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Structure of paper

Chapter 1 contains the thesis design.

The second chapter contains the literature review, which explains the relevance of natural resources, specifically Protected Areas (PAs) and their contribution to society as a whole. It also elaborates on the actors and management of Protected Areas. This chapter provides models for an effective management of PAs and links this with the participation of private sector mechanism.

The third chapter zeros in on the history, past and present development of STINASU and also discusses briefly the policy and legal framework of this organization. It also discusses previous initiatives between private sector and STINASU and gives an analysis of the past and current management of the organization.

The forth chapter will go in depth on the analysis of the organization by zeroing in on the strengths and weaknesses. It links the prerequisites for private sector participation with the analysis of the data. The final chapter, chapter five, contains the conclusion and recommendation.
Chapter 1 Introduction

Background Information

A worldwide trend is that Public Private Partnerships (PPP’s) emerged in the management of Protected Areas (PAs) (IUCN, 2000; Eagles et al, 2001, and Eagles, 2008). Almost 90% of Suriname is covered with forest, which is an important natural resource in the economic development of the country. The forest is divided in certain areas and PAs are an important part of it. The Multi Annual Plan (MOP 2006-2011) of the government of Suriname (GOS) state that the forest shall be fully deployed for the national development. Forests have an economic value; for example timber is exported, which contributes to almost 4 to 5 million US$ revenues annually (MOP).

The GOS therefore acknowledged that forests need to be used in a sustainable and efficient manner. Special designated forests such as curtain functions forests shall be maintained for that purpose and will be contained and preserved for their biological diversity. The GOS also has committed itself to the Millennium Development Goals (MDG), specifically MDG 7, which means that the country has committed to formulate a policy strategy particularly aiming towards an integrated sustainable environmental policy.

An integrated national environmental policy aims to realize an efficient and effective environmental management structure. One of the measures to reach this goal is to strengthen institutional capacity and identifying financial mechanisms for environmental projects. The measure to be taken into effect for this strategy is to strengthen public and semi-governmental agencies responsible for nature conservation and management.

Against this background this thesis is written. The Foundation for Nature Conservation, STINASU hereafter, was solely established to preserve PA’s through nature tourism, research, education and conservation.

Apart from the long experience in the ecotourism sector, STINASU is nationally and internationally known, mainly through the initiator of STINASU (Dr. Johan Schulz)\(^1\). STINASU is also internationally recognized through the protection of endangered sea turtles. STINASU has a long standing relation with

\(^1\) Johan Schulz was a biologist and former Head Nature Conservation Division (NCD) of the Suriname Forest Service (LBB) and the first director of STINASU.
local communities (indigenous and tribal people). STINASU is the essential institution when visiting nature reserves such as the Central Suriname Nature Reserve (CSNR), Raleigh Falls (RV) and Galibi Nature Reserve (GNR) (Sea turtles) and the Brownsberg Nature Park (BNP).

At present STINASU is not capable to maintain its activities and is subsidized by the Ministry of Physical Planning, Land and Forest Management (MoPPLFM). STINASU is at a crossroad as to choose which path to take while keeping the main objectives of the foundation in mind.

**Research Objectives:**
The objective is to find out whether Public Private Partnership (PPP) can be an appropriate model to improve the performance of STINASU. In first instance through identifying the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the organization and examine the possibilities of partnerships with the private sector.

**Research questions:**
1. To what extend is Public Private Partnership a viable option for environmental conservation and what are the key features and preconditions of Public Private Partnerships?
2. How can engaging with the private sector (private sector participation) enable STINASU to improve its environmental conservational tasks and eco tourism activities?

**Research methods:**
At first, extensive literature and desk studies were carried out to define the relevant definitions, boundaries and issues. Literature study is carried out on models of organizational reform, especially with the application on private sector mechanisms. Literature study on PPPs, their advantages and disadvantages. Primary and secondary sources are used. Primary data is collected through interviews with management and employees of STINASU, tour operators (private sector), NGOs, and government officials from MoPPLFM. Interviews were structured and semi structured in order to gain more information from the subjects (see Annex 1). Overall the interviews covered issues such as the role of STINASU within the ecotourism sector; a key issue was also the role of the private sector and other actors such as NGOs regarding their contribution to nature preservation through ecotourism activities.
(see Annex 2). An analysis is conducted on the success story of South Africa, on how to manage PA and linking it with the Surinamese situation on the basis of similarities and differences.

This research describes the current and past management of STINASU; therefore an assessment of management is conducted and lastly the strengths and weaknesses are assessed as to find possibilities to capitalize on their strengths and find partners to complement their weaknesses.

**Scope and Limitations:**

The choice for research in the management of natural resources, specifically protected areas and possibilities of ventures between public and private sector stems from the work experiences in this sector. The emphasis is not based on characteristics of the natural resources and protected areas, but merely on how they are managed and how these public entities can survive in this competing and constant changing environment. It means that people need address issues differently and adapt to their environment. This scope is not on in depth management and organizational issues, but specifically on management models used in park tourism and the possibilities of private sector participation.
Chapter 2        Literary review

2.1. Introduction

First of all, it is important to lay out the theoretical underpinnings that will place the concept of private sector participation within nature preservation and nature tourism. This chapter shall also go in depth on the organizational reform needed for organizations dealing with protected areas and their activities within nature tourism. The South-African experience will be discussed and it will be compared in chapter four with the Suriname case.

One of the millennium development goals of the UN, MDG 7, is to ensure environmental sustainability, whereby different aspects are targeted in order to achieve this goal. The MDG 7 targets are “to integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources” (OECD in Scherl et al 2004: 18). One of the ways in which countries can achieve the aforementioned is to designate areas within their borders as protected areas and nature reserves.

2.2. Why have partnerships for PAs organizations

Before going in depth into the question why organizations form partnerships, it is necessary to elaborate on the different meanings of this concept. There are diverse definitions of partnerships. One definition is (Henderson 1999:2): “arrangements in which public and private partners work cooperatively towards shared objectives in which there is shared authority and responsibility, joint investment of resources, shared risk taking and mutual benefit”. A more simplistic explanation of partnership according to UNCHS (1993:18) in the context of shelter services is “to ensure that comparative advantages of different actors in the shelter process are exploited in a mutually supportive way”. The goal is therefore harmonization of strengths and weaknesses of the different actors for optimum benefit.

Public and private organizations have different goals, but can conclude that collaboration is necessary to enhance the performance of their organizations. For whatever reasons, the core of any successful partnership is the willingness and trust that organizations have towards each other (Johnson et al 2006). For the private sector, PPP’s present business opportunities in areas from which it was previously excluded.
Johnson et al (2006: 73) has noted that partnerships enable different actors to gain access to the skills and resources of each other. The preconditions, process and outcome are crucial elements when the goal is to have a partnership agreement. A PPP tends to emerge there where the public sector is not able to provide services to the public in a cost effective manner.

The reasons for partnerships vary; pragmatic reasons, due to resource constraints to ideological reasons, whereby governments should involve the private sector in their activities (McQuaid 2006). Most governments seek for partnerships within the private sector for financial and economic reasons, due to their limited financial capacity for investment (Kouwenhoven in Kooiman 1994).
Organizations use partnerships because “the partners are not in a zero (or rather constant) sum game” (McQuaid 2006: 19). He argues that for a certain amount of resources the output level will be increased when organizations collaborate.

Cost effectiveness, efficiency through a clear coordination mechanism, availability of resources such as finance, information, expertise, legitimacy, whereby participants are acknowledged are the sum of the advantages of a PPP.

Although there are potential benefits from having PPP’s, still Awortwi (2004: 223) noted that the public sector must not ignore the fact that some important basic conditions need to be in place before entering into a partnership. These fundamentals are: incentives to share responsibilities, creating competition, clear contractual agreement and monitoring, the capacity of the public sector and the private sector to work with each other, the need for stakeholders involvement and the rules and regulations in which the partnership takes place (Awortwi, 2004). The conclusion that Awortwi has drawn in his study of PPP’s in solid waste collection is that “PPP’s do not in themselves guarantee effectiveness and lower costs” (2004: 223). Careful review of the factors and elements should be kept in mind when considering a PPP. Indicators of enablement of PPP are therefore trust and willingness, participation, sharing of responsibilities and sharing of information.
2.3. Types of partnerships

Research of literature suggests that there are different types of partnerships (Batley 1996, Osborne 2000). For management of PAs a few forms of partnerships exist and has been applied in the world (Eagles 2008). For the management of PAs the partnerships mostly used are contracting out of certain services, such as transportation, waste collection, laundry services etc, also leasing of lodges and concession of specific areas under strict conditions.

Review of the literature suggests that nature preservation organizations should seek for partnerships with local communities; this is also one of the conditions of the Convention of Biological Diversity, which is ratified by Suriname in 1992. Literature shows that the current trend in the world is that one of the ways to preserve protected areas is through ecotourism (IUCN 2000).

However there are certain conditions that have to be met in order to have a successful partnership within the management of PAs. Proponents of nature conservation and ecotourism are of the view that co-management is the most suitable way (IUCN 2000). Such a model combines the public sector, government, the private sector, such as tour operators, NGOs, travel agents and local communities together to work closely on management of protected areas. But before a partnerships emerged the different stakeholders should be in line and formulate a common goal, furthermore the capacity of the actors and willingness is important for a partnership to succeed. This thesis will therefore elaborate on the capacities of the public and private sector, in order to suggest whether a PPP is a feasible option.

For successful partnership, potential partners should examine the alternative methods and approaches for private sector involvement. A precondition is to appraise the costs and benefits before choosing a particular form of partnership. This can be seen as a second phase of the deliberation between potential partners. First of all, potential partners should analyze the fundamental characteristics that will enable a partnership. Awortwi argues that organizations neglect these fundamentals, hence when a partnership is established; the outcome and output will be a zero sum (Awortwi 2004). Although there are advantages, Awortwi stresses that potential partners should examine the prerequisites that can make a PPP successful.
These fundamentals are:

1. Incentives to share responsibility (and information)
2. Public sector capabilities to perform (capacity)
3. Private sector capacity and willingness to work with the government (trust and willingness)
4. Stakeholders’ involvement (stakeholder analysis)
5. Clear rules, regulations and procedures (legislation)
6. Clear written and managing contractual agreement (Adapted from Awortwi 2004)

These fundamentals and an appropriate institutional framework are preconditions if PPP’s are to succeed. Institutions planning to implement a PPP program should therefore proceed with caution when such a framework is not in place.

A careful appraisal is that partnership between public and private sector may help to enhance the performance of an organization. Furthermore organizations should in first instance have the fundamentals in place otherwise a partnership is doomed to fail. This suggests that organizations should have a long standing relation, they should trust each other and although they may have different goals, they can formulate a common goal. They should be able to share the responsibility and exchange information. The willingness of partners is essential for a PPP to succeed.

### 2.4. Improve performance through management and organizational reform

Daft (2006) defines an organization as social entities that are goal-oriented and deliberately designed to be structured and coordinated. For any organization to perform well it is necessary that the internal organization is well-oiled, otherwise output will be zero sum. Most of the PAs in the world and in Suriname are managed by public entities, because there are certain goods and services that by nature are public, which means that it need to be accessible to the general public for recreational and education reasons (IUCN 1994; IUCN 2000; ABS 2008). Due to the fact that most of the management lies within the public domain, the tendency occurs of too much bureaucratic procedures and regulatory framework, which does not contribute to an efficient and effective management. If this is the case the possibility of reforming such an agency can be an option to perform better.
Literature and practice shows that public entities do not have the culture to be result oriented because there is no need to (Daft 2006). The empirical research and observation of private and public2 (interviewees) officials confirms, that there is no motivation, because wages are set, no incentives and most of the time managers do not motivate their employees to perform. There seems to be a clear lack of leadership. In STINASU’s case there isn’t a performance management in place and employees currently don’t really know their job description. In such cases Daft (2006) argues to work on a set of factors that may help an organization perform well. These factors are a good incentive system, performance management, motivation, leadership; planning of activities, goals, mission and vision. Strategic planning is very important and people need to know the strengths and weaknesses of the organization and of themselves.

2.5. Models of management reform

PAs are initially a responsibility of government, because of their wide variety of goods and services they provide (IUCN 2000). The reason is that the services and goods provided need to be accessible to the general public. If private companies own and manage parks, it will do this on the basis of cost efficiency and profits, consequently leading to a certain target group that is willing to pay for the services provided by the forests, such as fishing, hunting or bird watching (interviews with the private sector). The literature review suggests that there is a transformation in management. Eagles (2008), More (in Eagles 2008) and Borrini-Feyerabend et al. (2006) argues that there are several models of managing and governing PAs. In conclusion these authors agree on the following models.

These models are: a fully public model; the management lies within a government body or park agency. The government body is responsible for management. In this case the government has total ownership of the PA and some tasks can be delegated to lower institutions. A second model is where co-management exists. This model entails a plurality of actors and there are processes and institutional mechanisms in place through which the management authority is shared. A precondition of this model is that all actors need to agree and recognize their responsibility in the management of the PAs. Co-management means that the authority should seek to collaborate with all the stakeholders concerning the respective and surrounding areas. Then there are PAs that are managed through private NGO’s; the land is owned by individuals, corporations or communities and therefore the management

2 See annex 1 for the interviews with the private and public sector; for clarification private sector is A 1 and public sector is A 2. Also see Annex 2 for the questionnaire.
lies within their authority. The case may be that these NGO’s are non-profit oriented but there are also NGO’s that are profit oriented. In both cases the owners are responsible for the decision-making and dictate their own conservation policy. Another important model is the community based model, whereby local communities manage the areas. The literature indicate that this is one of the oldest form of management of land and natural resources (Eagles, 2008; Borrini-Feyerabend et al., 2006)

Key elements of management according to Eagles (2008:6-7) are the participation of the public; stakeholders consensus, a need for strategic vision and planning. He considers performance as a key issue whereby responsiveness to stakeholders is a prerequisite, furthermore effectiveness and efficiency of the daily operations and projects. He therefore proposes that the organization should have the capacity to realize the objectives in an effective manner. He proceeds by concluding that accountability and transparency towards stakeholders are also key elements to look at, because PAs management should be required to be accountable and accept responsibility for their failure. In his perception effectiveness means how well the organization carries out their plans and involves leadership from the managers and political officials.

Eagles (2008:3) define several models on the basis of the types of management, the source of income and ownership. Eagles conclude that the most outstanding models are those used in South Africa, Australia and Costa Rica. In these cases there is a for-profit corporation that has ownership of the resources; funding takes place through user fees and management is within the private sector. This works well for ecotourism industry. A parastatal model embodies a government owned corporation and funding is through user fees. This model seems to be common in developing countries with strong tourism volumes. This does not however incorporate ecotourism. Another model described by Eagles (2008) is a combination model of government and management by a public and private organization, however the financial system within this model is not transparent and if agreements are not clear and written, problems arise easily.

2.6. Lessons learned from South Africa

Studies on the management of environmental conservation in PAs have shown that management involves all actors/stakeholders (IUCN 2000, Eagles 2008). A stakeholder analysis is a prerequisite. Local communities, NGOs, civil society are involved in the management of PAs. According to Fearnhead (2003) South African National Parks (SANParks) was established as a semi-governmental agency, mandated to establish and maintain a system of national parks throughout South Africa,
through government subsidies. During the years they were unable to maintain the system and deliver tourist services because of inefficient procedures. This had an effect on biodiversity conservation. An internal audit was performed with the outcome that there were great inadequacies when compared against similar private operations. For this reason the SANParks authority decided that the business unit should be done separately from the conservation tasks. The government acknowledged that they didn’t have the skills and the incentives to run a business. The private sector was needed to be able to access capital. The idea was to establish a company, with shareholders that are able to call for capital. The government of South Africa believed that private companies were willing the invest, but that an appropriate regulatory framework should be designed to mitigate against impacts on biodiversity, and ensuring that there is a relatively risk free return to the conservation assets. The goal was thus to generate additional revenues. This was done by re-focusing SANParks energies and resources on its core business of managing biodiversity in PAs and only providing the foundation and regulatory framework for tourism and recreation. The aim was to transfer the management of commercial operations or some aspects of commercial operations in national parks to commercial operators that were qualified and equipped to run these facilities. Granting concessions was thus one of the options to involve the private sector. This strategy was a great success. The project not only generates more revenues but also created opportunities for partnerships. It enabled private businesses to operate under a concession lease and thus generating not only profit for themselves but also for conservation purposes. The success was based on the grass root approach, enabling as many individuals and businesses as possible, a sound legal framework and clear contractual agreement with regard to finance and environmental management and penalties when partners did not meet the requirements.
Chapter 3  Description of STINASU

3.1. Historical overview

This chapter will focus on the history of STINASU. The legal framework and the policy regarding the management of PAs will briefly be described. Furthermore a preview of private sector involvement will be discussed which will be continued in chapter four.

History teaches us that Suriname has been able to preserve and protect the rainforest successfully for several decennia. STINASU was established as a semi-autonomous non-profit agency with the objective of preserving Suriname’s heritage through the management of PAs and the implementation and coordination of activities contributing to heritage preservation, such as nature education, research and ecotourism.

The goals of STINASU (see Annex 3 Bylaws) defined at its creation were to stimulate and implement the sustainable use of nature reserves through the facilitation and undertaking of scientific research, nature education and public awareness, and the generation of income through nature tourism in PAs. By making the areas that fall under the management of the Forest Service of Suriname (LBB) and its Nature Conservation Division (NCD) accessible to the public, revenues are gained through nature tourism and other activities can be funded. These goals are in accordance with 1954 Nature Conservation Act (Natuurbeschermingswet 1954) (Government Bulletin 1954 no. 26, last revised in 1992);

STINASU is active at the following sites for tourist activities:

1. Galibi Nature Reserve (GNR)
2. Raleigh falls (RV) situated in the Central Suriname Nature Reserve (CSNR)
3. Boven Coesewijne Nature Reserve (BCNR)
4. Matapica

STINASU supports the Nature Conservation Division (NCD) of the Forest Service of Suriname (LBB) with nature preservation, specifically the turtle project in the GNR.
STINASU is the owner, through a government land lease of the Brownsberg Nature Park (BNP) and STINAT, a wetland trail. The organization played a major role as governmental authority, supporting the Forest Service of Suriname (LBB) and NCD. A strong and structural aspect in STINASU’s establishment was its potential (based on the bylaws) to retain its revenues, while ordinary government agencies had to submit all incomes to the national treasury. (Sijlbing 2005, Khodabaks 2005)

According to Sijlbing (2005), the development of ecotourism in PAs in Suriname has been for a great deal the sole responsibility of STINASU. As one of the front runners of this organization and protégé of the first director and initiator Sijlbing argues that STINASU has played a ground-breaking role because the organization has set the conditions and criteria for the current sustainable tourism developments in the country. From his long experience within the organization he argues that many dedicated individuals, staff members and volunteers have contributed to the continuation of the foundation, especially in the years during and after the civil strife.

Sijlbing argued (2005) that there was a serious loss of image as a nature preservation institution and there was a clear lack of capability to perform. Many studies and actions were taken due to predictions from actors within the sector that there was a real possibility of extinction. Assessments and evaluation studies were performed by organizations such as EU, WWF and UNDP, pointing at the fact that STINASU had been transformed from a moderately successful organization into an ailing organization (Nelom, 2005; Coathup, 2004 and Cobb, 2004 in Sijlbing 2005).

Nelom (2005) and Bro/EU (2005) (in Sijlbing 2005) recommended that STINASU should have focused on the facilitation of private tour operators, particularly through the development of PAs as important tourist attractions. The Integrated Tourism Development Program initiated by the Suriname Tourism Foundation (ITDP/STF) also provided STINASU with advice on model lease agreements in PAs (STF/SITDP, 2005). The general conclusion of the studies was that the foundation had no clear vision or tourist strategy, nor a marketing strategy, and lacked resources to develop or implement a strategy. Coathup (in Sijlbing 2005) argued that the ineffectiveness of management was the primary weakness of the organization.

As mentioned earlier, STINASU and the NCD have a long standing relationship, but both organizations struggle with the available capacity, which limits their work. Several memorandum of understandings (MOUs, see Annex 5 MOU 2003) were signed between these two organizations.
The first was in 1999, this was a necessary procedure to regulate and determine the respective responsibilities. In this document STINASU was in charge of all tourist activities as well as nature education and research coordinating actions in PAs, whereas NCD was in charge of the formal management, control and enforcement. STINASU also had the specific task to manage marine turtle protection (since 1980), but the enforcement related to egg poaching and other illegal acts was and is still a NCD responsibility. Interviews with public officials and former heads of STINASU suggest that there were some tensions with regard to divergent interpretations of executions of tasks.

Based on the development of STINASU and the research done by numerous consultants, governmental and nongovernmental institutions, they concluded that immediate corrective actions were necessary. In February 2009 STINASU determined a policy to deal with its future mandates (Strategic policy document 2009).

### 3.2. Policy and Legal framework

The policy on PAs aims at the conservation and management of natural resources and the sustainable use of these resources.

The legal framework in which the activities and tasks of STINASU are performed is as already mentioned the 1954 Nature Conservation Act. The Ministry of Physical Planning, Land and Forest Management (Annex 4 Government Bulletin 2005 no. 94) is responsible for nature conservation and nature protection. Inventory, exploration, optimum exploitation and management of forests, flora and fauna are also a responsibility of this department.

National laws for the protection of natural areas are the 1954 Nature Conservation Act. This forms the basis for the establishment of nature reserves; this is the most important law on protected areas. The preamble of the Nature Conservation Act states that the conservation of natural richness is needed for science, recreation and education purposes and considerations of ethical, esthetic and economic reasons. The economic considerations are for instance nature tourism and maintenance of genetic resources. (Translation: Baal 2005)
3.3. STINASU and the Private Sector

According to Sijlbing (2005: 15) a few attempts have been made to establish ad hoc partnerships between STINASU and private tour operators during the years, including marketing oriented ones. Khodabaks also concluded (2005) that steps were put out in the direction of outsourcing certain services in 2001, in order to concentrate more on the core conservation objectives. An example of this attempt is the leasing of the bar/restaurant at BNP to a private business. Interviewee 1 stated that in 2002 the execution of all tours was contracted out to a private tour operator, while STINASU was still engaged in marketing and promotion. A former head of STINASU declared in an interview that in that year revenues declined and the cause was the contracting out of the tours, therefore they decided to exploit their own tours. During this period there were no attempts to upgrade the quality of the services. Poor management and execution of the tours gradually decreased their image.

In conclusion, interviewee 1 and 2 concludes that there was a time where there was no clear vision and the organization just muddles through. Research and facilitation of research, publications became a scarcity after 2005 and the only source that kept the organization going was that people still wanted to visit the destinations.

3.4. Organizational setup and management of STINASU

The past organizational setup of STINASU provides the following main services: research and monitoring, education and communication, preservation and park management, tourism and community development. There are administrative units such as the secretary, project planning and personnel affairs, financial and technical tasks who assists the other units in fulfilling their tasks. In the past and this is still the case, STINASU faces a lack of skilled employees at all levels of the organization. This has affected the organizational structure and the continuity because employees were assigned to other tasks, which have led to underdevelopment of the different main activities of the organization. In the past there were numerous community projects, but until the last four years little was done to develop local community projects. Thus participation of local communities was small when tours were conducted to the different sites. (Khodabaks 2005).

According to interviewee 1 STINASU assigned Symbiont Consulting in 2002 to formulate a strategic policy document. The consultant advised a merger between STINASU and the NCD. Interviewee 1 stated that this idea was sabotaged and after 2003 another idea was brought namely to
merge the NCD, STINASU and the Foundation for Forest Management and Control (SBB) into the so-called “BOSNAS” (Forest and Nature Authority Suriname). BOSNAS was never established due to different visions of the stakeholders. Symbiont concludes that STINASU doesn’t have a formal organizational chart and the board doesn’t function. Over the past 6 years 4 directors have managed STINASU. The last two years there was an acting management.

According to the strategic goals, STINASU has formulated a vision and mission statement, which states that “STINASU is the leading and guiding organization in the ecotourism and nature conservation branch within the PAs in Suriname and contributes actively to the sustainable use and self preservation of Suriname’s natural resources. A professional team of employees advises and gives guidelines for sustainable use of our environment, by giving nature education and facilitating nature research. The knowledge of the Surinamese biodiversity, her service oriented approach and good collaboration with partners make STINASU the provider of eco and nature tours in Suriname’s PAs”. (STINASU Strategic document 2009:14, personal translation)

Current structure of STINASU (adapted from Symbiont Consulting: 15):

Symbiont (2009) concludes that the current structure of STINASU is not adequate and a lot of key functions are still vacant. There are no personnel available for the tourism and marketing unit, there is no head of research department, no head of education, and furthermore there is not a public relation officer and still not a fulltime director. There are no skilled employees available to write
project proposals to finance certain activities. The availability of donor funding is essential to assist in the implementation of certain activities. Due to lack of management capabilities and a permanent management, main activities and tasks are not fully completed. Thus creating a span of control; this is not good for the internal organization. Interviews with personnel suggest that most of the employees are at the level of operations, but then again there is also no guidance and steering from above. Work procedures are too much ad hoc and informal. Communication within the organization seems to be a big problem and needs to be addressed (Symbiont Consulting 2009 and personal observation/interviews with employees). Interviewee 11 stated that the lack of high educated personnel has never been as evident as in the past two years. There are four higher educated employees and the total number of personnel is sixty nine.

Clearly there is a need to professionalize the organization. Key functions, a shortage of skilled and competent employees make it necessary for the organization to develop a human resource approach. The organization needs to work on the basis of result and performance, which means there is a need for a good public relation and a culture shift within the organization into a more proactive organization. STINASU therefore needs to address the capacity of her personnel, which means a good recruitment, training and guiding of employees and attract qualified personnel, it also means that STINASU needs to address her reward system, because low wages will not attract skilled people.

Interviews with employees suggest that staff meetings seem to be a scarcity and the internal communication between employees and management seems to be at such a level that it creates tension and de-motivated personnel. The consequence is that personnel who has a contract and are not on the payroll of the government tend to leave the organization.
Chapter 4  Assessment of private sector involvement towards participation within environmental conservation

4.1. External and internal factors

This chapter will focus on the internal and external factors that hamper the functioning of STINASU; it will also go in depth on the analysis of the empirical research and links this with the literature review from chapter 2. First a map of Suriname indicates the different PAs.

Protected areas in Suriname
Nature reserves:
1. Galibi
2. Wia-Wia
3. Coppennamemonding
4. Hertenrits
5. Peruvia
6. Wanekreek
7. Copi
8. Boven Coesewijne
9. Brinckheuvel
10. Centraal Suriname
11. Sipaliwini
NaturePark:
12. Brownsberg
Proposed nature reserve: 13. Nani

18. Noord Commewijne /Marowijne Adapted from: STINASU

The monitoring and management of the above PAs lies within the NCD and STINASU task is to coordinate the eco tourism activities within these areas and contribute to nature conservation and education.
Over the past two decades several external factors have influenced the functioning of STINASU. The tourism industry emerged, due to the availability of commercial airlines and accessibility of Suriname. The tourism and hospitality industry expanded.

Interviews with public officials and management of STINASU suggest that tourism still is the only activity that generates revenues, apart from funding for certain projects. These revenues are used to pay the wages and the operational cost of maintaining the organization, hence other activities are neglected.

4.2. Strengths and weaknesses

4.2.1. Strengths

According to interviews with officials within the organization and with former heads of STINASU, the organization has a great expertise and a long experience of biodiversity within nature reserves and PAs. This expertise should be utilized when partnering with the private sector, especially in the area of their long relation with local communities. Interviews with public and private officials and NGOs suggest that STINASU’s strength lies in the fact that PAs contribute to the maintenance of ecosystems and are of great relevance for recreational, educational and other values. Interviews with tour operators also indicate that they depend on STINASU, as it is the focal point when planning a trip to the PAs.

4.2.2. Weaknesses

To the general public the role of STINASU, NCD and LBB is not clear. There is no coordination and too much overlap of tasks (Khodabaks 2005, Nelom 2005). Interviews with tour operators also suggest that the roles of the two organizations are not clear to them. Analysis of the interviews with the private sector suggests that policy is not adequate and not transparent. The board doesn’t function. Interviews with employees instigates that management is almost not available for employees and others, which creates tension, de-motivated employees and clients. There are hardly any staff meetings, which mean that there is a clear lack of communication internally. Facilities and office are not adequately equipped and not up to international standards.

Management of PAs and ecotourism activities require (Worboys et al.2006) a manager to be a communicator, advocate, trainer and fundraiser. All resources are necessary, which means the
required human, financial, physical and information resources. STINASU has a lack in all the mentioned resources. Management processes (Worboys et al.2006) also dictates that planning should take place, organizing, leading the organization and controlling or monitoring the performance and take corrective actions. Analysis of the interviews with the management and employees of STINASU lead to conclude that these processes are not carried out. Interviews with the management suggest that there are projects being implemented, but staff and employees are not involved, only after the decisions had been made. Thus there are no work-plans or short term goals within the organization. Employees are thus “in the dark” as what really is happening within the organization.

Obsolete legislation; the Head of the Forest Service is responsible for nature reserves and has delegated this responsibility to the NCD, thus STINASU needs the permission of NCD, when engaging with the private sector for leasing of certain sites within the nature reserves, when infrastructure need to be set up. This is the major block towards co-management.

There is too little collaboration with national and international organizations regarding ecotourism activities. Due to lack of capacity new tourism products are not being introduced or developed. There is no clear ecotourism strategy or policy and a clear lack of marketing strategy. This suggests a lack of political commitment of the GOS. It suggests that ecotourism is not acknowledged as a major source of income.

4.2.3. Opportunities

The main road that leads to the interior is being done with bitumen, which means that transportation will be much cheaper, though this also presents an increased risk such as too much tourists, problem with waste management, endangerment of the habitat of animals and plants. Interviews with some tour operators indicate that they are concerned with the current changes and the affect on the environment.

Good public relations and marketing is essential. There is a worldwide interest in medical use of plants, which can attract researchers. It means that the organization needs to rebuild her image through good public relations and promotion. The organization also needs to work on partnering with airline companies to promote its products. STINASU should make use of the fact that they are the only organization that make tourism available in the PA’s and collaborate more with all the
stakeholders within the tourism sector. The organization needs to be more active within the society, at schools, the media and it should communicate more with all the actors within the conservation and ecotourism branch. The interviews with the management suggest that there are some ideas on the table and some projects are implemented but it seems that they are on an island and nobody except the management knows what really is going on.

4.2.4. Threats

There are several threats such as mining activities, surrounding and near the BNP, illegal gold diggers, and use of mercury and loss of biodiversity, pollution, and availability of other destinations outside the PAs. Due to red tape researchers tend to look out for other places, outside the PAs and other countries. STINASU should therefore collaborate more with all the necessary institutions dealing with environmental threats and judicial authorities. There should be a continuous awareness program towards the general public through media.

A STINASU- led swot analysis (Symbiont 2009) indicates that management and staff have come to some critical success factors for a better performance. Some of these success factors are competent, motivated and service oriented employees, excellent facilities and infrastructure aimed at the tourists, good internal and external communication lines, sound financial administration, tourist-oriented and marketing policy, quality control (planning, monitoring, evaluation), written standard procedures, clear guest rules and most importantly a good understanding and relation with all the stakeholders such as the NCD, the Suriname Tourism Foundation (STF), local and international nature conservation organizations, NGOs, tour operators, local communities, civil society.

STINASU needs to work more on their internal organization and communication with staff and personnel. A work-plan or activity list and regular meeting with employees are some of the issues that need to be addressed. These are simple but important things for every organization. If these issues are not addressed STINASU, partnering with others may not lead to success.

4.3. STINASU and private sector/tour operators

Interviews with the current management (interviewee 10 and 17) suggest that although organizations make use of the services provided by STINASU there are only a few that play a role in the daily activities, namely the transportation to and from the nature reserves and multiple use management
areas are outsourced to the local communities such as Stidunal, Johanna Margaret and Witagron. WWF Guianas has a standing project in the GNR for the protection of endangered sea turtles.

The previous chapter already elaborated on the attempts to involve the private sector. The actual scene regarding STINASU and private tourism industry reveals a low appreciation for STINASU. Although the interviews covered a small portion of the total amount of tour operators, that have a relation with STINASU, it can be stated that the interviews from the private sector forms the general view of the private sector. Interviewee 1 also indicates that in 2005 Conservation International Suriname (CIS) set up a workshop for the private sector within the eco tourism sector and the conclusions was that the private sector was negative towards the role and functioning of STINASU. An important portion of trend setting tour operators has little trust in STINASU’s role and management, and evaluates its current deplorable performance as a rather damaging one for the tourist market.

These trend setting tour operators are of the opinion that the sites of STINASU are the most visited sites, but because of poor accommodation and services provide by STINASU many tour operators are reluctant to bring foreign tourists to one of STINASU’s destinations. The empirical data available from tour operators is that they are not content with the quality of STINASU’s products; they find them not up to standard. Rules are not clear and written. In their view STINASU should stimulate eco-certification of boat transports, guides etc. Tour operators also mention the lack of management at the sites, the inadequate reservation system and therefore they recommend that the organization should improve its internal organization in order to provide adequate service operation through continuously training of staff and try to develop a management system independent of the government. STINASU should also foster more environmental educational programs.

However the A 1 interviews also suggest that there are tour operators who are interested in commercial long-term partnerships. The possible partnerships that these tour operators foresee vary from adopting a lodge, leasing of the sites possible by tendering, rebuilding and renovating and exploitation of a site through a concession agreement. It seems that actors within this sector don’t discuss the issues and problems with each other, in order to find out what their capacities are.

---

3 The interviews covered were mostly done with tour operators that are members of the Association of Tour Operators in Suriname (VESTOR) and former members.
As already mentioned in chapter 2 there are some preconditions in order to have a successful PPP. Awortwi instigates that the fundamentals, which means in this context the incentives to share responsibility, the capabilities of the government i.e. STINASU to perform, also on the part of the private sector (tour operators in this case) and the willingness to work with STINASU and the government.

Careful review of the interviews with some tour operators suggest that they are willing to work with the public sector, under certain conditions. As previously mentioned the public sector i.e. STINASU should have a clear vision and the government should also have a clear policy. Furthermore, legislation must be updated; obsolete legislation is clearly a major obstacle in order for co management of PAs to take effect. On the other hand most of the tour operators in the country are one headed companies; this means a minimum capacity of personnel, fairly low budget. This has also to do with the fact that it takes some time to set up a company. There is also the problem that local banks are reluctant to finance operations that have a great risk factor especially in the interior. Thus tour operators face a lot of problems, not only when starting a company but also to maintain it.

4.3.1. Case Raleigh falls, an attempt to establish a PPP

Furthermore analysis suggests that in one case, where an international NGO tried to set up a state of the art tourist facility in the Raleigh falls, the preconditions of setting up a PPP were not met. The organizations have underestimated these preconditions. This project has not been successful for the following reasons.

An interview with the former director of the NGO indicates that the initiative was theirs. According to the former executive director of the NGO the government was very passive and vague. In this sense there was no collaboration. Every decision and every initiative came from the NGO. Furthermore the public sector entities, in this case, STINASU and NCD, were in his view, not capable to recruit the personnel needed for this project. He sensed a lot of frictions and tension between the organizations. Interviewee 7 indicates that at the beginning a stakeholder’s analysis was not performed and local communities near the vicinities of Raleigh falls have only been consulted, when the project already were materialized. This suggests that the opinion, the livelihoods, the rituals and habits of the Kwintis, the local community, has been neglected. This was also confirmed by the former head of NCD and by interviewee 15.
One of the preconditions, as stated in the Convention on Biological Diversity is that local communities must take part in activities that will affect their daily lives. IUCN also has conducted several studies whereby a key element for success and for eco tourism to last in PAs, is the participation and involvement of local communities. Also the role of the private sector, is utmost important. It is due to the tourism activities that there is some sort of economic activity, which can also benefit local people.

An interview with the former executive of the NGO concludes that the public sector was not willing to give away a part of their power. And he goes on stating that the project has learned that the local private sector was not ready for such a big project. It also gives away the underlying truth that partners are not willing to share responsibilities.

On the other hand interviewee 1 stated that at first this initiative was highly welcomed by STINASU. The NGO gave the management of STINASU the opportunity to travel to Peru and Ghana to experience how such a partnership is maintained and can be beneficial. Interviewee 1 also noted that the NGO seems to have a hidden agenda. In his perception the NGO wanted to have ownership of the area. And this was clearly not in line with overall policy of PAs. He furthermore stated that the NGO wanted to have rich American tourists to visits this site and that would mean that Raleigh falls would not be accessible anymore for local residents. This is certainly not in line with the bylaws of STINASU, as every PA should be available for all people. The NCD came in this picture because of construction and renovation of the infrastructure. The former Head of the NCD stated in an interview that everything was in place and some technical issues were yet to be smoothened out. He stated that a discussion point was the role of the local communities. This project was funded through the IDB and the donor wanted the local community not to have the traditional role such as the outsourcing of the kitchen, housekeeping, waste management etc. The role of the community should have been more on a management level, but the former head of NCD stated that the local people had limited skills. He also stated that the local community was consulted long after the project has taken effect. As former head of NCD he sensed distrust between the NGO and STINASU and that in essence there were different visions on what type of tourists to attract.

This example indicated that potential partners have not taken into account the fundamental characteristics of a PPP. Before entering into a PPP, organizations must be clear what it is that they really want to achieve, meaning that they should formulate a common goal; they should know their
strengths and weaknesses as to complement each other were possible. Trust and a long standing relation is a precondition. Furthermore, partners must be able to share the responsibilities and share the decisions. A prerequisite for establishing a PPP as covered in chapter 2 is a stakeholder analysis. The interviews led to conclude that a stakeholder’s analysis was not assessed. The outcome was distrust from the local communities towards STINASU. According to interviewee 1 the NGO wanted to have the overhead, which made it impossible for the project to succeed.

PPPs are thus not a panacea for organizations that are seeking to function efficiently and more effectively. It may be a viable option but literature shows that there also other types and forms possible for organizations to perform well. It is a necessity that the organization should have a clear vision and make several strategies to achieve the goals they have set forth.

4.4. STINASU and private sector initiative

4.4.1. Participation

As suggested in chapter 2 certain conditions need to be met before establishing a PPP. The main indicators described are trust, willingness and the participation of all actors, the capacity of the partners and sharing of information and responsibilities. Over the years STINASU has contracted several services out the the local communities. Interviews with management indicate that STINASU will contract out certain services to the CBOs in the BNP. These services that are contracted out are housekeeping, local tour guides, maintenance of the park and the restaurant. The local community therefore takes active part in this development within BNP through the Tjufanga Foundations, which is the representative of eight villages of Brownsberg. 4The outsourcing of services means that the local communities have a certain role in the contribution of preserving the environment through the ecotourism activities. It also means that they have a source of income and that they participate and also give ideas to STINASU. It also gives them a sense of responsibility to be able to contribute to this sector.

4.4.2. Sharing of responsibility

Interviews with management of STINASU indicate that there is a form of partnership with IAMGOLD, a gold mining multinational, which operates near the area of Brownsberg. This

4 Interview with management of STINASU
partnership constitutes that IAMGOLD will make funds available for a certain period of time to renovate the infrastructure of the BNP facilities. This partnership means that a permanent consultation takes places. The organizations that take part in this permanent management are STINASU, IAMGOLD, Tjufanga Foundation, NCD and all relevant stakeholders. This partnership clearly shows that actors share the responsibility and are accountable for their actions within the BNP activities. It also instigates that there is a willingness to work with each other and that actors have agreed that one or two organizations take the lead. The participation of the local communities is also very essential for this project to succeed and at this stage the participation of the local communities already takes effect before the start of the project. This will also motivate the local people to work and take active part in the renovation activities of the BNP.

As shown in the Raleigh falls case study, the communities’ non-participation was rather damaging for the project. Furthermore Suriname is confronted with many various kinds of indigenous people and tribal people, with their bere’s and lo’s, also the fact that they are very nomadic make it difficult for the GOS to have their participation when it concerns their interest. There is also rivalry between the different clans and most of the more educated ones are in the city or abroad. Therefore it is very difficult to begin a project in the interior. The South African experience also shows that the political will and enabling environment for private sector is a key element to look at. Countries that have successfully conserved their PAs and also have ecotourism have the legal framework and policy in place.

After careful reviewing the A 1 and A 2 interviews, the Surinamese situation suggest low coordination from the government and no political will to enable STINASU to professionalize. Clearly the GOS is not capable and ready to share the responsibilities with the private sector and to facilitate and share the decisions. Reviewing the weaknesses of STINASU and the high turnover of management it seems that the GOS is not committed to strengthen or improve the capacities of the organization.

STINASU most certainly can apply some of the measures such as the SANParks example (Fearnhead 2003). By establishing a new company with shareholders, which will be run like a

5 Bere’s and Lo’s are the branches of the different clans within the maroon communities.
business, STINASU can transfer the tourism activities to this company. The legal framework must be in place and revenues gained can be divided between STINASU and the new company.

For the existing PAs and tourism destinations STINASU need to work more closely with the private sector and local communities as to combine the different strengths and weaknesses. STINASU also need to look internationally and nationally for conservation funds in order to provide for continuous funding for the conservation of the environment and the natural resources.

STINASU has several strengths which can be used to form alliances with the private sector to tackle the issues and problems within the ecotourism branch. There are some weaknesses such as the fact that too little collaboration takes place with ecotourism organizations internationally and locally. Ecotourism organizations, tour operators have a certain expertise in marketing their products and this is where they can assist STINASU in promoting their products to the international market. STINASU can tap on their expertise of promotion, marketing and public relation, while STINASU can give them the expertise of her knowledge of the PAs and biological diversity.

In STINASU ‘s case there is no trust between the potential partners which can lead to the conclusion that when such a partnership would be initiated both organizations will not be willing to share the responsibility and information; the capacities within the organization and also within the private tour operators are not adequate as to merge to one organization. As the interviews suggest most tour operators are one headed companies and they don’t have the finance to assist STINASU, although they can make their marketing expertise available.

Therefore STINASU and the private sector should work closely together as to find common goals for economic benefits and the conservation of the PAs.
Chapter 5 Major findings and Conclusion

The findings after the empirical research and analysis are:

Public Private Partnerships may be beneficial for partners. Some advantages of PPP’s are allocation of financial resources, exchange of expertise and information, increase of output level of the organization, cost effectiveness and efficiency.

The preconditions for successful PPP’s are: shared common goals, shared responsibilities, capacity, willingness and trust, participation (stakeholder’s analysis), legislation/rules/procedures. These are some of the fundamental features and can form a set of indicators.

The analysis of private sector participation shows that tour operators are willing to collaborate with STINASU, under certain conditions. These conditions are: the government need to be more facilitating towards the private sector i.e. too much bureaucracy when starting a company, too much to deal with different departments for license, the need for the organization to be transparent with open communications vice versa, clear vision of the management, clear policy from the government towards conservation and ecotourism, facilitating the private sector in their tourism activities within the PAs, STINASU should not operate as a tour operator, their role should be facilitating and monitoring, more collaboration and sharing of information as worthy partners and lastly STINASU should works toward international standards in order to cope with the contemporary trend in the world.

Based on the indicators, the analysis shows that the preconditions of PPP’s are not met. Organizations such as international NGOs and tour operators, have underestimated the fundamental prerequisites. The analysis and the interviews clearly instigates that future partners should look for common goals and complement each other on their weaknesses. The key features and conditions of enabling a PPP such as trust and willingness of partners, sharing of information and responsibilities, participation of all stakeholders should be in all instances taken into account.

In conclusion, the interviews with the private sector indicate that organizations have not dealt or even thought about these issues. There are a lot of remarks from the private sector towards STINASU, but the former should also keep in mind that STINASU is a non-profit organization and conservation is a costly business. On the basis of the information gathered through the interviews, the conclusion can
be drawn that both, STINASU and the private sector, need to work on their own organizations regarding capacity and expertise. Both private and public entities need to work more towards transparency of the organizations and open communication. The interviews indicate that organizations don’t trust each other and between the lines there was a sense of hidden agendas. It also indicates that both organizations, public and private are not ready to form partnerships. The conclusion drawn from the interviews is that there are different visions and views within the private sector. It is clear that much work needs to be done, not only within the private sector, but also within the government with regards to legislation and capacity building and capturing the trust from the private sector. It seems that a champion is needed to lift up all the actors, because there is much talk but too little is done, not only within the public sector but also within the private sector.

Engaging with the private sector will not per see lead to improvement of STINASU’s conservational tasks and ecotourism activities. Thus partnership with private tour operators seems not to be an option at the moment, due to the fact that the key features of PPP are not met by both organizations.

The lessons learned from the SANParks experience can form the basis for improvement of the organization. As mentioned in Chapter 3 there are 11 PAs. Monitoring will be easier; when PAs are divided and separate units are set up for the different areas. STINASU should divide their tasks and set up a business venture for the ecotourism activities. They should in collaboration with the NCD lease out concessions through biddings and involve all actors, especially at the grassroots i.e. local communities and local businesses. Bidding will lead to competition which consequently leads to optimizing of standards. Concession lease, setting up infrastructure and good written agreement with sanctions will generate the financial resources.

There are though differences between both cases. In the Surinamese case STINASU and NCD has to deal with local communities that live around and near the vicinities. The local communities, indigenous people and maroons don’t’ always live in harmony with each other, which make it difficult to involve all the members of these communities. This has been a major block when trying to implement a project in the interior. Another problem is that the land rights of these communities are not sufficiently recognized within the national legislation. Tension arises regularly between clans and the government about these land rights and has formed a major obstacle in the development of the interior. It is therefore necessary that the GOS solve this problem that both local communities and others will benefit from activities and projects implemented in the interior.
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### Annex 1 List of Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. de Vries</td>
<td>Orange Travel</td>
<td>Director (chairman of VESTOR)</td>
<td>October 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Sijlbing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Former Director STINASU 1997-2003</td>
<td>November 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Djosetro</td>
<td>Ministry of Physical Planning, Land and Forest Management</td>
<td>Former Director STINASU 2006-2009</td>
<td>November 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Nelson</td>
<td>Moonlight Jungle Tours (STAT)</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>November 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Zalman</td>
<td>Access Travel</td>
<td>Director (Board member of VESTOR)</td>
<td>November 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Bodha</td>
<td>Rehanna Tours</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>November 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Nelson</td>
<td>Conservation International Suriname</td>
<td>Environmental Officer</td>
<td>November 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Themen</td>
<td>Tropical Gem</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>November 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Gummels</td>
<td>Oxygen Travel</td>
<td>Director (Board member of VESTOR)</td>
<td>November 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Djoeharie</td>
<td>STINASU</td>
<td>Director (2009-till now)</td>
<td>December 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Febis</td>
<td>STINASU</td>
<td>Legal officer</td>
<td>December 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Fredison</td>
<td>STINASU</td>
<td>Educational/research</td>
<td>December 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Ramcharan</td>
<td>STINASU</td>
<td>Research unit</td>
<td>December 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Esajas</td>
<td>Nature Conservation Division</td>
<td>Head of Education NCD</td>
<td>January 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Udenhout</td>
<td>Suriname Conservation Foundation</td>
<td>Chairman of Suriname Conservation Foundation</td>
<td>January 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Drakenstein</td>
<td>Nature Conservation Division</td>
<td>Former Head of Nature Conservation Division</td>
<td>January 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Amatroesijat</td>
<td>STINASU</td>
<td>Coordinator of Sites</td>
<td>January 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Sewradj</td>
<td>STINASU</td>
<td>Education unit</td>
<td>December 2009 / January 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Sabajo</td>
<td>MoPPLFM</td>
<td>Chair of steering comite STINASU</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Jong</td>
<td>MoPPLFM</td>
<td>Member of steering comite STINASU</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Mohamed Hoesein</td>
<td>MoPPLFM</td>
<td>Acting Permanent secretary Forest management</td>
<td>March 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2 Questionnaire

1. What kind of relation does your organization have with STINASU?

2. Does your organization make use of the services of STINASU?

3. Which services?

4. What is your opinion about the services? Accommodation, service friendly, sites etc.

5. What is the general opinion of the tourists about the sites that are managed by STINASU?

6. What is your opinion about the role of STINASU in the eco tourism sector and the task of preserving nature?

7. In your perception, does STINASU fulfill its tasks adequately?

8. What do you think of the organization as a whole? (Strengths and weaknesses, opportunities, threats)

9. Does your organization feel that STINASU limits your activities?

10. If STINASU were to outsource or contract out certain services would your organization be interested to work in partnership in order to i.e. exploit certain cites or lodges?

11. How was the relation with STINASU in the past and how is at present? How do you see the relationship in the future? What role should STINASU play, in your opinion, towards the private sector?

12. Should STINASU be more facilitating and stay with its core business i.e. nature preservation and education?

13. What kind of contribution can the private sector make towards nature preservation and development of the eco tourism sector?

14. What is your opinion of PPP (Private Public Partnership)? How do you envision this and what are the preconditions from the private sector/ civil society/NGOs?
In Artikel 1 lid 1 worden aan de wetten en reglementen van de Natuurbehoudende Huizen de voorwaarden voor het inrichten van deze huizen aangegeven. Het artikel 8 lid 1 wordt vanaf de zevende woord aan herzien en gekorrekt.

ARTIKEL 1

Kunnen menselijke woorden worden gebruikt?

De wet van 19 juli 1999 (StB 1999 no. 38 zt.) wordt herzien door StB 2002 no. 16, in het deel "Beslissing van de Minister van de Rechtszaken" opgenomen.

OVERZICHT VAN DE REPELIER SURLAN

President van de Republiek Suriname

Staatsbesluit van 6 september 2002, handtekenend de
BOOSIEBEEI WOORDEN DE JONGEREN LIJKEN DE VOLK ORGEL

GROND EN

1. VOOR DE MINISTERIE VAN KUNSTENLIJKE OORDENING

als volgt

ART. 22 en ART. 27, KAN NIEUW ART. 22 INGEVOERD, HUEK

ART. 27 WELKEN, Onder communisatie van het handboek

De beschrijving, onder vereniging van sub 1 en sub 2.

CN. 2

I. Artikelen
de beschrijving op en omfattende uitwerking van

K. Het onderwerp in de overeenkomst van de wetwijze regeling

2. In artikel 19, lid 1 worden

transport en de distributie van eenige

betrekkingen in het wetboek van de beschrijvingen:

en de erkenning van de

de de wetwijze regeling

en de erkenningen:

en de wetwijze regeling

G. De beschrijvingen, waarin in Internationaal Verenigd

Nederlandse wetwijze regelingen, van de ears

en erkenningen, opnieuw, opnieuw erkenningen en het

2005

No. 3
De

Deze kader aan de onderstaande registers is opgenomen:

1. Een verantwoordelijke Registers en Registerskamer

b. De registers en Registerskamer, optimaal exploitatie en het

bepakken tijd de aarde:

c. De controle op de naleving van regels en voorschriften met

verband,

locatiezoekeren, waar ook in Ministerieaal

de controle op het Rechthandel en de zorg van
del.

2. Het Registers en de Registerskamer in Registerskamers:

Interdepartmentaal verband,

de deelstukken in samenwerking de Koninklijke Registratie's, waar ook in

c. Een registers en Registerskamer, het can en ander in samenwerking met

verband,

c. De bodekamer, waar ook in Interdepartmentaal

op de bodekamer.

b. De registers, de Registerskamer, de aarde, het Registerskoor en

Interdepartementaal Rechthandel.

can de Rechthandel, opnieuw, het Registers, het Registerskoor en

De 2005
M. S. H. Hassankhan

de Ministre van Binnenlandse Zaken.
( hammered en Première du 6 septembre 2005

R. F. VESENTIAN

(Ocréven en Première du 6 septembre 2005

van dit Staatsblad bellet
Broedersen en Binnenlandse Zaken zijn met de uitvoer
fesionelle Commissie van de Unie voor de Groot- 
3. De Ministers van Nieuwbouw superieure Onderwijs

achtergrond.
2. Het resultaat van de verkoop van de dag van zith

Sinnuende achtergrond.
1. Dit Staatsblad moet in het Staatsblad van de Republiek

ARTICLE 11

zover niet hiervoorstellig van een andere minister opgelegd
registratieboek in de hand van de minister voor
of onderwijs en de hand van de minister voor
2. Dit ministerie is leden bestemd met de zorg voor deze

fieren in Friesland

bladregister het product van huis en houtproducenten de

caractere op de parafrase van leden van toezicht met

No, 9
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STINASU
Stichting Natuurbehoud
Suriname

Intentieverklaring betreffende de fusie tussen de Stichting
Natuurbehoud Suriname (Stinasu) en de Dienst Lands
Bos Beheer (LBB), Afdeling Natuurbeheer (NB) 15 april 2003

De Stichting Natuurbehoud Suriname (Stinasu), partij ter ene zijde

en

Dienst Lands Bosbeheer (LBB), Afdeling Natuurbeheer (NB), partij ter ander zijde,
in overweging nemende:

- de Natuurbeschermingswet 1954 welke ten doel stelt de bescherming
  en behoud van de in Suriname aanwezige Natuurnonumenten;
- de Jachtwet 1954 houdende voorzieningen tot bescherming van de fauna
  en tot regeling van de jacht in Suriname;
- het ontstaansdoel en de statuten van Stinasu;
- de wens van partijen om een sterke natuurbecnoersorganisatie te doen
  ontstaan;
- het streven om een efficiënt en duurzaam natuurbeheer te voeren;
- het Memorandum van Samenwerking tussen Dienst Lands Bos Beheer,
  Afdeling Natuurbeheer en Stichting Natuurbehoud Suriname dd. 12
december 1997.

Verzekerd dat de fusie tussen Stinasu en NB de beste mogelijkheid biedt om te geraken
tot een sterke Natuurbecnoorganisatie, welke op een effectieve en duurzaam wijze de
Natuur beheert,

besluiten partijen het volgende:

1. Dat partijen met deze verklaring tot uitdrukking brengen hun oprechte intentie om
te geraken tot een sterke natuurbeheersorganisatie, middels een fusie tussen
Stinasu en NB.

2. Deze fusie tussen Stinasu en NB te doen plaatsvinden volgens de als bijlage A
aangetekent implementatie schema.


47
3. NB is bij wet de afdeling die, namens het Hoofd van de Dienst Lands Bos Beheer, verantwoordelijk is voor het beheer van alle ingestelde natuurreservaten alsmede voor de controle op de naleving van bepalingen en besluiten, die op de Natuurbeschermingswet 1954 en de Jachtwet 1954 van toepassing zijn.

4. a. Bioprospecting projecten in natuurreservaten, in welke vorm dan ook, vallen onder de verantwoordelijkheid van LBB eq. NB.

b. Stinasu is verantwoordelijk voor toeristische activiteiten in de natuurreservaten.

5. Inzake bestaande onderzoeks- en bezoekerscentra in de natuurreservaten is Stinasu de beheerinstantie van deze faciliteiten.

6. Partijen zullen elkaar voor de duur van deze Intentieverklaring waar mogelijk, op andere gebieden dan onderzoek en educatie, technisch en financieel bijstaan.

7. Stinasu en NB zullen elkaar regelmatig op de hoogte stellen van bestaande en geplande activiteiten.


9. Eventueel gerezen conflicten, misverstanden, interpretatieverschillen tussen partijen primair op te lossen dmw concensus en wel volgens onderstaande methode:
   1. Directeur Stinasu en Hoofd Afdeling Natuurb. treden in overleg met elkaar ter oplossing van het probleem. Indien er geen overeenstemming is bereikt dan treedt punt 2 in werking.
   2. Directeur Stinasu met kleine staf -(maximaal 3 stafleden) en Hoofd Natuurb. treden in overleg met elkaar. Indien er geen overeenstemming is bereikt dan treedt punt 3 in werking.
   3. Het probleem wordt door de in punt 2 genoemde functionarissen besproken met het Hoofd LBB en de Vz. van het Bestuur van Stinasu of zijn daartoe aangewezen vervanger. Indien er toch geen overeenstemming is bereikt dan treedt punt 4 in werking.
   4. Het probleem wordt tenslotte voorgelegd aan de Minister NH ter beslissing.
   5. Het totaal proces (punt 1 t/m punt 3) duurt niet langer dan 3weken. Hierna wordt binnen 1 week de Minister van NH gevraagd, zo spoedig mogelijk uitsluitsel te geven.

10. Dat Partijen gezamenlijk op zoek zullen gaan naar technische assistentie en/of financiële middelen voor de ondersteuning in de verschillende fasen van het implementatie schema.
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11. Dat alle door partijen te nemen besluiten in de afzonderlijke organisaties, vanaf het moment van ondertekening van deze Intentieverklaring, zullen geschieden in de geest van de aan te gane fusie.

12. Bijlage A vormt een integraal deel van deze Intentieverklaring, welke uiterlijk op 31 oktober 2004 eindigt of zoowel eerder, als de fusie tussen Stinasu en NB heeft plaatsgevonden of als de Minister van NH de werking van deze Intentieverklaring stopzet.

Heden te Paramaribo, 15 april 2003

Hfd. Afd. Natuurbeheer,

Ir. F. Baal
Hfd. LBB
Drs. C. Jukka

Direkteur Stinasu,

H. Sijlbing

Vz. Bestuur Stinasu

Ch. Stijlberg

STINASU