than executing the strategic plan. Furthermore, over the last five years, key oversight functions were not fulfilled such as publication of the annual reports and confirmation of Executive Directors. For example, the Trust has not published an Annual Report in 4 years. The current ED, whose contract expired in January 2017, was recruited by the former Board which was dissolved after the legislative amendment took effect. The team was advised that they were “cleaning up” outstanding issues.

3. Capacity Gap for New Mandate
   PACT’s current organizational structure is not optimal for the status quo and will be inadequate for its new mandate. PACT will need to do determine its ‘core business’ under the new mandate and key internal competencies required, and re-structure and staff the organization appropriately. Additional non-core or highly technical skills will need to be outsourced as needed. PACT will have to initiate strategic partnerships with key organizations, and bring in other skills, possibly through board sub-committees to make up for the skills gap.

4. Active Fundraising and Trust Fund Growth
   PACT has not yet been able to grow the Trust Fund to fill the NPAS financing gap. PACT’s culture is that of a passive recipient of funds rather than an active fundraiser, despite the widening gap between revenue and NPAS financing needs and the unchanged allocation of US$3.75 from the departure tax over 20 years. PACT’s reluctance to move beyond this grant-
making identity is demonstrated by the six year vacancy of the approved position of Associate Director, Development and Marketing.

PACT has been satisfied with collecting the conservation fee and cruise ship head tax fee, and returns on investment. Between 2013 and 2016 revenues from these sources increased by 35%; this was largely driven by an extraordinary increase of 27% in cruise ship revenue in 2015. This volatility illustrates the dependence of PACT on the tourist arrivals, which can be considerably affected by exogenous events or market trends. Indeed, with the decreased allocation from the cruise ship head tax and additional functions now assigned to PACT such as M&E, planning and oversight, PACT must begin to source and mobilize additional sources of revenue.

Central Bank instruments (Treasury Notes) are currently the only source of investment. However, as interest rates decline, PACT will have to identify new more lucrative investment opportunities. Although some options were identified in the current strategic plan, these were not followed through.

With PACT’s new mandate, financing the NPAS will require a more proactive approach that prioritizes NPAS investment decisions based on strategic protected area management needs, engages multiple stakeholders (this is already occurring), takes a longer-term view and will likely require more and larger investments than the current limit of BZ $400,000. At the same time, PACT will have to develop a strategy that does not disadvantage small community based organizations whose protected areas under management may not be as critical to the overall system and who have limited alternate options for funding or income generation.

5. Stakeholder Relationships

There is a lack of a strong stakeholder engagement strategy and a ‘partnership’ culture, distinct from a donor-grantee relationship. As PACT has thought of itself as a grant-making Trust, the nature of engagement with stakeholders has largely been from the perspective of donor-grantee relationship. This strategic objective from the current strategic plan shows limited, if any progress.

From the consultations, the team had the distinct sense there was limited engagement with other donors or international partners supporting the NPAS. The nature of the relationship with other GoB departments appears to have deteriorated with the passage of the new Act.

With the change in the legislation and new mandate, there is an environment of stakeholder uncertainty and ‘distrust’. This is a significant challenge that PACT must overcome as it is thrust into a more central role of NPASSP oversight and financing. The team was not privy to the nature of the consultations surrounding the changes to the legislation, however it is clear that they were not considered satisfactory to stakeholders.

This dissatisfaction among government and non-government stakeholders is with the way the legislation was developed and promulgated. In their view, both the process and the product were flawed. Consultations held to support the development of the Acts were perceived to be insufficient and ineffective and the final product did not seem to respond sufficiently to some Stakeholders’ concerns. A main point of contention appears to be that the Acts did not go far enough in establishing an NPAS Authority which has been a long-standing
recommendation from various studies as the way forward. Some Stakeholders disagree with the composition of the Board, while some even want to go back to the drawing board to revise the Acts.

On the other hand, while many stakeholders had strong views about the Acts, it is not entirely obvious that all stakeholders have actually read them in detail. It also appears that some stakeholders have chosen to interpret the PACT Act based on a perception that it gives exceptional powers to PACT to ‘run’ the National Protected Areas System which they believe PACT is currently ill-equipped to do.

The team found in several instances during the consultations, that initial resistance was reduced when the team pointed to potential opportunities presented by the Acts for stakeholders to take advantage of the lack of prescriptive directives or prohibitions.

6. Administrative Costs
PACT lacks efficiency in managing administrative costs to deliver its grant/investment programme.

The expanded mandate for PACT will require additional sources of funds, or a significant re-allocation of staff functions to new positions, increased efficiencies and different ways of working. In particular, additional resources towards fund mobilisation, NPAS coordination and management, will be needed. Any increase in administrative costs will need to be clearly communicated to stakeholders who already perceive PACT to have high administrative costs.

7. Streamlining grant administration requirements
PACT’s identity and culture have been that of a project-based small grant-making institution that utilizes public funds for which it holds itself highly accountable.

PACT prides itself in being highly accountable for the prudent management and expenditure of funds collected, and dedicates significant resources through the Finance Department to ensure that grant funds are accounted for down to the last cent.

While financial accountability is important, this has to be balanced with the cost and administrative processes required of grantees for reasonable assurance of proof of funds spent. PACT requires redundant records of proof of expenditure throughout the project cycle and undertakes financial monitoring visits to grantees during implementation in addition to requiring hard copy submission of documents that are stored in PACT’s offices. This imposes a huge administrative burden on grantees for record keeping and documentation, and on PACT staff for detailed on and off site review as well as the need for storage of volumes of paper records at PACT. At the same time, for small CBOs especially, this accounting and reporting is often done voluntarily as there are limited funds for grantees to pay for accounting services.

An analysis of PACT’s grant programme for 2011/12 and 2012/13 indicates that PACT’s capacity development grants represent 14% and 3% respectively of the value of grants approved, but 57% and 43% respectively of the volume. PACT uses the same appraisal process, and expends the same level of effort to administer these capacity development grants as it does for its conservation grant programme. This is a highly inefficient use of PACT’s
resources and imposes an unnecessary administrative burden on both applicant and PACT staff. PACT may need to consider more simplified application and reporting processes for these types of small grants (assuming this will continue to be a part of the NPAS investment strategy).

The challenge for PACT is to streamline its reporting/documentation requirements during project implementation and focus on end of project auditing of projects to minimize the administrative burden on grantees.

8. **Impact Assessment / Monitoring and Evaluation**

There has been minimal attention or allocation of resources to measuring and assessing PACT’s impact and implementing a proper monitoring and evaluation system and public reporting on the impact of PACT’s grant programme.

After almost 20 years of operation, PACT’s impact on Belize’s protected areas system has not been quantified in a systematic way. There is a small budget allocated in project budgets for internal monitoring of projects, which was recently reduced. An end of project assessment is carried out jointly between PACT and the grantee, but these assessments are not independently validated, nor is there a process or schedule for ex-post evaluation. The last portfolio level evaluation was conducted in 2011, and only on 6 larger grants. There is no evidence of any thematic evaluations or an assessment of the impact on PACT’s capacity building, professional development and research programmes. It is not clear within the organizational structure, who is responsible for ensuring that PACT’s M&E policy is being complied with and whether staff have sufficient M&E capacity.
6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter provides a conclusion on the assessment of PACT as an institution, and key recommendations for initiatives to close the gaps.

To summarize the institutional assessment of PACT, the team examined various dimensions of institutional capacity. Taking into account the results of the SWOT Analysis, evidence gathered during the assignment and international best practice, the team has assigned a ranking of strong, weak, and fair to each dimension. A ‘strong’ rating indicates the extent to which PACT is close to best practice, and in which the SWOT analysis indicated elements of this dimension as a strength. A ‘fair’ rating indicates some elements of best practice and where the SWOT analysis indicated mixed results in terms of strengths and weaknesses of elements of this dimension and uneven implementation. Finally, a ‘weak’ rating indicates that the SWOT analysis pointed to elements of the dimension primarily as weaknesses, and where best practice is generally not followed or where there are significant implementation gaps. These ratings will guide the need for recommendations to improve the areas in which PACT may be weaker.

6.1. Summary Assessment of PACT

Table 6: Summary Assessment of PACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Dimensions</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1) Governance               | Fair       | • Committed Board  
• Recent high turn-over of key positions  
• Documented policies, but need updating  
• Too involved in operations, some oversight responsibilities have slipped |
| 2) Strategic Planning and Implementation | Fair | • Strategic Plans have guided PACT’s operations since inception  
• Current strategic plan identified critical issues, but some were outside of PACT’s control to implement  
• Fairly substantial implementation gap between what was planned and what was actually undertaken and achieved. |
| 3) Impact Measurement       | Weak       | • No sense of impact of various grant portfolios (eg. Small grants, capacity development, professional development, research)  
• No M&E Framework or action plan guiding higher level impact measurement |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Dimensions</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4) Programming and Grant Cycle Management</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>• 20 years’ experience of grant cycle management&lt;br&gt;• Documented policies and procedures, that are followed&lt;br&gt;• Good staff capacity and commitment to financial accountability&lt;br&gt;• Administrative burden could be reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>• Project and portfolio level M&amp;E policies not being followed&lt;br&gt;• Insufficient financial resources allocated to M&amp;E&lt;br&gt;• No external validation of internal end of project assessments&lt;br&gt;• Limited internal M&amp;E capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Human resources management and capacity</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>• Comprehensive HR policy/manual&lt;br&gt;• Not all job descriptions are up to date and procedure for updating not consistently followed&lt;br&gt;• PACT not staffed per approved organizational chart&lt;br&gt;• Delays in filling vacancies (COO and Associate Director Finance) and confirming previous Executive Directors&lt;br&gt;• Board intervention at lower level recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Information Technology</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>• Delay in procuring and installing Grant Management software&lt;br&gt;• IT used for social media&lt;br&gt;• Staff intranet, on-line applications other functionalities not deployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Marketing and Communications</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>• Communications strategy not implemented per strategic plan&lt;br&gt;• PACT not generally well-known in Belize – not a household name, and not many social media followers&lt;br&gt;• Extensive social media presence and marketing collateral, videos&lt;br&gt;• Website with key documents and informative content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Financial Management</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>• Internationally recognized for fiduciary management&lt;br&gt;• Takes accountability seriously&lt;br&gt;• Annual audits&lt;br&gt;• Scope for reducing administrative costs and improving accounts receivables</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2. Key Recommendations

The Institutional Assessment Report herein has identified certain gaps and areas that PACT will need to address in order to be able to meet the requirements of the Act.

6.2.1. Governance

1. The Board must utilize the provision presented in the legislation to delegate management functions, while focusing on those functions it cannot delegate and ensuring it carries out its oversight and fiduciary roles as trustees of a public trust. The Board should officially delegate executive management to the Executive Director and staff and allow the ED to focus on managing the organization rather than servicing the Board.

2. The Board should review, and revise and update the draft Board Charter, and the Board Manual in keeping with the new Act and PACT’s mandate. The Charter should clearly indicate the delegation of management responsibility to the Secretariat. Both documents should be approved by the Board and brought into use.

3. The Board should reduce the number of Board meetings and sub-committee meetings and establish a schedule that is more in keeping with best practice (e.g. quarterly). The Board Charter should document the nature of business to be discussed at Board meetings, distinguishing oversight from operational issues.

4. The Board should ensure that PACT prepares and publishes outstanding Annual reports.

5. Given the expanded mandate, the Board should review whether additional committees are warranted. To compensate for the external perspective previously provided by the Advisory Council, the Board should consider expanding the membership of the Grant Review Committee to include external parties. The Board may consider additional technical committees with external representation to oversee and support resource mobilization, and NPAS coordination and planning. An ad hoc change management committee, with defined TORs and defined lifespan could also be considered; or this role subsumed by Strategy Committee.

6. In order to instill confidence in stakeholders, PACT will need to fairly quickly build internal capacity to execute its new mandate. PACT should identify core business competencies based on the elements of PACT’s mandate that (a) require consistent rather than periodic attention; (b) have more of a networking, coordination and facilitative rather than a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Dimensions</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10) External Stakeholder Relations | Weak | • Good relations with grantees; not as strong with non-grantee stakeholders  
• No follow-up after passage of amended Acts  
• Is not strongly networked with other NPAS stakeholders  
• Weakened by elimination of Advisory Council |
technical role that might be available elsewhere; (c) are more in keeping with the core function of PACT which is to operate, finance and grow the Trust. For other functions, PACT should identify external sources of expertise to engage in strategic partnerships or contractual arrangements. A recommended modified organizational structure with key roles and responsibilities is appended as Annex A. The Board will however, need to review and approve a new organizational structure and job descriptions, based on this ‘core business’ analysis.

7. PACT should put in place a strategy and **M&E framework** to undertake impact measurement and organizational performance measurement, and assign specific responsibility (through job descriptions) to an appropriate position in the PACT Secretariat. As PACT will now be responsible for M&E for the system, this M&E framework will have to be multi-dimensional. PACT will also need to ensure it allocates adequate financial resources to M&E. This should become a specific budget line item.

6.2.2. Operations

A main focus for PACT is to re-orient its identity and culture with respect to (i) stakeholder engagement; (ii) resource mobilization; (iii) deeper participation in management of NPAS; and (iv) investment decisions in NPAS.

The 2005 NPASP noted the urgent need for close coordination between the departments responsible for protected areas and indicated that a formal arrangement reinforced by statute was needed. The favoured approach was the establishment of a statutory National Protected Areas Authority which would amalgamate the Fisheries Department and Forest Department. While this recommendation was never implemented, the fundamental changes to the PACT Act established an alternate legal and administrative arrangement to the proposed National Protected Areas Authority. PACT is now responsible for the governance and financing of NPAS, but not the management of NPAS. A major transition for PACT will be understand and absorb what this means.

PACT’s Board and staff will have to re-orient the organization and its internal culture and sense of identity to transition away from a strictly grant making institution to one responsible for the successful implementation of the System Plan. The magnitude of this should not be underestimated. This will require the Board and staff to be willing to take a birds-eye view of the NPAS, think about the system rather than sites; approach existing functions in new ways, and develop novel and effective approaches for new functions. PACT’s current culture of being reactive and focused on internal processes and limited external engagement will have to be transformed to one that is expansive, proactive, flexible and engaged in strategic partnerships and innovative thinking.

Such a shift will be necessary for the following functions:

**(i) Stakeholder engagement and strategic partnerships:**
Given the current level of stakeholder uncertainty, PACT will need to engage with the critical stakeholders to generate stakeholder buy-in in the implementation of NPASP. It will therefore be critical for all stakeholders to be brought together immediately to: (a) bring clarity to the intent and contents of the Act and the nature of the optimal institutional arrangements to bring effect
to the Act and (b) to assuage the fear of what is perceived to be a drastic change in the status quo – but not the change that was desired.

The institutional arrangements have to be ‘teased out’ of the legislation, clarified with stakeholders and everyone brought together on the same page. An NPAS stakeholder mapping and institutional analysis have been proposed in the NPAS Strategic plan undertaken under this consultancy. These need to be shared with the stakeholders and discussed, and consensus arrived at as to the nature of institutional relationships, and roles and responsibilities.

For the long term, a stakeholder engagement strategy must be developed and implemented. This should be the responsibility of PACT’s Executive Director under the oversight of the Board or appropriate sub-committee.

(ii) Resource Mobilization
PACT should develop TORs for the development of a resource mobilization strategy that will guide identification of new sources of revenue and optimization of existing sources. This strategy should be largely implemented in-house, overseen by a Board sub-committee or the Honorary Board as designated in the Act. This will also require PACT to review the job description for the Associate Director, Development and Marketing (or new title as appropriate) and filling that post as a matter of urgency.

Resource mobilization must include seeking avenues for private investment in sites with income generating potential that can be sustainably tapped. In this regard, the resource mobilization strategy should include bringing in players such as banks and investment houses and the Development Finance Cooperation to meet with protected areas site co-managers with a view to investing in commercial opportunities. PACT should establish a generic framework for such private investment agreements between co-management entities and financiers.

(iii) Deeper participation in management of NPAS
If PACT is to have a more central role in NPAS oversight, PACT will have to become a more technical organization. While PACT will be able to avail itself of the technical expertise from other stakeholders, it will require in-house expertise to coordinate and review certain technical inputs, and articulate PACT’s own technical needs and interface with the Technical Committee and other technical experts. The organizational structure will have to be reviewed and core technical competencies identified for inclusion in position(s) in the new structure.

(iv) Investment decisions in NPAS
PACT will need to develop an investment strategy which is more responsive to the need of the system rather than the individual, specific needs of NGOs and CBOs. The Wildtracks Rationalization report should be utilized as a starting point to guide NPAS investment decisions. The challenge will be for stakeholders to buy-into this investment strategy which will require broad-based consultations and transparency.

This should not mean that critical needs of NGO and CBOs in particular are not met, but that their funding needs are considered within a larger package of investment which may be of longer term, or address specific regional/location or thematic system needs (e.g. enforcement, prioritization of the central corridor, etc.). The fact is however is that PACT will need to mobilize additional
resources so that the needs of both the system and the sites managed by NGOs/CBOs with limited capacity, income generating potential and alternate sources of funding are met.

6.2.3. Operational Effectiveness

From the summary assessment of PACT, the following recommendations emerge:

1. **Grant cycle management**: PACT uses the same appraisal process, and expends the same level of effort to administer small capacity development grants as it does for its conservation grants. This is a highly inefficient use of PACT’s resources, especially at the Board level. The application process for these small grants should be simplified and approval authority delegated to the GRC rather than the Board of Directors. The Board should ensure that there are clear guidelines and criteria for selection with a simplified application form tailored to these criteria, and provide review and oversight for this rather than being involved in approvals.

2. **Human Resources Management**: Human resources management currently rests with the Executive Director with support from an Administrative Officer. It is anticipated that the Executive Director will have additional responsibilities such as networking and relationship building, resource mobilization and strategic coordination that will reduce time available and focus on operational issues such as HR administration, office administration and finance. In the short term, PACT will require expertise in HR and organizational rationalization to support the transition to a “new” PACT better suited to its new mandate. This should include organizational restructuring of PACT and updating all job descriptions. In the long term, HR administration may be better placed under a Chief Operations Officer. This position was created (but not part of the approved organizational chart) and staffed previously, but is currently vacant.

3. **IT Optimization**: PACT should acquire and install grant management software. The Chief Operations Office should be charged with the responsibility for optimizing IT within PACT, including identifying any IT enhancements or programmes required to streamline administrative processes and for PACT’s new technical NPAS responsibilities.

4. **Marketing and communication**: PACT is not a well-known household name in Belize, neither is there general public awareness about the importance of the National Protected Areas System, especially in the more urban areas of Belize. This means that Belizian citizens are not sufficiently benefitting from the System from an experiential perspective, nor are they adequately contributing to its protection through visitor fees. This presents an opportunity for PACT to invest in marketing of the protected area system in a more targeted way to drive both awareness and utilization of the sites by Belizian citizens. Additionally, PACT could partner with the Ministry of Tourism to enhance the branding and marketing of the protected areas system, as this underpins the tourism sector. This would help generate awareness and increased visitorship to sites, build support for paying increased conservation or cruise ship head tax fees, and also help to demonstrate the economic value of the system to the Belizian economy.

5. **Administrative cost reduction**: PACT must retain its high standards of financial management and accountability, however the processes and level of effort invested in
grant fund accountability must be reasonable and efficient. The grant cycle management system and administrative processes should be rationalized as comparator grant-making institutions manage equivalent or higher volumes and values of grants with fewer staff.

6.3. Conclusion

For PACT to manage this transition successfully, a deliberate change management strategy is required. Understandably, within PACT, there is ‘transition fatigue’ and fear of change, particularly as the expanded mandate clearly will require a modified organizational structure and skill sets. The new mandate will also require a change of perspective by the Board which will need to transition from directing operations to be more strategic in focus. PACT will need to identify its ‘core business’ that must be facilitated by a core secretariat; and those aspects of its new mandate that can be outsourced to those best positioned and equipped to fulfil them. This transition in our view, needs dedicated resources and must be carefully managed, preferably by independent outsourced expertise. The PACT strategic plan which accompanies this institutional assessment will identify, detail and prioritize specific initiatives to carry PACT forward.

PACT will need to allocate resources to finance a range of organizational restructuring and transitional activities. These activities will emerge from the strategic plan and some of the recommendations of this institutional assessment, for example, stakeholder engagement exercises, change management consultancy, organizational restructuring and HR services (e.g. revision of job descriptions) and budgeting for PACT’s new administrative and programme costs. The transitional activities should be considered as extra ordinary expenses; however, it should be recognized that going forward, PACT’s budget must be expanded to meet the requirements of its new mandate. It is therefore imperative that as a priority, PACT focuses on maximizing revenue options available under the Act, while seeking to minimize current costs.
Annex A: Proposed Organizational Chart and Key Roles and Responsibilities

Executive Director – Accountable to the Board and responsible for overall execution of Strategic Plan. Acts as Board Secretary and facilitates directives of standing committees. Responsible for oversight of NPAS Coordination and preparation of NPAS Strategic Plan; Stakeholder Relationships, (including the MFFSD; National Protected Areas Advisory Council; Funders/IDPs other Government Stakeholders; Tourism and Private Sector Interests); Resource Mobilization & Fundraising; Performance Appraisal (COO and Associate Directors) and Public Relations. Along with Protected Areas Specialist, responsible for ensuring NPAS Investment Strategy M&E Strategy for NPAS are developed and executed. Provides internal approvals for grant awards and project completion.

Chief Operating Officer – Responsible for general administration and HR Management including performance appraisal of junior staff; office management and administration, financial management oversight, and grant cycle oversight. Ensures operational policies and procedures are documented and updated as necessary. Along with Associate Director of Finance, determines organizational budgetary needs and prepares annual budget. Responsible for execution of investment strategy and liaison with fund managers. Along with Associate Director – NPAS Investments, determines grant cycle procedures for approval by ED/Board of Directors. Participates in internal project appraisal reviews.

Protected Areas Specialist: Accountable to the ED, provides technical support for NPAS coordination; identification of external technical support and preparation of TORs for technical work contracted by PACT, oversight of NPAS M&E; liaison and support for PACT Technical
Committee and National Protected Areas Secretariat, and liaison with Forest and Fisheries Department and co-management agencies.

Development and Marketing Officer: Accountable to the ED, supports the ED in resource mobilization, fundraising, and public relations. Provides research and grant proposal preparation support, development of collateral and marketing materials and implementation of communication/social media strategy.

Associate Director – Finance: Accountable to the COO, provides financial management and reporting; supports preparation of annual budget, monitors/approves disbursements, monitors revenues and accounts receivables, establishes controls and procedures for administrative and grant expenditure and auditing of grant accounts; supports execution of investment strategy; prepares periodic financial reports; responsible for ensuring organization is ready for audit at the end of the financial year.

Associate Director - NPAS Investments: Responsible for executing NPAS investment strategy and management of grant/investment cycle, including project appraisal, identification and approval processes; supports Project Review Committee; ensures on-going monitoring of grant investments, compliance with grant agreements, adequacy of grantee reporting and identification and resolution of implementation issues. Along with Protected Area Specialist, supports identification of capacity development needs of grantees/co-managers and proposes strategies and partnerships to address co-management capacity gaps.

Grant Officers: Provide support for grant/investment cycle execution, ex-ante grantee capacity assessment; ensuring compliance with grant procedures and proper documentation for applications, progress and financial reports; identification of implementation issues, monitoring of disbursements/project expenditure and project performance, administrative capacity development support; grantee liaison.

Account Clerks:
Revenue collection: Responsible for revenue collection, monitoring accounts receivables,
Project Audit: Review of disbursement reports; audit of project accounts and compliance with financial and documentation requirements of grant agreements.

Fiduciary and Procurement Officer: Responsible for fiduciary oversight/management of externally funded third party projects; project and PACT administrative procurement and compliance with PACT/GOB procurement policies.
ANNEX B: TERMS OF REFERENCE

Consultancy to Develop the
2017-2021 NPAS Strategic Plan;
2017-2021 PACT Strategic Plan &,
the 2017 PACT Institutional Assessment

1. BACKGROUND

In October 2015, the National Protected Areas System (NPAS) Act became law. The NPAS Act repealed the National Parks System Act, Chapter 215 of the Substantive Laws of Belize, Revised Edition 2011. The purpose of the NPAS Act is to provide for the maintenance of coordinated management of a system of protected areas that is representative of internationally agreed categories, effectively managed, ecologically based, consistent with international law, and based on best available scientific information and the principles of sustainable development for the economic, social and environmental benefit of present and future generations of Belize.

The Board of Directors (Board) of the Protected Areas Conservation Trust (PACT) is charged with the responsibility to facilitate the development and implementation of a Five-Year Strategic Plan for the NPAS.

The PACT was established by law in 1996 with legislative amendments in 2003 and 2015. The general function of the Trust, according to the 2015 amendment, shall be to contribute to the sustainable management and development of Belize’s natural and cultural assets for the benefit of Belizeans and the global community, both now and for future generations.

The 2015 Amendments significantly expanded PACT’s functions to now include the following: facilitating the development of a five-year strategic plan for the National Protected Areas System (NPAS) and its implementation; reviewing the management plans for each protected area to ensure consistency with the National Protected Areas System Plan and priorities set for the National Protected Areas System; promoting the coordination of, and collaboration within, the National Protected Areas System; monitoring and reporting on the National Protected Areas System; promoting public understanding, appreciation and awareness of the National Protected Areas System through the implementation of a communication strategy for the national protected areas system; funding activities included under the Schedule; serving as the national implementing entity for multilateral and international funding sources related to the sustainable management of natural resources, climate change and other environment related issues, in collaboration with other relevant agencies as necessary; accessing regional and international funds in regard to natural resources, biodiversity and...
other related matters; and, performing such other functions that are necessary or expedient to enable it to carry out its functions under the Act.

The 2015 PACT Act (Amendment) comes at an opportune time as the PACT Board embarks on preparing the 2017-2021 NPAS Strategic Plan, from which will then follow the realignment of existing PACT Strategic Plan (2011-2016) to position the PACT to deliver on the strategic objectives identified in the NPAS Strategic Plan (2017-2021) followed by an institutional gap assessment to transform the PACT to deliver on its mandate.

2. PROJECT OBJECTIVE
The overall objective of the PACT contracting with a consultancy is to develop three integrated deliverables:

A. The 2017-2021 NPAS Strategic Plan, that must fully consider, integrate and build upon:
   i. The National Protected Areas System Act (2015);
   ii. The National Protected Areas System Plan (2015);
   iii. The Rationalization Exercise of Belize’s PAs (2013);
   iv. The PACT legislation (1996, 2003, 2015); and,
   v. All other relevant documents.

B. The 2017-2021 PACT Strategic Plan, that must fully consider, integrate and build upon:
   i. The NPAS (2017-2021) Strategic Plan;
   ii. The 2011-2016 PACT Strategic Plan;
   iii. The 2010 PACT Institutional Assessment Report;
   iv. The PACT legislation (1996, 2003, 2015); and,
   v. PACT’s 2016 Willingness to Contribute to Conservation Study.

C. The 2017 PACT Institutional Assessment Report, that must fully consider, integrate and build upon:
   i. The NPAS (2017-2021) Strategic Plan;
   ii. The PACT (2017-2021) Updates Strategic Plan;
   iii. The 2010 PACT Institutional Assessment Report and performance management scorecard;
   iv. The PACT legislation (1996, 2003, 2015);
   v. PACT’s 2016 Willingness to Contribute to Conservation Study.

3. CRITICAL DESIGN CRITERIA FOR THE DELIVERABLES

   a) There has been considerable work done (e.g., plan, studies, assessments) in the recent past regarding Belize’s National Protected Areas and the PACT. Therefore, the Board, via the ToR, wants to make clear that the consultancy will not “reinvent the wheel” by gathering large amounts of information that already exist. The consultancy must consider and integrate the existing plans and assessments. The existing documents must be viewed as a platform on which to develop
b) “more effective documents” in terms of content, structure, format, tools, usability, detail, and clarity. If the consultancy identifies missing information or a better way to structure the deliverable(s), they are expected to submit deliverables based upon their expert opinion and best practices, and not be constrained by previous plans and assessments.

c) There are many different types of plans. The consultancy should note that a five-year strategic plan is a detailed “internal” document that gives direction and guidance to the PACT Board and Staff. A strategic plan is not an “encyclopedia” of all things about Belize’s protected areas, but rather a focused working document that can be implemented during the timeframe between 2017-2021. In this instance, the PACT Strategic Plan must position PACT to both deliver on the NPAS strategic objectives as well as transform the PACT in order for it to deliver on its mandate.

d) A strategic plan is intended to be a clear, concise, detailed, and an easily useable action document which helps to guide and justify various Board and Staff decisions in a given year (e.g., budgets, annual work plans, communications, staffing, equipment, construction). Most of all, a strategic plan must be strategic.

e) A strategic plan tends to use matrices and visuals to present key strategic objectives linked to actions/activities and details such as where, when, why, how, level of priority, responsible person, resources needed to implement, assumptions, and sequence over the five-year period. An effective strategic plan is often a reasonably short document.

f) The level of time and money allocated to this TOR does not permit independent activities for each of the three documents. It is expected, for example, that the inception meeting, stakeholder meetings, interviews and data collection, will contribute to all three documents referenced in the Project Objectives to the extent practicable.

g) Where practicable, the NPAS Strategic Plan, the update of the 2011-2016 PACT Strategic Plan and the PACT Institutional Assessment should be done concurrently.

h) Both the NPAS and PACT Strategic Plans must include a monitoring/performance tracking tool to assess annual progress and for adaptive management during the five-year life cycle of plans.

4. TASKS and ACTIVITIES

A. Tasks

i. Attend an Inception Meeting with the PACT Board to: (1) discuss the scope of the Terms of Reference (TOR) and deliverables to be produced and (2) discuss and finalize the work-plan and proposed consultation schedule.
ii. Conduct a meeting with the National Protected Areas Advisory Council to discuss their role and contribution as it pertains to the ToR.

iii. Conduct meetings with relevant Government Ministries/Departments and Non-Governmental Organizations including, but not limited to:

*Ministry of Natural Resources
*Ministry of Tourism
*Ministry of Culture
*Departments of Forestry, Fisheries, and the Environment
*Coastal Zone Management Authority Institute
*Belize Tourism Board
*National Institute for Culture and History
*Non-Government Organizations and Community Based Organizations who serve as co-managers, stakeholders, including the private/public sector, such as the Belize Tourism Industry Association, the Belize Hotel Association, and the Belize Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

iv. Review all relevant literature, to include but not be limited to those sources referenced in Section 2 of this ToR.

B. Specific Activities

The consultancy team, in their response to this ToR, will be expected to develop a work plan, which details specific activities, timeline, and their sequence.

5. DELIVERABLES

The deliverables will be submitted by the consultancy in hard copy (15 copies) and digital format to the Chair of the PACT Board. All timeframes/schedules for delivery shall be outlined in an approved Inception Report with specified due dates agreed upon between the consultancy firm and the PACT Board.

Deliverables and Estimated Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Timeline (Calendar Weeks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inception Meeting Report—brief executive summary of meeting</td>
<td>No later than 2 weeks after signing of contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on consultations and draft outline of SPs and Assessment</td>
<td>No later than 6 weeks after signing of contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft NPAS SP, PACT Assessment and presentation to Board</td>
<td>No later than 9 weeks after signing of contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft PACT SP and presentation to Board</td>
<td>No later than 12 weeks after signing of contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final NPAS SP, PACT Assessment, and PACT SP</td>
<td>No later than 14 weeks after signing of contract</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. APPROACH
An interactive and participatory approach is a requirement. The consultancy firm will be responsible to propose a work plan to undertake the assignment. Access shall be given to the consultancy firm to actively engage the PACT Board and Staff, members of the NPA Advisory Council, co-managers, other stakeholders and the public.

7. QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE
The selected consultancy team shall consist of both international and local experts. Resumes of individuals on the consultancy team must be submitted with specific reference to previous work with PACT and/or in the development of five-year strategic plans for similar institutions to the PACT. Other similar work experience on plans intended to affect change and make management improvements to areas similar to PACT administered government property will be considered. Resumes of the consultancy’s individual team members must be submitted along with the proposal.

The proposal should indicate the principal person (by name) that will be responsible for the consultancy and day-to-day availability for PACT to communicate with the consultancy. This includes organizational structure, roles and responsibilities, person-days of involvement for each consultant and can answer questions about the consultancy meeting the established timeline for completion of the project.

The PACT draws the attention of interested applicants to Section 28 (4) of the PACT Act Amendment (2015) which addresses evaluations of the Trust, inclusive of the development of strategic plans, which states the following:

*Any person who is, or was during the period under evaluation, in any way associated with the Trust, such as a member of the Board, Staff or the Finance and Audit Committee appointed under section 18 of the Act or any administrative, technical, scientific or other Board committee or as a direct or indirect beneficiary of the Trust, shall not be appointed to the evaluating team.*

a. MINIMUM PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS
The consultancy team bidding on this project must have demonstrated excellence and experience in strategic planning or other similar institutional assessments, institutional monitoring (tracking) and performance evaluation, project management, adaptive planning/management, stakeholder engagement, group facilitation and meeting management, technical writing, and active listening.

It is expected that the consultancy team will include international expert(s) who meet the minimum professional qualifications or have the desired demonstrated experience.

b. DESIRED DEMONSTRATED EXPERIENCE
It is highly desirable, but not required, that the consultancy firm and team members have demonstrated experience and knowledge of PACT and the Belize’s NPAS----its history, programs, strategic plans, legislation and amendments, accomplishments, funding streams, and organizational structure.
Other desired professional qualifications may include expertise in sustainable finance management/revenue generation, institutional assessment and Belize’s environmental laws and legislative process.

8. DURATION OF THE CONSULTANCY

The expected start date of the consultancy is November 21, 2016. The total duration of the Consultancy should not exceed 90 person days over a 14 week period.

9. PAYMENT SCHEDULE
Payments will be made on the basis of the review and acceptance of deliverables as stipulated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Payment schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inception Meeting Report—brief executive summary of meeting</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on consultations and draft outline of SPs and Assessment</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft NPAS SP and PACT Assessment and presentation to Board</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft PACT SP</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final NPAS SP, PACT Assessment, and PACT SP</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. REPORTING
The consultancy will report to the PACT Board or as directed.

11. SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF REPORTS
All drafts and final reports and deliverables shall be written in English. Draft reports shall be submitted digitally in Microsoft Word format on a flash drive. Final reports shall be submitted in the following manner: fifteen (15) bound copies and two digital copies on flash drives (Microsoft Word and printable version) and must be submitted by the consultant to the Chair of the Board of Directors of PACT. The PACT Board is solely responsible for approving the final versions of all deliverables.

12. MONITORING AND EVALUATION
The results to be achieved by the consultancy team are specified above. Progress towards achieving these results will be measured by the following Monitoring and Evaluation indicators:

a. Timeliness of the submission of deliverables and other services provided;
b. Technical outputs prepared, finalized and approved by PACT Board;
c. Meetings and consultations completed with all relevant stakeholders;
d. Meeting objectives and activities outlined in the ToR; and,
e. Final strategic plans and assessment documents.
## ANNEX C: LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Government and Community Based Organizations</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Anthony Hislop</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Steadfast Tourism and Conservation Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Dwight Montero</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Steadfast Tourism and Conservation Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Rochelle Daly</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Mayflower Bocawina Development Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Ellen McRae</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Forest and Marine Reserves of Caye Caulker (FAMRACC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Heron Moreno</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Corozal Sustainable Future Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Lester Delgado</td>
<td>Head Ranger</td>
<td>Corozal Sustainable Future Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Marcial Alamina</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Friends of Swallow Caye (FOSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Arreini Morgan</td>
<td>Acting Executive Director</td>
<td>Southern Environmental Association (SEA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Angelia Lane</td>
<td>Development Officer</td>
<td>Ya’axche Conservation Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Jacob Marlin</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Belize Foundation for Research and Environmental Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Sipriano Canti</td>
<td>Chief Ranger</td>
<td>Belize Foundation for Research and Environmental Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Joel Verde</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Sarteneja Alliance for Conservation and Development (SACD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Leomir Santoya</td>
<td>NRM Program Manager</td>
<td>Sarteneja Alliance for Conservation and Development (SACD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Zoe Walker</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Wildtracks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Matthew Miller</td>
<td>Managing Director</td>
<td>Monkey Bay Wildlife Sanctuary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Valdemar Andrade</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Turneffe Atoll Sustainability Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Arvin Coc</td>
<td>Parks Manager</td>
<td>Belize Audubon Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Jose Perez</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Association of Protected Areas Management Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Edilberto Romero</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Programme for Belize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Kenny Cal</td>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
<td>C’ac’alelenel Car Sa Nima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Gilberto Co</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>C’ac’alelenel Car Sa Nima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Christina Garcia</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>BAPPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Role</td>
<td>Organization/Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Oswaldo Sabido</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>BAPPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Wilber Sabido</td>
<td>Chief Forest Officer</td>
<td>Forest Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Hannah St. Luce Martinez</td>
<td>BIOFIN PROJECT</td>
<td>Climate Change Project/Forest Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Rasheada Garcia</td>
<td>Officer In charge</td>
<td>Forest Department - San Ignacio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Victoria Chi</td>
<td>Forest Officer</td>
<td>Protected Areas Program - Forest Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Raul Chun</td>
<td>Forest Officer/Officer In charge</td>
<td>Forest Department – Punta Gorda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Beverly Wade</td>
<td>Fisheries Administrator</td>
<td>Fisheries Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Rigoberto Quintanna</td>
<td>Fisheries Officer</td>
<td>Fisheries Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Adriel Castaneda</td>
<td>Fisheries Officer</td>
<td>Fisheries Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Maurio Gongora</td>
<td>Fisheries Officer</td>
<td>Fisheries Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Sandra Grant</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>MCCAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Eugene Waight</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>KBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Ansel Dubon</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>National Protected Areas System Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Colin Young</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>Social Security Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Adele Catzim Sanchez</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>Ministry of Youth, Sports and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Yashin Dujon</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>Ministry of Tourism &amp; Civil Aviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Colin Mattis</td>
<td></td>
<td>National Climate Change Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Herbert Haylock</td>
<td>Director of Quality Assurance</td>
<td>Belize Tourism Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Marco Salon</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>National Security Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Martin Alegria</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>Department of Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Hon. Omar Figueroa</td>
<td>Minister of State</td>
<td>Ministry of Forestry, Fisheries and Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Cecy Castillo</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Faculty of Science and Technology (NRM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Leandra Ricketts</td>
<td>Administrative Director</td>
<td>University of Belize Environmental Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Abil Carreras</td>
<td>Lecturer – Marine Biology</td>
<td>Faculty of Science and Technology (NRM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### International Partners and Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Leonel Requena</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>COMPACT/GEF-SGP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Jennie Garcia-Saqui</td>
<td>National Coordinator</td>
<td>GIZ/Selva Maya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Nicole Auil Gomez</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Wild life Conservation Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Nadia Bood</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>World Wildlife Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Private Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Osmany Salas</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Belize Tourism Industry Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Private Citizens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Valerie Woods</td>
<td>Designated Rep.</td>
<td>People’s United Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Lisl Alamilla</td>
<td>Former Minister</td>
<td>Ministry of Forestry, Fisheries and Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PACT Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Raineldo Guerrero</td>
<td>Representative, Belize Tourism Industry Association</td>
<td>PACT BOARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Elma Kay</td>
<td>Representative, President – University of Belize</td>
<td>PACT BOARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Abil Castañeda</td>
<td>Alternate Representative, Ministry of Tourism and Civil Aviation</td>
<td>PACT BOARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Anthony Hislop</td>
<td>Representative, Community Based Organizations</td>
<td>PACT BOARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Eric Eusey</td>
<td>Finance Expert</td>
<td>PACT BOARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Artemio Osorio</td>
<td>Representative, Ministry of Finance</td>
<td>PACT BOARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Ruth Meighan</td>
<td>Representative, National Emergency Management</td>
<td>PACT BOARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Yvonne Sharman Hyde</td>
<td>Ministry of Economic Development</td>
<td>PACT BOARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Amanda Burgos-Acosta</td>
<td>Belize Audubon Society</td>
<td>PACT BOARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Dennisia Francisco</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>PACT BOARD Secretary/Executive Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PACT Staff
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Arceni Lizama</td>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>PACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Darrel Audinette</td>
<td>Grants Officer</td>
<td>PACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Michael Pipersburgh</td>
<td>Accounts Clerk</td>
<td>PACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Vanessa Burke</td>
<td>Executive Assistant</td>
<td>PACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Lorena Ramirez</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>PACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Kevin Maddison</td>
<td>Office Assistant - Driver</td>
<td>PACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Ellen Arnold</td>
<td>Office Attendant</td>
<td>PACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Nayari Diaz-Perez</td>
<td>Associate Director-Grants</td>
<td>PACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Modesta Cal</td>
<td>Administrative Officer</td>
<td>PACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Mary Tun-Quewell</td>
<td>Grants Officer</td>
<td>PACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Mark Zelaya</td>
<td>Accounts Clerk</td>
<td>PACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Farrah Tingling</td>
<td>Junior Accounts Clerk</td>
<td>PACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Andrea Tillett</td>
<td>Procurement Officer</td>
<td>PACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Lauren Burn</td>
<td>Communications Officer</td>
<td>PACT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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