



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.: General
25 September 2026
English only

Conference of the Parties

Seventeenth meeting

Yerevan, 19-30 October 2026

Item 8 (a) of the provisional agenda*

**Resource mobilization and financial
mechanism: resource mobilization**

Study on how the guidance on safeguards in biodiversity finance mechanisms adopted in decisions XII/3 and 14/15 has been implemented, identifying good practices and lessons learned, as well as opportunities for improving implementation of the guidance**

Note by the Secretariat

Introduction

1. In decision 16/34 the Executive Secretary was requested, subject to the availability of resources, to commission, or undertake, alongside relevant international institutions, studies on: (a) the relationship between debt sustainability and the implementation of the Convention; (b) how the guidance on safeguards in biodiversity finance mechanisms adopted in decisions XII/3 and 14/15 has been implemented, identifying good practices and lessons learned, as well as opportunities for improving implementation of the guidance; and (c) the relationship between biodiversity and climate finance (para. 26 (b)).
2. A study on how the guidance on safeguards in biodiversity finance mechanisms adopted in decisions XII/3 and 14/15 has been implemented, identifying good practices and lessons learned, as well as opportunities for improving implementation of the guidance is provided in the present document. The study has been prepared by an independent consultant who was commissioned by the Secretariat. Notification No. [2026-017](#) was issued on 4 February 2026 to invite peer reviews of an earlier draft. Notification No. [2026-026](#) was issued to extend the deadline for the peer review of the document to 20 May 2006, following a request by the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at its sixth meeting. The present final draft considered all inputs received until this deadline.
3. The document is issued in the form and language in which it was received.

* [CBD/COP/17/1/Rev.1](#)

** The present document is being issued without formal editing.

Study on how the guidance on safeguards in biodiversity finance mechanisms adopted in decisions XII/3 and 14/15 has been implemented, identifying good practices and lessons learned, as well as opportunities for improving implementation of the guidance

Prepared in response to decision 16/34: Resource mobilization, paragraph 26(b)(ii)

2 September 2026

Acknowledgements

This study was prepared as a technical input in response to decision 16/34, paragraph 26(b)(ii), of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity and was commissioned by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

The Secretariat and the author are grateful to the Parties and to the intergovernmental, United Nations, observer and academic organizations listed below, which provided reviews on an earlier draft. Their input strengthened the study's technical and analytical robustness and balance. Responsibility for the final text, and for any errors or omissions, rests with the author; the views expressed do not necessarily reflect those of the Secretariat or the reviewing Parties and organizations.

Contributor Index: Reviewing Parties and Organizations

Parties: Argentina; Germany; Japan; Netherlands; Norway; Peru; Switzerland; United Kingdom.

United Nations and intergovernmental bodies: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights; Biodiversity Credit Alliance;

Observer organizations, networks and academic institutions: Alliance of Bioversity International and CIAT; African Wildlife Economy Institute; Stellenbosch University; Organización Nacional Indígena de Colombia; Association des Jeunes Courageux du Congo; Forest and Finance Coalition; Forest Stewardship Council; Friends of the Earth International; Friends of the Earth Malaysia; Greenpeace International; International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED); Institutional Investors Group on Climate Change (IIGCC); The Nature Conservancy; Synapse Colombia; The Common Initiative.

Study on how the guidance on safeguards in biodiversity finance mechanisms adopted in decisions XII/3 and 14/15 has been implemented, identifying good practices and lessons learned, as well as opportunities for improving implementation of the guidance

Prepared by Gonzalo Oviedo, Consultant

I. Introduction

1. At its twelfth meeting, the Conference of the Parties adopted voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms ([decision XII/3](#), annex III). The guidelines indicate, inter alia, that the potential effects of biodiversity financing mechanisms on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities to be addressed effectively, in accordance with national legislation, and that particular attention needs to be given to the impacts on, and contribution of, indigenous peoples and local communities as well as women, and to ensure their effective participation in the selection, design, and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.
2. At its thirteenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties ([decision XIII/20](#), para. 26) requested the Executive Secretary to compile and analyse information, including good practices or lessons learned, on how Parties, other Governments, international organizations, business organizations and other stakeholders take the voluntary guidelines into account when selecting, designing and implementing biodiversity financing mechanisms, and when developing instrument-specific safeguards for indigenous peoples and local communities, in accordance with decision XII/3, paragraph 16.
3. At its fourteenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties ([decision 14/15](#), para 7) urged Parties, other stakeholder organizations and other institutions to continue using the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms in designing and operating their financing mechanisms and in setting up their safeguard systems, and provided further guidance through a technical checklist contained in the annex to the said decision.
4. At its sixteenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties ([decision 16/34](#), para 9) urged Parties, the private sector, financial institutions and multilateral development banks to put in place and enforce social and environmental safeguards and apply a human rights-based approach in developing or scaling up biodiversity and finance instruments, in particular for innovative schemes, in line with the voluntary guidelines for safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms ([decision XII/3](#), annex III) and with the guidance provided in [decision 14/15](#). Further, in para 26 (b) (ii) of [decision 16/34](#) the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretariat to conduct a study on how the guidance on safeguards in biodiversity finance mechanisms adopted in decisions [XII/3](#) and [14/15](#) has been implemented, identifying good practices and lessons learned, as well as opportunities for improving implementation of the guidance.
5. The CBD "Strategy for resource mobilization for the period 2025–2030", adopted by the Conference of the Parties in the aforementioned [decision 16/34](#), Annex 1, contains several provisions reinforcing the need to apply social and environmental safeguards. Among the enabling actions, the Strategy in para 4 (i) proposes "Encouraging multilateral development banks and, as applicable, other international financial institutions that are working on environmental and social safeguards [...] to continue and intensify, to the extent possible, that work, in line with their respective mandates". In relation to the mobilization of new and additional resources, the Strategy calls for the application of environmental and social safeguards when stimulating and increasing innovative schemes (6 (a)); leveraging international private finance and promoting blended finance (6 (c)); significantly increasing domestic private finance for biodiversity through partnerships (11 (c)); stimulating innovative schemes (11 (d)); significantly increasing the use of nature-based solutions and/or ecosystem-based approaches at the national and subnational levels (11 (f)). The view of CBD Parties,

therefore and as demonstrated in the various provisions of the Strategy, is that social and environmental safeguards should be an integral part of resource mobilization under the Strategy, whenever there is a need for effectively avoiding or mitigating unintended impacts of financing mechanisms on different elements of biodiversity, as well as on indigenous peoples and local communities' rights and livelihoods.

6. Following the request from the Conference of the Parties in para 26 (b) (ii) of [decision 16/34](#), on 26 September 2025 the Executive Secretary issued Notification 2025-122¹ Survey for study on safeguards in biodiversity finance mechanisms, inviting Parties, other Governments, indigenous peoples and local communities, as well as relevant stakeholder organizations, including the private sector, financial institutions and multilateral development banks, to complete a short survey with questions on experiences of implementation of the CBD voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms. As of 14 November 2025, twenty-one responses were received by the Executive Secretary with information and views about the implementation of safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms – ten from Parties² and eleven from other relevant organizations.³

7. To move forward on the task requested in [decision 16/34](#), the Executive Secretary engaged an independent consultant to prepare a study on how the CBD guidance on safeguards in biodiversity finance mechanisms has been implemented, identifying good practices and lessons learned, as well as opportunities for improving implementation. A first draft of the study was informed by the discussions held on the topic during the sixteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the experience and expertise of the consultant, the selected expert interviews that the consultant conducted, and inputs from key staff at the Secretariat, and was presented at the sixth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, held in Rome, 16–19 February 2026, under Item 3 (a) of the agenda on Resource Mobilization, in document [CBD/SBI/6/INF/18](#).

8. From the outset, the study was framed as an initial review of the experiences in using the CBD guidance on safeguards, identifying good practices and lessons, and an appraisal of how the existing safeguard systems of a range of institutions correspond or align with the CBD Guidelines, so as to identify opportunities for synergies and harmonization. The study was not designed to assess on-the-ground implementation of the Guidelines or of systems of other institutions, to create or propose new safeguard systems, or to compile knowledge from field-based documented cases studies; all such undertakings are valuable in their own, but are outside the remit of the present work.

9. The first draft of the study offered an initial overview, highlighted salient elements of the review of experiences, including good practices and lessons learned, regarding the implementation of safeguards in biodiversity financing, and offered preliminary elements for potential conclusions and recommendations on the way forward. In Section II the document summarized submissions received by the Executive Secretary on experiences in relation to using the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms and other aspects of safeguards implementation in biodiversity financing mechanisms; in Section it III provided a more detailed analysis of the systems of twenty-nine selected institutions in relation to the guidance provided in the CBD Convention and decisions, the purpose of which was to draw lessons on good practises and identify possible areas for improvement in the CBD guidance. Section IV of the document summarized the main conclusions of the review and suggested further steps.

¹ First notification 2025-122 - <https://www.cbd.int/notifications/2025-122>. Second notification 2025-137 - <https://www.cbd.int/notifications/2025-137>

² Albania, Brazil, Central African Republic, El Salvador, France, Germany, Guinea, Honduras, The Netherlands and Peru.

³ African Wildlife Economy Institute, Biodiversity Credit Alliance, CIFOR-ICRAF, Earthmind, Energy Research Solutions Inc, Finance For Biodiversity Foundation, the GEF, University of Limerick from Ireland, Naturalis Biodiversity Center, Tany Meva Foundation and University of Gothenburg from Sweden.

II. Comments received from Parties and other Stakeholders on the first draft of the Study

1. As reported in document [CBD/SBI/6/INF/17](#), 18 Parties and 12 observers submitted statements to SBI6 under agenda item 3 (a) (resource mobilization and financial mechanism: resource mobilization), through the early submission process.

2. During deliberations on the indicated agenda item at SBI-6, 25 additional statements were presented by Parties and observers⁴. Altogether, the 55 early submissions and on-site statements addressed a range of topics relevant to resource mobilization, with a primary focus on enhancing funding, improving access and equity in funding, safeguarding resource access and utilization from conditionalities, enhancing funding specifically for indigenous peoples and local communities indigenous peoples and local communities, and ensuring effective participation and respect for the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities. The importance of social safeguards was acknowledged, and more specifically the value of undertaking the present study on safeguards in biodiversity finance mechanisms was confirmed. Participants stressed the critical importance of greater outreach and engagement of a wider range of stakeholders in further developing the study.

3. By the time of the extended deadline for the peer review, 26 participants had submitted their comments to the draft study (8 Parties and 18 observers)⁵, either through comments inserted in the text, or through separate comments contained in email texts and attachments.

4. Feedback from peer reviewers included general comments, as well as specific suggestions for changes on the text. Feedback from the peer review process can be summarized as follows:

(a) External standards: Most financial institutions use their own frameworks (such as those of the World Bank or the IFC) instead of the CBD's specific guidelines, therefore compatibility or synergies are very important in practice.

(b) Capacity gaps: There is a critical lack of technical and financial resources in organisations to monitor and implement safeguards correctly.

(c) Importance of FPIC: It is reaffirmed that Free, Prior and Informed Consent is essential to avoid conflicts and protect the rights of indigenous peoples. FPIC should be implemented in stages: not requesting consent as a one-off event, but maintaining a permanent consultation process with indigenous peoples throughout the life of the project.

(d) Need for practical tools: Users need simpler guides, checklists and platforms to share success stories, rather than theoretical documents.

(e) Technical Rigour: It is necessary to include clear rules on baselines (to measure impact), additionality, and mechanisms to correct results if the project fails (adjustment reserves).

(f) Digital Transparency: It is proposed to create independent georeferenced records and use unique identifiers to ensure faithful reporting.

(g) External Monitoring: Institutionalise audits and verifications carried out periodically by independent third parties.

(h) Linguistic Accessibility: Translate all technical information into languages and formats that local communities can truly understand.

(i) Legal and Policy Harmonisation: align international frameworks with the laws and policies of each country to avoid legal loopholes and facilitate implementation at the local level.

⁴ The list of Parties and Observers' statements is presented in Annex 2, with highlights of the statement and feedback from the study author.

⁵ The list of Parties and Observers' submissions is presented in Annex 3, with highlights of the submissions and feedback from the study author.

(j) Rights-based Approach: strengthen the protection of indigenous peoples and local communities rights and traditional knowledge, and ensure that grievance mechanisms are culturally appropriate.

(k) Operational Simplification: develop a simplified 'roadmap' for governments and others to facilitate the integration of safeguards into national legislation.

5. The feedback provided by peer reviewers offered many valuable insights and suggestions that have been useful to enrich the conclusions of the study and to support efforts by Parties and stakeholders to implement the safeguards, and were reflected accordingly in the present draft.

6. A number of topics addressed in the reviews called for additional efforts and actions, beyond the remit of the actual study. Similarly, several reviews also commented more broadly on important topics that relate to the subject rather indirectly, such as the need for greater access to biodiversity funding to support efforts by indigenous peoples and local communities for biodiversity conservation. While comments on such topics are acknowledged and have been referenced in some cases, they have not been directly integrated in the text of the present document. The present section seeks to reflect these issues and to provide some comments and clarifications thereon.

7. Some comments from peer reviewers raised the need for further in-depth investigation and learning on the matter, combining different levels and types of analysis and research. For instance, several reviewers called for an analysis of the effectiveness of safeguards' implementation, based on on-the-ground evidence and community-based self-assessments, possibly coupled, as suggested by one reviewer, with a more substantive assessment that identifies overarching trends, convergences, divergences and gaps, articulating emerging patterns and priority issues.⁶

8. In considering this, it is important to note that the CBD Guidelines are not an implementation tool or mechanism, and therefore they cannot be assessed as a project-level instrument; they are policy guidelines aimed to provide strategic direction. Institutions implementing projects and actions on the ground (such as the institutions appraised for alignment with the CBD Guidelines in the present study) have their own instruments and tools for project-level safeguards application, and therefore they are the ones whose safeguard systems need to be evaluated for effectiveness in the context of their own specific interventions, using the CBD Guidelines as a policy reference. Thus, while outside of the scope of the present study, the need for effectiveness evaluations of safeguard systems remains valid, to be pursued at the appropriate level, keeping the CBD Guidelines as a policy reference.

9. In a similar vein, some comments questioned the approach to appraise "convergence" of safeguard systems with the CBD Guidelines, as it potentially conflates convergence for "functioning" of such systems. The study does not equate convergence with functioning, as it does not assess implementation of the systems. The interest of enquiring about convergence is to appraise the value and meaning of the Guidelines within the wider landscape of safeguards, not to assess implementation of those systems, which, as explained in the previous paragraph, is a valid, but a different issue, to be addressed from the implementers' systems angle.

10. Some peer reviewers addressed the issue of the status of the CBD Guidelines as voluntary, and proposed a "transition" from voluntary Guidelines to safeguards of obligatory application. While it is ultimately up to Parties to the Convention to consider and decide on such a step, a clarification is needed. In reality, the Guidelines are voluntary, but all projects funded under the CBD through the GEF as its financial mechanism are obliged to apply safeguards defined under the GEF safeguard policies, which are consistent with the Guidelines. The social and environmental safeguards of the eighteen GEF Agencies that implement projects under the CBD financial mechanism are to be applied in an obligatory manner and are a fundamental requirement for accessing and using funding; this includes funding channelled for KMGBF implementation. This is also true for GEF-managed

⁶ An exercise of this type was already undertaken in Section IV of document CBD/WG8J/10/6 of 2017. The conclusions of that section remain generally valid and would be a useful basis for further analyses.

funding under the other five Conventions to which the GEF is the financial mechanism. Therefore, it is safe to state that the voluntary status of the CBD Guidelines does not curtail the obligatory implementation of safeguards under the CBD funding mechanism, because such obligation derives from the statutory requirements of implementing bodies that respond to CBD policies. The recommendations from this study, therefore, do not include a specific call for transitioning from voluntary to obligatory guidelines, but to improve the CBD guidance in a way that better supports enforcing safeguard implementation by implementing agencies.

III. Summary of submissions to the survey on implementation of the voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms

11. As indicated earlier, as of 14 November 2025, twenty-one responses had been received by the Executive Secretary with information and views about the implementation of safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms. The key themes, lessons learned, opportunities and challenges identified through the survey are described below. Responses have been anonymised and are not presented in any particular order.

12. One respondent reported that they did not specifically apply the CBD voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms. They suggested however that the guidelines could be improved by providing continuous training for staff and partners on safeguards and best practice, clear guidance materials, including practical checklists and implementation guides aligned with the CBD, technical support for socio-environmental risk assessment, tools for real-time monitoring and reporting of impacts, and exchange of experiences and success stories between different projects and countries. The respondent further emphasized that safeguarding should be integrated throughout the entire project cycle - from initial planning to final evaluation. They called for encouraging active community participation in defining safeguard criteria and recommended harmonizing international safeguard guidelines with national legislation and policies to close implementation gaps and ensure coherence. Furthermore, mechanisms for continuous learning and iterative updating of safeguards - based on practical experience - should be established.

13. One respondent highlighted that, although institutional frameworks have been established to apply the CBD's guidelines on safeguards, insufficient capacity and financial resources have hindered their effective implementation. It was further emphasized that safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, taking into account country-specific processes and legislation as well as relevant international agreements such as the CBD, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP).

14. In another survey response, it was reported that although the CBD guidance is not specifically applied, environmental safeguards (or conditionalities) were given to new projects according to the environmental law, with similar objectives. Environmental permits include safeguards or conditions that are mandatory and included in an environmental bond. The respondent shared a key lesson learned was that clear, well-defined safeguards are an essential prerequisite for environmental bond issuance. A challenge encountered in the application of safeguards was the valuation of biodiversity. Regarding positive outcomes from applying the guidelines on safeguards, it was observed that these have contributed to fulfilling environmental legislation. It was noted that to improve the application of safeguards, national guidelines would be needed to support the implementation of biodiversity-related projects and environmental permitting. Further emphasis was placed on the need for enhanced support for countries developing safeguard systems and strengthening national capabilities in biodiversity finance systems, particularly through initiatives like UNDP's BIOFIN initiative.

15. Another respondent reported that although it does not apply the checklist of safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms under the CBD, it does use guidelines and checklists on free, prior and informed consent, stakeholder engagement, and capacity building. They highlighted however, that they incorporate safeguards into their work by integrating biodiversity protection into

existing policies, using specific funding mechanisms (such as environmental taxation), and strengthening regulatory and institutional frameworks. The lack of sufficient funds to achieve biodiversity targets, insufficient coordination between stakeholders, and the lack of clear and effective monitoring indicators to assess the impact of financing measures on biodiversity as significant challenges in applying the CBD's guidelines on safeguards were identified as key challenges. Nonetheless, it noted increased protection of ecosystems, as well as the increased governance and social equity, as positive outcomes observed from applying guidelines on safeguards. Some good practices and lessons learned in applying the guidelines on safeguards were also shared. These included strategies to increase capacity building for eco-guards and communities, as well as combating poaching and illegal trade. It was noted that building stronger partnerships and increasing technical and methodological support could also help improve the application of safeguards in their work. Finally, increased funding from organizations such as the GEF was recommended as an option to improve the existing guidance on safeguards under the CBD.

16. One respondent reported that its approach to safeguards is guided by the work of the International Advisory Panel on Biodiversity Credits (IAPB), the Biodiversity Credit Alliance (BCA) and the World Economic Forum (WEF), partners to the Framework for High Integrity Biodiversity Credit Market and the High-Level Principles to Guide the Biodiversity Credit Market. Key challenges in applying these guidelines included ensuring ecological and financial additionality of biodiversity credits. With regards to potential benefits from applying the CBD guidelines, it was suggested that alignment with the CBD guidelines might enhance buyer confidence in the biodiversity credit framework. Good practices and lessons learned in applying guidelines on safeguards for biodiversity credits include measurable and verifiable evidence of positive biodiversity outcomes, ensuring ecological and financial additionality, long-term durability, local ecological equivalence, prioritizing mitigation hierarchies such as local-to-local and like-to-like. Credits should be independently verified by third parties, projects be governed locally, and secondary markets be prohibited. They could be used to support local compensation, supply chain insetting, and evidence-based contributions. It was emphasized that biodiversity credits should complement, and not replace other financing mechanisms. In response to the question on recommendations for improving existing guidance on safeguards, the respondent proposed to take into account ongoing and completed studies, as well as work by relevant stakeholders, such as IAPB, Biodiversity Credit Alliance (BCA), and the World Economic Forum (WEF).

17. Another respondent reported that it applies the International Finance Corporation (IFC) Performance Standards as a core reference for environmental and social safeguarding. These standards are integrated into its national funding programme, which supports climate and biodiversity protection projects in non-OECD countries. All project proposals submitted to the programme must comply with its Safeguards Policy, which is aligned with the IFC Performance Standards. Project applications are subject to a mandatory compliance screening process to ensure adherence to IFC Performance Standards. Recipients of funding are required to report regularly on the status of environmental and social risks, as well as on mitigation measures implemented throughout the project lifecycle. In the event of serious incidents, immediate reporting is required within 72 hours and promptly followed up by the funding mechanism's safeguards team. A challenge encountered in the application of the guidelines on safeguards is that there is often limited awareness and institutional capacity among implementing organizations to effectively manage environmental and social risks in accordance with the IFC Performance Standards or broader safeguard frameworks. Key lessons learned include that projects are more effective in avoiding negative environmental and social impacts and in enhancing positive outcomes when environmental and social risks are addressed from the earliest stages of project planning. Proactive integration of safeguard measures into project design, combined with a participatory planning approach, have proven essential in ensuring that projects deliver tangible benefits for biodiversity and communities, while upholding international standards. Since the IFC Performance Standards are applied in its project implementation, the respondent noted that a concise gap analysis comparing IFC Performance Standards with the CBD's safeguard guidance would allow for the identification of potential gaps in operational practice.

18. One survey respondent indicated that it does not use the CBD checklist of safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms, and instead relies on guidelines from other partner institutions, such as the United Nations Development Programme and the World Bank. Expanding on this, the respondent explained that safeguards are primarily integrated into their work through each institution's particular policies, plans, and managed frameworks. It was highlighted that capacity constraints are a particular challenge in applying the guidelines on safeguards. They further reported that the respect for environmental safeguards principles across relevant frameworks is a positive outcome it has observed. The respondent expressed scepticism about the effectiveness of safeguards in achieving their intended outcome, and that capacity strengthening would help improve the application of safeguards. It was recommended that communications on the subject should be improved, as well as strengthening the capacity of CBD focal points as potential methods for improving the existing guidance on safeguards under the CBD.

19. In another response, it was reported that safeguards are integrated through involving multi-stakeholder and multi-level participation, recognizing the importance of awareness and ownership of intervention by local actors, communities and indigenous peoples, while respecting gender approaches, interculturality, intergenerational and ancestral knowledge for ecosystem-based solutions. It was noted that a key challenge was the duplication of interventions in the same territory by NGOs, international technical and financial cooperation actors, and public sector institutions, often due to lack of shared data or a unified information system to track ongoing or completed projects and the application of safeguards under national and international commitments. This calls for harmonization of approaches and tools, according to the respondent. They shared that safeguards application the integration of free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC), with the participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, is a key lesson learned. Adding to this, they indicated that financial support for technical assistance and capacity-building, including training programs under the CBD, would be instrumental in strengthening the capacity of public officials responsible for the implementation of safeguard guidelines in project execution.

20. Another survey respondent reported that it does apply the guidance on safeguards in biodiversity finance mechanisms under the CBD and that it utilizes the checklist from decision 14/15 as part of its safeguarding framework. In addition, the relevant ministry has developed a national Environmental and Social Safeguards Framework, comprising of safeguards tailored to the national context and aligned with international standards, including the proposed guidance of the CBD. The framework aims to prevent negative impacts of climate projects while enhancing their direct and indirect benefits for people and nature. The framework is integrated into all national programs, projects, and initiatives - including those funded by national budgets and international cooperation - across all stages: design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. Monitoring mechanisms are based on national and international guidelines, and each project includes designated safeguarding officers responsible for ensuring compliance. Special attention is given to the participation of indigenous peoples, in accordance with the recognition of the rights of indigenous peoples including the application of Free, Prior, and Informed Consultation processes. While safeguard frameworks are well-established in policy, the effective implementation is hindered by significant challenges, particularly in ensuring meaningful participation, addressing capacity gaps, and aligning national and international standards in complex, multi-stakeholder contexts. Indigenous peoples, in particular, often lack access to accessible, and culturally appropriate information about projects and their potential impacts. Cultural and linguistic diversity, combined with historical mistrust of state institutions, has hindered in some cases the full realization of Free, Prior, and Informed Consultation and participatory decision-making processes. Ensuring the inclusive representation of all community groups - including women, youth, and vulnerable people - also remains a persistent challenge. From a technical and administrative perspective, effective safeguard implementation requires trained personnel, inter-institutional coordination, and adequate resources for project formulation, execution, monitoring, and evaluation. Limited capacity and logistical constraints have affected the quality and consistency of social and environmental impact monitoring. The complexity of projects funded through a mix of national and international cooperation has led to regulatory inconsistencies and

alignment challenges between national and international safeguard standards, complicating compliance. Furthermore, identifying and mitigating indirect impacts - such as changes in land use, migration patterns, or cultural disruption - remains a critical gap. Another key challenge lies in ensuring that prior consultations are conducted in full respect for community self-determination, free from political or economic pressures. It was noted that the effective application of environmental and social safeguards has yielded significant positive outcomes in line with the objectives of the CBD and strengthened the protection of the rights of indigenous peoples, ensuring their meaningful participation in decision-making processes and respecting their culture, territory and self-determination. The safeguards have helped prevent negative environmental and social impacts, reduced conflicts, built trust among stakeholders, and promoted transparent, inclusive governance. Furthermore, safeguarded projects have delivered sustainable direct and indirect benefits, including biodiversity conservation, forest protection, and enhanced social inclusion, particularly for women, youth, and vulnerable groups, demonstrating that rights-based approaches are essential for successful and lasting outcomes in climate and environmental projects. The following good practices in the application of the safeguards were shared: conducting free, prior, and informed consultations, adapted to the cultural and linguistic context; ensuring effective participation of indigenous and local communities throughout all project phases; early planning, sustained technical support, inter-institutional coordination, and continuous staff training for effective implementation; monitoring and feedback mechanisms for timely identification and mitigation of risks; and demonstrate experiences that show that safeguards strengthen the protection of rights, prevent risks, and enhance both social and environmental outcomes of projects.

21. Similarly to another respondent, another reported that they often refer to the IFC Performance Standard 6, and for wild plant harvesting to the FairWild standard. These standards were used to explore voluntary measures for ensuring sustainable, legal, and equitable wildlife-based and wildlife-friendly goods and services. They noted the challenge of a widespread lack of understanding of the potential role for voluntary standards and certification schemes to ensure sustainable outcomes and assure stakeholders of these outcomes. They emphasized the need for the development and implementation of standards and certification schemes for wild animals and wild plants. It also called for the adoption of safeguards of the type of IFC Performance Standard 6 in wildlife-friendly enterprises, including tourism, agriculture, and livestock production.

22. One respondent indicated that they do not follow the voluntary guidelines for safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms under the CBD, but that it does assess whether entities receiving development finance from its development assistance have adequate safeguards and risk management systems in place. Furthermore, they reported that safeguards are integrated into their work via a risk analysis process embedded into their appraisal procedures, which precedes any decision on new commitments or financial allocations. Furthermore, external advice may be sought through various processes, and that dialogue on risk also constitutes an important part of the monitoring process following financial allocations. The respondent highlighted that due to the reliance on the entities receiving financial allocations, monitoring and reporting remains one of the largest challenges it has observed on the application of the guidelines on safeguards. They claim to have seen little benefit or positive outcomes from applying the guidelines on safeguards, but highlighted that they assume the guidelines on safeguards under the CBD have been providing incentives for relevant entities to put in place adequate safeguards. Regarding recommendations for improving the existing guidance on safeguards under the CBD, increased awareness among relevant entities was suggested.

23. Another respondent welcomed the CBD's survey to improve the applicability of the voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms as a timely and ambitious step toward addressing the biodiversity finance gap. They added that while principles developed (and under development) for biodiversity credit mechanisms are specifically designed for biodiversity credit markets, they also provide valuable operational guidance that can strengthen the integrity of a broader range of biodiversity-related financial instruments. The strong alignment in foundational intent

between the CBD safeguards and those such as the High-Level Principles (HLPs) to Guide the Biodiversity Credit Market - such as preventing harm and promoting positive outcomes for biodiversity and communities, recognizing biodiversity's intrinsic value and its role in resilience, emphasizing rights-based approaches (including FPIC and tenure), and grounding of safeguards in national and international legal frameworks (e.g., UNDRIP, UNFCCC) were strong points. It was noted that they also share commitment to transparency and accountability, while the HLPs would advance more rigorous measures such as third-party audits, public registries and grievance mechanism. The following enhancements to strengthen the CBD safeguards and ensure their coherence and applicability across both voluntary and regulatory biodiversity finance mechanisms, while supporting convergence with emerging standards in nature-based financial solutions were recommended: (i) Codify outcome integrity through explicit provisions on baselines, additionality, durability, leakage, and crediting periods, including conservative ex-ante estimation, ex-post adjustment, and buffer mechanisms. Indicator selection should be documented and tied to a Theory of Change, with public disclosure of indicator-to-unit conversion methods, including treatment of uncertainty and reversals; (ii) Institutionalize independent monitoring via third-party validation and verification at project initiation and at regular intervals (e.g., every five years), with clear conflict-of-interest safeguards; (iii) Strengthen transparency in issuance and tracking by promoting the use of independent digital registries with unique identifiers, geo-referenced project areas, and clear records of issuance, transfer, and retirement; (iv) Introduce demand-side integrity guidance to ensure buyers apply the mitigation hierarchy, disclose nature-related strategies and claims, and address equivalence and acceptable claims language, particularly in compensation or offsetting contexts; (v) Deepen indigenous peoples, local communities, and Afro-descendant indigenous peoples and local communities governance and equity through stage-gated FPIC, meaningful roles in project governance (including the option to act as proponents or beneficiaries), co-designed and transparent benefit-sharing with pre-consent capacity building, and accessible grievance mechanisms aligned with UNDP best practices; (vi) Embed indigenous data sovereignty through safeguards on data ownership, consent, privacy, and clarity regarding public versus private datasets, agreed through FPIC; (vi) Align safeguards explicitly with GBF Target 19 and national NBSAPs, with public disclosure of project governance, credit ownership, and location context, including overlaps with indigenous territories; (vii) Update the checklist of [decision 14/15](#) to include operational items such as additionality tests, baseline and counterfactual definitions, durability commitments, leakage assessments, MRV disclosure (including indicator-to-unit conversion and uncertainty treatment), auditor independence and cadence, registry and retirement protocols, indigenous peoples and local communities and Afro-descendant data sovereignty, benefit-sharing transparency, and grievance mechanism accessibility.

24. One organization reported that it uses its own set of environmental and social safeguards. These safeguards are applied to all recommendations, projects, and proposals issued by the organization. Compliance is monitored at the level of the organization's Project Management Unit, which oversees all project activities to ensure adherence to safeguard requirements. One significant challenge faced is that stringent safeguard requirements may disqualify investments in contexts where institutional frameworks for representativity, land tenure, and the rule of law are weak or underdeveloped. It was therefore proposed that a library of case studies could significantly enhance the application of CBD safeguard guidance. Another recommendation was to explore the development of Artificial Intelligence (AI)-driven guidance assistants to potentially support the application of safeguard guidelines in specific project contexts⁷.

25. In another survey response submission, the respondent noted that they are somewhat familiar with the guidance on safeguards in biodiversity finance mechanisms under the CBD, and that they have applied the voluntary guidelines. They have used the checklist of safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms under the CBD as well. They added that in their particular case, they have

⁷ The author of this study notes that the exploration of artificial intelligence use in safeguards is a potentially sensitive subject with widely varying views, and should therefore be considered cautiously. The recommendation shared in this section is however extracted from the survey results and should not be considered as a recommendation being made by the overall study.

developed blockchain-based MRV systems with integrated safeguards, which are aligned with International Capital Market (ICMA) Green Bond Principles, Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) 304, the TNFD framework, and Science-Based Targets for Nature. The respondent advised that they integrate these safeguards into their work through technology infrastructure. This includes blockchain MRV platforms, IoT monitoring, and real-time verification systems embedded into green bonds. Moreover, they develop models for regional banks to integrate CBD safeguards into lending decisions. They also recognized several challenges faced in applying these guidelines on safeguards, including the lack of standardized infrastructure for safeguards monitoring, information asymmetry between biodiversity-rich countries and financial institutions, high costs for manual verification, regulatory uncertainty across jurisdictions, difficulty translating CBD policy into actionable business processes, limited capacity in regional financial institutions, and trust gaps. Nonetheless, they noted several anticipated benefits from applying the guidelines on safeguards under the CBD based on past experience with carbon markets, such as enhanced credibility with ESG investors, reduced criticism through transparent verification, improved risk management, better alignment with Indigenous community needs, competitive differentiation for early adopters, and facilitation of cross-border finance flows. Regarding good practices in applying the guidelines on safeguards, they highlighted technology-enabled verification, the use of MDBs as a channel to reach regional financial institutions, and further alignment with market standards as successful approaches worth noting. They recommended further implementation guidance for banks and green-bond issuers, technical assistance grants for pilot implementations, formalizing relationships with MDBs, increasing indigenous peoples and local communities capacity building, and the creation of a transparent public dashboard showcasing implementation as potential guidance that would help improve the application of safeguards in its work. Additionally, it was noted that integration with the Cali Fund, the strengthening of language in existing guidelines, and indigenous-led monitoring are some of the ways in which the existing guidance on safeguards under the CBD could be improved.

26. One survey respondent highlighted that they are very familiar with the guidance on safeguards in biodiversity finance mechanisms under the CBD, but prefer to use other guidelines such as IFC Performance Standard, PS6, and GN6. They reported that they use PS6 for evaluating commercial projects with potential environmental and social impacts. It was explained that understanding the critical synergies between biodiversity and impacted communities (which are often linked to the use and harvesting of wild species) is one of the greatest challenges it has faced in applying these guidelines on safeguards. They advised that there are many good practices and lessons learned regarding IFC PS6, but unfortunately these are not prevalent in the public domain. It suggests that the CBD could consider implementing a project to assist companies in developing case studies on potential PS6 applications. When considering what support or guidance would help improve the application of safeguards in its work, the respondent indicated that linkages to KMGBF Targets such as Targets 5 and 9 would be welcome. They further suggested that reviewing and updating the existing guidance on safeguards under the CBD would be useful, especially since the existing guidance predates the KMGBF. Moreover, they recommended improvements to the CBD guidelines on safeguards by adding biodiversity credits and integrating biodiversity and communities into carbon credits.

27. Another respondent noted that it is very familiar with the guidance on safeguards in biodiversity finance mechanisms under the CBD, and that it has applied the voluntary guidelines for safeguards in biodiversity financing. Considering this, they do not use the checklist of safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms under the CBD; instead using their own in-house policies on safeguards and their implementation. It was noted however, that their own policies cover the checklist of safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms under the CBD. The safeguards used by the respondent are widely used in their work, as their policy on safeguards is a prerequisite for all projects and programs funded by the organization. Regarding challenges faced in applying their guidelines, they highlighted that ensuring consistency of application of the policy and guidelines is a particular difficulty given the different safeguard policies and internal systems used across implementing partners. It was noted that safeguard guidelines under the CBD benefits recipient countries, as not all

countries have similar environmental and social safeguard policies as funding institutions. It was suggested that the exchange of good practices on the ground would be useful to improve the application of safeguards in their work, and noted that the existing guidance on safeguards under the CBD could be improved if the CBD shares its own good practices from different regions and themes.

28. One respondent drew attention to the use of a range of guidelines available to financial institutions (FIs) for ensuring social safeguarding mechanisms, such as the Equitable Earth Standard, the World Bank's Environmental and Social Standards, the International Finance Corporation (IFC)'s Performance Standards, the Equator Principles, the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, and that some FIs may also use their own in-house due diligence process with similar criteria. It noted that FIs may integrate aspects contained within the CBD guidelines by evaluating social impacts for stakeholders as well as ecosystem and climate impacts when considering opportunities and by including a number of key concepts in their decision-making, including in supply chain, community impacts, and worker rights. The respondent noted that engaging indigenous peoples and local communities in project development presents operational challenges, including ambiguity and inconsistency in the application of free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC). While increased transaction costs and dedicated timelines are inherent to FPIC, reinforcing a globally recognized approach can enhance practicability and reduce implementation barriers. Strengthening early-stage due diligence, improving clarity in communication, and increasing awareness through targeted training - particularly in front offices - are essential to embed FPIC throughout project lifecycles. Regulatory, legal, and political challenges, including insecure land tenure and limited institutional capacity, high legal and transaction costs, complex measurement standards, and insufficient protection against exploitation further complicate implementation. Improved access to reliable data, standardized reporting, and commonly accepted Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) would support financial institutions in effective screening and decision-making. They noted that the application of the CBD guidelines on safeguards enhances the effectiveness of due diligence by providing a clear, recognized framework for identifying key biodiversity and social risks, and creates a common understanding and legitimacy across different teams. It promotes early integration of safeguards into project design, enabling timely identification of impacts and mitigation measures. Partnering with indigenous peoples and local communities as project developers and ensuring their full participation and equitable benefits fosters long-term stewardship for biodiversity and sustainability of investments. Strong safeguards strengthen governance, prevent greenwashing, and build investor confidence in biodiversity finance. With regards to good practices, it was noted that financial institutions employ a range of key performance indicators (KPIs) to ensure the upholding of social safeguards, many of which align with the principles of the CBD's safeguard guidance. These include monitoring union relations, supply chain controversies, employee relations (e.g. wages, benefits, working conditions), and the respect and management of community rights – including particularly indigenous peoples' rights such as free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC), co-management, and benefit-sharing mechanisms. KPIs also track community conflicts such as land grabbing, livelihood loss, and displacement. The development of a local community project plan is a valuable process that supports long-term sustainability. To enhance the applicability of safeguard guidance across the private sector, the respondent proposed the following recommendations: (i) Companies should be encouraged to integrate social safeguards as early as possible in project lifecycles, including during due diligence, sourcing, and risk assessment processes, with clear guidance on embedding safeguards into existing frameworks; (ii) Financial institutions could benefit from tailored guidance to support good practices on the stewardship of companies, including specific questions for investors to assess whether companies have implemented appropriate safeguards in climate, biodiversity, and social issues; (iii) Financial institutions could benefit from guidance with step-by-step approaches on safeguards implementation during project development and analysis; (iv) Including reference to or strengthening alignment with existing international norms and standards, such as the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. Regarding opportunities for improving the existing guidance on safeguards under the CBD, the following recommendations were shared: (i) Aligning the CBD safeguards with other established international norms, including the

UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, as well as standards on environmental and social impact assessment, etc., would enhance coherence and provide a consistent foundation across instruments; (ii) Consider different types of investment and financing activities - including direct project finance, corporate operations, and supply chain impacts - in safeguards and ensure that the guidelines are fit for purpose across different types of asset classes and financial relationships. This includes providing practical guidance for companies on integrating safeguards into existing risk assessment and due diligence processes, as well as targeted questions for investors to assess safeguards in companies; (iii) The CBD safeguards could benefit from incorporating an approach that involves focusing on the collective and future well-being of communities where projects are being implemented, such as acknowledging reciprocity and the continuous relationship between indigenous peoples and the land.

29. Another respondent indicated that they are somewhat familiar with the guidance on safeguards in biodiversity finance mechanisms under the CBD. They mentioned engagement in indirect research on the CBD safeguards, and in particular with those concerning tenure, participation, equity and ecosystem functions. It was also noted that the research makes use of FSC and PEFC sustainable forestry certification standards, EU sustainable finance frameworks, and TNFD and PES guidelines. These safeguards are integrated into the respondent's research through the analysis of forestry and natural-capital investment models assessing how their governance structures align with economic, ecological and social expectations. Some challenges faced in applying these guidelines on safeguards were noted. These included the variable rigour in certification systems, the inconsistent disclosures of consultations with local communities, the weakness of biodiversity metrics when compared to carbon, and the lack of broad tenure and land-rights transparency. Regarding positive outcomes observed from applying the guidelines on safeguards under the CBD, the respondent highlighted the benefits arising from safeguards frameworks creating structured expectations that help identify governance gaps. They also reported that a harmonised global reporting framework would help improve the application of safeguards in the work of researchers. Regarding specific recommendations, enhancing coherence between CBD safeguards and the FSC, SFI, SFDR, and TNFD to encourage consistent implementation was recommended. It was also recommended to encourage minimum standards for transparency in private forestry and nature-based funds.

30. One survey respondent indicated that it is not familiar with the guidance on safeguards in biodiversity finance mechanisms under the CBD, not having applied or used either the voluntary guidelines for safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms under the CBD or the checklist of safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms under the CBD. Instead, they make use of the IUCN Global Standards and the CSRD instead – which they use to develop biodiversity assessment tools and approaches. Considering challenges faced, they highlighted the large gap between KPIs in these standards and the real work requirements to safeguard nature positive action as a particular difficulty. It was also noted that corporations find these standards difficult to uptake and integrate into their decision-making processes. Moreover, the respondent reported the challenge of translating the context and location specific nature of biodiversity into standardized KPIs. Furthermore, it was noted that safeguards depend on governments taking action in the form of suitable and ambitious legislation to create a clear and level playing field that all companies must adhere to. Since the respondent has not applied the guidelines on safeguards under the CBD, they did not note any benefits or positive outcomes from their application. To potentially improve the existing guidance on safeguards under the CBD, it was recommended to streamline the existing document as well as communicate it more extensively to make it both more widely accessible and used by the financial industry.

31. Similarly to some other respondents, another respondent indicated that that they have developed their own tailored safeguard policy based on the CBD's checklist of safeguards for biodiversity financing mechanisms, considering both internal and external levels. The policy is integrated across transversal thematic areas and actively applied at both strategic and operational levels, particularly in the design and delivery of funding to communities. They reported that they have fully implemented the components of the guidelines that are most relevant to their mandate and

operational work. A key challenge encountered is that community partners currently lack a clear understanding of safeguard principles and their practical application. As a result, they require sustained support and capacity development implying the need for adequate time and dedicated resources. Good practises in the implementation of safeguarding activities were identified at two levels: internal and external. At the internal level, safeguarding is applied to the conservation trust fund staff and office operations, ensuring compliance with environmental and social standards in institutional practices. At the external level, supporting partner institutions and community organizations are included. The integration of safeguarding measures within community-based projects is a mandatory condition for receiving funding.

32. Lastly, another survey respondent reported that they are somewhat familiar with the guidance on safeguards in biodiversity finance mechanisms under the CBD. They stressed that safeguards are not intrinsically integrated into their work, as they are primarily engaged with sustainability in the field of education. Regarding guidance that would help improve the application of safeguards, they highlighted that there is a clear lack of knowledge around these issues. Keeping that in mind, it was recommended to further education, communication, and dissemination of safeguards guidance under the CBD.

33. The submissions received from survey respondents show that although awareness about the CBD voluntary guidelines for safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms remains limited within this sample, the application of environmental and social safeguards that follow similar objectives is widespread in practice. A range of Parties and other organizations have adopted safeguard systems that are aligned with the objectives of the CBD guidelines (e.g. IFC Performance Standards; WEF/IAPB/BCA High-Level Principles to Guide the Biodiversity Credit Market; the FairWild Standard; the GEF Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards). Others have developed national frameworks, institutional tools, or organization-specific safeguard mechanisms tailored to their context and mandate. A few actors explicitly noted that their safeguard approaches are based on or aligned with the CBD's checklist and core principles, reflecting growing recognition of the CBD's guidance as a foundational reference for credible and equitable safeguard implementation.

IV. Overview of recent literature review of policies, practices and experiences from selected institutions regarding convergence of guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms

34. In decision 14/15, the Conference of the Parties highlighted the convergence that was emerging between the existing processes for developing and/or improving safeguard systems of the financing mechanisms and the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms. The COP encouraged these processes to further refer to the guidelines in order to create greater convergence. To examine the advancement of this convergence, and in response to the request from decision 16/34, practices used in a sample of twenty-nine institutions were reviewed as part of a desk study, to understand the extent of the convergence called for by the CBD Parties, and to draw lessons learned about the development and implementation of environmental and social safeguard systems.

35. The sample includes two global multilateral development organizations (IFC and WB), five regional multilateral development organizations (ADB, IADB, CAF, SPREP, CEB), three UN Agencies (UNDP, UNEP, FAO), two global multilateral environmental finance organizations (GEF, GCF), four international conservation organizations (CI, IUCN, WWF, CCB), and thirteen international organizations of non-governmental or mixed constituencies and diverse programmatic foci (Gold Standard for the Global Goals (GS4GG), Plan Vivo (certification), Biodiversity Credit Alliance, International Advisory Panel on Biodiversity Credits (IAPB), FairWild standard, Verra, Equitable Earth, Equator Principles, UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, BNP Paribas Group, Aviva, Ford Foundation, CIFOR-ICRAF).

36. The International Finance Corporation (IFC), a member of the World Bank Group, is the largest global development institution focused exclusively on the private sector in developing countries. The IFC Sustainability Framework, updated in 2012, articulates its strategic commitment to sustainable development. The IFC Sustainability Framework comprises the IFC policy on environmental and social sustainability and eight performance standards, which have been the key reference for the development of safeguard systems internationally. IFC standards are largely convergent with the CBD guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing. This is the only organization of the sample which has not updated its safeguard system after the adoption of the CBD Guidelines; however, in April 2025 IFC announced an updating process that is expected to end in 2028. This is an international process that may be particularly relevant for the ulterior development of safeguard systems, given the influence of the IFC standards – a process where seeking greater convergence with the CBD Guidelines will be critical to amplify their impact globally.

37. As indicated, most organizations surveyed for coherence of their safeguard systems with the CBD Guidelines have updated their systems after adoption of the Guidelines by the CBD in 2014. As examples, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) updated its system in 2024; the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB) adopted its current Environmental and Social Policy Framework in 2020; the Asian Development Bank (ADB)'s Environmental and Social Framework was adopted in 2024.

38. One of the most relevant organizations having updated its safeguards policies is the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The GEF is particularly important since it is currently the institutional structure operating the financial mechanism of the CBD. It also serves five other Conventions in this role: United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), Minamata Convention on Mercury, and the Biodiversity Beyond National Jurisdiction (BBNJ) Agreement. The GEF adopted a "Policy on Agency Minimum Standards on Environmental and Social Safeguards" in 2011. Following evaluations of those standards, the GEF updated the safeguards in 2018, issuing the adopted Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards in 2019.

39. The GEF operates through a partnership of 18 agencies, which are required to comply with its standards on environmental and social safeguards. According to the latest report on implementation (November 2025), there have been notable advancements by the agencies, for example on establishing proper risk-assessment procedures (which are critical for compliance with the CBD Guidelines' overall purpose). At the same time, the report acknowledges that challenges exist across agencies for example in terms of capacity for implementation⁸. In addition to the latest report on implementation, further assessments on the effectiveness of the GEF as the financial mechanism are envisioned as part of the seventh quadrennial review, that include elements related to safeguards implementation.⁹

40. The literature review of the sample of institutions included a point-by-point analysis of alignment of their safeguard systems with the CBD Guidance offered in decision 14/15. The review is purely analytical in nature and does not make judgements or rank the safeguard systems in any way. The results of the analysis are influenced by the overall alignment of each organisation's safeguards systems with the CBD Guidance, as well as the type of organisation and its mandate and the extent of their development. Further details are provided in the annex to the study.

41. The starting point of the analysis was to investigate whether the institutions have a risk-assessment tool that allows for the identification of "unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities" as required by the CBD (decision 14/15, Annex "Checklist of Safeguards in Biodiversity Financing Mechanisms Under the Convention on Biological

⁸ GEF (2025). GEF/C.70/Inf.08. "Progress Report on the Implementation of the GEF Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards" https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/2025-11/EN_GEF.C.70.Inf_08_Progress_Report_on_Implementation_GEF_Policy_on_ESS.pdf

⁹ See recommendation 6/2 of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation, annex II.

Diversity”, overall question), and whether the risk assessment was followed by a system, programme, policy or tool to “effectively avoid or mitigate” such impacts. The answer to this question appears positive, as a high degree of compliance with those two requirements was assessed. It is important to note however that “effective” is assessed through parameters of degree and process. Additionally, a risk-assessment tool may exist without capturing collective rights and traditional knowledge-related matters.

42. The literature reviewed indicates that institutions do not make specific reference to the CBD Guidance offered in the aforementioned decision. Although this assertion does not necessarily indicate that in the process of drafting, consulting and setting up the safeguard systems the CBD Guidance has not been used, it shows that more awareness-raising is needed on the availability and potential uses of the Guidance.

43. The literature review revealed that when assessing compliance of the safeguards systems of the sampled organisations against the checklist of safeguards contained in CBD Guidance from the annex of decision [14/15](#), most systems comply with the guiding questions. In some cases, full answers are not provided given that the questions have a very specific focus of their particular area of assessment, but it appears the substance of the CBD Guidance is generally widely reflected in the development and application of safeguard systems of institutions

44. A summary table of the degree of alignment of 29 of the sampled organisations with the CBD Guidance is provided below. A detailed review is provided in the annex to the study. For reference, the CBD Guidance from decision 14/15 is reproduced below.

<i>Code</i>	<i>CBD Guidance</i>
	Overall question on the purpose of the Convention’s voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms:
O	Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?
A	Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity’s intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.
A.1	Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?
A.2	Are biodiversity’s intrinsic values recognized?
B	Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.
B.1	Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?
B.2	Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?
B.3	Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?
B.4	Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?
C	Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant

<i>Code</i>	<i>CBD Guidance</i>
	international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.
C.1	Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?
C.2	Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?
C.3	Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?
D	Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.
D.1	Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?
D.2	Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?
D.3	Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?
D.4	Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?
	Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:
E	Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?
F	Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?
G	Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?
H	Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?

Institution	O	A.1	A.2	B.1	B.2	B.3	B.4	C.1	C.2	C.3	D.1	D.2	D.3	D.4	E	F	G	H
Multilateral development organizations																		
IFC	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
World Bank	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Regional multilateral development																		
IDB	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
ADB	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
CAF (Corporación Andina de Fomento)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	No	Partial	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Partial	Partial	Partial	Partial
SPREP	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
CEB	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes	Partial	Partial	Partial	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Partial	Partial
UN Agencies																		
FAO	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
UNDP	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
UNEP	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Multilateral environmental finance organizations																		
GEF	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
GCF	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
International conservation organizations																		
CI	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
WWF	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
CCB	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
IUCN	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Non-governmental or mixed constituency organizations																		
Gold Standard	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes
Plan Vivo	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
BCA	Partial	Yes	Yes	Partial	Partial	Partial	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes	Partial	Partial	Yes	Partial	Yes	Partial	Partial	Partial
IAPB	Partial	Yes	Yes	Partial	Partial	Partial	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes	Partial	Partial	Yes	Partial	Yes	Partial	Partial	Partial
FairWild	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes
Verra	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes
Equitable Earth	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Equator Principles	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes	Partial	Partial	Partial	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes
UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights	Partial	Partial	No	Partial	Partial	Partial	Partial	Partial	Yes	Yes	Partial	No	Yes	Partial	Yes	No	Partial	Partial
BNP Paribas Group	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Partial	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial
Aviva	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes	Partial	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes	Partial	Partial	Partial	Partial	Partial
Ford Foundation	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Partial	Partial	Yes
CIFOR-ICRAF	Yes	Yes	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

V. Conclusions and recommendations from the assessment

45. The CBD Guidelines and their operational guidance contained in the Annex to [decision 14/15](#) remain valid, relevant and applicable, and are in line with the concerns, approaches and purposes of institutions working to conserve biodiversity and provide funding for it. However, as the landscape of biodiversity funding evolves and the experiences of risk assessment and safeguarding interventions grow, the Guidelines and their operational guidance need to also evolve. Therefore, further assessments of the contents and application of the CBD Guidelines and operational guidance as they may pertain to specific entities using them, could be considered, with the active involvement of all stakeholders and particularly of potentially affected peoples and communities, with a view to updating them as necessary, to ensure they remain fit for purpose, including with regard to the safeguarding of women and girls.¹⁰

46. Although the survey for this study demonstrated that awareness and explicit recognition of the CBD voluntary guidelines for safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms remains limited, the application of environmental and social safeguards that follow similar objectives is widespread in practice, which points to the value of the Guidelines' purpose and direction.

47. In terms of alignment with the CBD Guidelines, one important consideration is the common interest in mitigating the unintended impacts, especially on indigenous peoples and local communities, which might emerge from biodiversity-related financing. However, differences exist regarding the use and application of the mitigation hierarchy, where the CBD guidance explicitly state that avoidance of impacts comes before mitigation. In this regard, institutions may consider adopting clearer frameworks where avoidance of impacts is given priority over mitigation measures, as well as mechanisms for proper risk assessment.

48. At a higher level, the CBD discussion on resource mobilization, where topics of debt sustainability and climate finance are nested in the same space as safeguards, provides the opportunity to explore the structural links that may influence the landscape of risks from biodiversity finance and actions. Synergies must exist in considering all the said topics, so that safeguards do not remain as downstream remedial tools for impacts that could be avoided if upstream planning and actions include proper risk assessment.

49. Across the spectrum of institutions implementing safeguard mechanisms, constraints of time, staffing, budget, and institutional mandates exist and shape implementation quality. This creates a need and opportunity for peer-to-peer capacity exchange, especially bringing together institutions with mature safeguard systems and those still building them, alongside with more systematic inclusion of potentially affected communities' perspectives on how safeguards are experienced, monitored, and reported in practice.

50. A range of needs and opportunities for improving the safeguards' application has been noted. These include:

(a) To enhance capacity building and financial support for technical assistance and training as well as rights-based pre-consent capacity-building for indigenous peoples and local communities to ensure meaningful participation in the safeguard process;

(b) To put in place, or further strengthen, national policy frameworks that incentivize the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, creating an enabling environment for the enhanced application of safeguards;

¹⁰ It is noteworthy that several institutions participating in the peer-review process of this safeguard study have provided thoughtful and substantial recommendations on how further reviews, studies or assessments on safeguards' effectiveness could be framed.

(c) To set up and implement, whenever needed, co-designed and transparent benefit-sharing mechanisms with associated capacity-building elements for indigenous peoples and local communities;

(d) To develop and provide clear, practical, and context-specific guidance, including aligned checklists, implementation guides, and national enabling frameworks, when and if required, to complement and support existing guidance and tools;

(e) To establish mechanisms for continuous learning and enhanced access to knowledge through libraries of case studies and exchange platforms, for sharing experiences across projects and countries and support the ongoing improvement of safeguards application, enabling adaptive management, knowledge-sharing and the integration of lessons learned from project implementation into policy and practice;

(f) To advance the early-stage integration of risk assessment and safeguarding into project planning, and throughout the project cycle, with tailored guidance for companies and investors to embed safeguards into due diligence, sourcing and stewardship practices;

(g) To promote the application of the voluntary guidelines in the ongoing work of relevant institutions on harmonizing safeguards standards, with a view to improving coherence and optimizing the use of existing frameworks and tools, thereby reducing duplication and overlaps;

(h) To recommend that relevant institutions consider revising and updating their safeguards frameworks regularly, on the basis of practical experience from project implementation and with the active involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities. Some elements that could be considered in this regard include:

- i. To strengthen gender-related aspects of safeguards frameworks to ensure their alignment with the CBD Gender Action Plan, and recognize the specificities of risks for women and girls and therefore the need for a focus on, among other topics, tackling violence against women and girls (VAWG) and Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment (SEAH);
- ii. To explore improvements in risk identification and assessment, as well as in related project, programme and action classification by types of risk;
- iii. To strengthen wording and guidance about implementation of free prior informed consent;
- iv. Provide further guidance as needed on the implementation of culturally appropriate grievance mechanisms;
- v. Strengthen and further develop guidance on the protection of traditional knowledge and of the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities;
- vi. Consider integration and formalization of community-led monitoring of impacts and responses as a mandatory safeguard requirement;
- vii. Recommend the integration of independent verification in assessments of the effectiveness of the implementation of safeguard systems;
- viii. Strengthen guidance about the integration of indigenous peoples and local communities and civil society reports and inputs in safeguard implementation assessments;

51. As part of the continued evolution of the CBD guidance on safeguards, as well as Parties' and other stakeholders' efforts to ensure that financial mechanisms intended to protect nature do not result in unintended, adverse social or environmental consequences, more work and the requisite resources will be needed to implement the findings noted in this review, with greater involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, as well as the academia and civil society organizations, and build on the progress made so far.

Annex 1

Assessment of alignment of safeguard systems with CBD's safeguard guidance (decision 14/15, annex)¹¹

CBD Guidance	International Finance Corporation (IFC)
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	Yes, the IFC's Environmental and Social Performance Standards (ESPS) - particularly its explicit commitment to human rights in Performance Standard (PS)1: Assessment and Management of Environmental and Social Risks and Impacts, and its stand-alone policy on Indigenous Peoples in PS7 - are designed to avoid or mitigate adverse impacts on indigenous peoples and local communities. The IFC requires compliance with applicable national law. Compensation and fair and equitable sharing associated with project usage of the resources or cultural heritage shall be ensured.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	PS1 requires integration of environmental and social risks into project design, and includes identification of indirect project impacts on biodiversity or ecosystem services upon which Affected Communities' livelihoods are dependent. PS6 requires assessment of risks and impacts to biodiversity and ecosystem services and take into account different values attached to it by Affected Communities. It proposes to include, <i>inter alia</i> , specialists with expertise in natural resource-based livelihoods. PS7 also aims to ensure that the development process fosters full respect for natural resource-based livelihoods.
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	PS6 requires protection and conservation of ecosystems, species, and habitats even if not economically valuable.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and	

¹¹ Organizations covered in this table will be invited for a review during the peer review process.

CBD Guidance	International Finance Corporation (IFC)
principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	PS1 states that business should respect human rights.
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	PS1 defines stakeholder analysis and engagement planning, disclosure and dissemination of information, consultation and participation, grievance mechanism, and ongoing reporting to Affected Communities. Meaningful engagement process/ consultation, participation in a culturally appropriate manner throughout the project cycle. PS7 provides further details with regard to indigenous peoples and, e.g., provision of sufficient time.
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	When Affected Communities are subject to identified risks and adverse impacts, a consultation process is mandated, and should be carried out as effective two-way process. For projects with potentially significant adverse impacts on Affected Communities, an Informed Consultation and Participation (ICP) process shall be conducted. For projects with adverse impacts on indigenous peoples, clients are required to obtain free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC). It is established through Good Faith Negotiation (GFN) between the company and indigenous community.
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	PS6 and in part PS8 state that the requirements set out have been guided by the CBD. PS1 sets out that business should respect human rights and mentions that each of the PS has elements related to human rights dimensions. Guidance Note 7 further states that IFC recognizes that key UN Human Rights Conventions form the core of international instruments that provide the rights framework for members of the world's indigenous peoples, and that, in addition, various declarations and resolutions address the rights of indigenous peoples, such as the UNDRIP and ILO 169. While such instruments would address the responsibilities of states, it would also increasingly be expected that private sector companies conduct their affairs in a way that would uphold these rights.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	PS1 requires context-specific risk assessments and community engagement.

CBD Guidance	International Finance Corporation (IFC)
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	IFC requires compliance with applicable national laws, but does not require alignment if national laws are weaker than IFC standards
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	The Guidance note 7 references, <i>inter alia</i> , UNDRIP, CBD, ILO C169, CEDAW, and Guidance Note 3 the UNFCCC.
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Clients establish grievance mechanisms where there are affected communities (PS1). IFC has a complaint portal where social and environmental complaints can be submitted. It further has a Compliance Advisor Ombudsman (CAO), an Independent Accountability Mechanism.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	IPAM can investigate complaints, recommend corrective actions, and suspend financing.
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	PS1, PS5 and PS7 require disclosure of information
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	IFC can suspend or terminate financing for non-compliance
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	PS7 requires fair and equitable benefit-sharing associated with client intending to utilize natural resources that are central to the identity and livelihood of affected indigenous peoples and local communities, as well as associated with cultural heritage/ commercialization of knowledge, innovation, or practice, consistent with the customs and traditions of indigenous peoples.
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	PS8 and PS7 require assessment of cultural heritage, where applicable. PS7 requires respect for spiritual values. PS7 mentions that indigenous peoples' spiritual beliefs may come under threat and that they may use lands for spiritual purposes that define their identity and community that can often be substantiated and documented.

CBD Guidance	International Finance Corporation (IFC)
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	PS7 requires consideration of customary use of land and resources.
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	PS7 aims, <i>inter alia</i> , to respect and preserve the culture, knowledge, and practices of indigenous peoples. Where a project proposes to use cultural heritage including knowledge of IPs for commercial purposes, the client will inform the affected indigenous peoples and local communities of their rights under national law and obtain their FPIC.

CBD Guidance	World Bank
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	Yes. The World Bank has a comprehensive safeguard system under its Environmental and Social Framework (ESF) designed to avoid, minimize and mitigate adverse impacts on the rights and livelihoods of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, in accordance with national legislation and international standards. In particular, Environmental and Social Standard 7 (ESS7) sets out specific requirements to protect Indigenous Peoples/Sub-Saharan African Historically Underserved Traditional Local Communities, including impact assessment, culturally appropriate engagement, benefit-sharing measures and, where applicable, Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC). The ESF also promotes opportunities to support Indigenous Peoples and local communities through inclusive development benefits and strengthened livelihoods.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	Yes. The World Bank's Environmental and Social Framework explicitly recognizes the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions in supporting local livelihoods and resilience. Environmental and Social Standard 6 (ESS6) on Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources requires projects to identify, assess and manage risks and impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services, particularly where communities depend on them for subsistence, income generation or cultural practices. These considerations are integrated into project selection, design and implementation through environmental and social assessments and mitigation measures.
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	Yes. The World Bank's Environmental and Social Framework recognizes biodiversity's intrinsic values alongside its ecological and socio-economic functions. Environmental and Social Standard 6 (ESS6) emphasizes the conservation of natural habitats, critical habitats and legally protected areas, reflecting the intrinsic importance of biodiversity beyond its

CBD Guidance	World Bank
	instrumental value for human use. The framework requires avoidance of significant conversion or degradation of critical habitats and promotes a precautionary approach to biodiversity conservation.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	Yes. The World Bank's Environmental and Social Framework clearly defines the rights and responsibilities of project actors and stakeholders in an equitable manner. The framework establishes specific obligations for borrowers, including requirements related to stakeholder engagement, protection of vulnerable groups, labour conditions, land acquisition, biodiversity conservation and Indigenous Peoples' rights. Roles and responsibilities are articulated through Environmental and Social Standards (ESSs), project-level Environmental and Social Commitment Plans (ESCPs), and supervision and monitoring arrangements.
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. The World Bank's Environmental and Social Framework requires effective and inclusive participation of relevant stakeholders in the definition and implementation of roles and responsibilities. Environmental and Social Standard 10 (ESS10) on Stakeholder Engagement and Information Disclosure mandates early, ongoing and meaningful consultation with affected parties throughout the project lifecycle, ensuring that stakeholder views are considered in project design, decision-making and the allocation of responsibilities.
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes, where applicable. The World Bank's Environmental and Social Standard 7 (ESS7) requires the Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) of Indigenous Peoples in specific circumstances, including when projects may have adverse impacts on land and natural resources subject to traditional ownership or use, cause relocation, or significantly affect cultural heritage. ESS7 also requires culturally appropriate engagement and the involvement of Indigenous Peoples in decision-making processes related to project design, implementation and benefit-sharing.
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	Yes. The World Bank's Environmental and Social Framework is informed by relevant international agreements and principles, including the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

CBD Guidance	World Bank
	In particular, Environmental and Social Standards 6 (Biodiversity Conservation) and 7 (Indigenous Peoples) reflect core CBD principles related to biodiversity protection, sustainable use and respect for Indigenous Peoples' rights, and incorporate international human rights standards into project requirements.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	Yes. The World Bank's safeguard system is designed to be grounded in local circumstances through country-specific assessments and project-level environmental and social analysis. The Environmental and Social Framework requires borrowers to identify and assess local environmental, social, cultural and institutional contexts, including national legislation, customary practices and community conditions, and to tailor mitigation measures and management plans accordingly.
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes. The World Bank's Environmental and Social Framework requires safeguards to be applied in a manner consistent with country-driven processes, national legislation and development priorities. Borrowers are required to comply with applicable national laws and regulations, and the ESF allows for the use of country systems where they are assessed as materially consistent with the Bank's standards. This approach supports alignment with national policies while maintaining minimum environmental and social protection requirements.
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	Yes. The World Bank's Environmental and Social Framework takes into account relevant international agreements and instruments, including those referenced under point B.4, as well as international human rights treaties and, where appropriate, climate-related frameworks. The ESF integrates principles derived from international conventions such as the Convention on Biological Diversity, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and relevant human rights standards, and aligns project requirements with broader international commitments related to gender equality, non-discrimination and climate resilience.

CBD Guidance	World Bank
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Yes. The World Bank has established appropriate and effective institutional frameworks to ensure the application of safeguards under its Environmental and Social Framework. These include defined roles and responsibilities within the Bank and for borrowers, mandatory Environmental and Social Commitment Plans, supervision and implementation support arrangements, and dedicated environmental and social specialists at both country and project levels.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	Yes. The World Bank's safeguard system includes enforcement and evaluation mechanisms to ensure compliance with the Environmental and Social Framework. These mechanisms include regular project supervision and monitoring, reporting requirements, corrective action plans, and the Bank's ability to apply remedies in cases of non-compliance. In addition, independent accountability mechanisms, such as the Inspection Panel, provide avenues for evaluation and redress.
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes. Transparency and accountability are core components of the World Bank's Environmental and Social Framework. The framework requires disclosure of relevant environmental and social information, including assessment documents and management plans, and promotes ongoing stakeholder engagement throughout the project lifecycle. Accountability is further supported through monitoring, reporting obligations, grievance redress mechanisms at the project level, and access to independent accountability mechanisms.
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	Generally yes, subject to supervision and enforcement. The World Bank requires all stakeholders involved in financed projects, particularly borrowers and implementing agencies, to comply with the relevant Environmental and Social Standards. Compliance is monitored through supervision, reporting and review processes, and corrective actions are required where gaps or non-compliance are identified. While challenges may arise in implementation, the institutional framework is designed to promote adherence to safeguards throughout the project lifecycle.
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	

CBD Guidance	World Bank
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Yes. The World Bank's Environmental and Social Framework includes provisions to promote equity and reduce risks of inequity in benefit-sharing. Several Environmental and Social Standards, including ESS1, ESS5, ESS6 and ESS7, require the identification of affected and vulnerable groups and the design of measures to ensure that project benefits are shared in an inclusive and equitable manner. ESS7 specifically emphasizes culturally appropriate benefit-sharing with Indigenous Peoples, aligned with their priorities and livelihoods.
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	Yes. The World Bank's safeguard instruments include procedures to assess cultural impacts, particularly through Environmental and Social Standards 7 (Indigenous Peoples) and 8 (Cultural Heritage). These standards require the identification, assessment and protection of tangible and intangible cultural heritage, including spiritual values and practices of Indigenous Peoples and local communities. Projects must avoid adverse impacts on cultural and spiritual heritage or provide mitigation measures developed in consultation with affected communities.
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Yes. The World Bank's Environmental and Social Framework considers customary use of land and natural resources in the identification and avoidance of risks. Environmental and Social Standards 5 (Land Acquisition, Restrictions on Land Use and Involuntary Resettlement), 6 (Biodiversity Conservation) and 7 (Indigenous Peoples) require recognition of customary tenure and use rights and mandate measures to avoid or minimize adverse impacts on livelihoods and traditional resource use.
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Yes. The World Bank's Environmental and Social Framework includes safeguards related to the traditional knowledge of Indigenous Peoples and local communities. Environmental and Social Standard 7 (ESS7) requires respect for Indigenous Peoples' traditional knowledge, innovations and practices, and includes provisions to protect their knowledge rights, ensuring that such knowledge is accessed, used and shared only with their informed consent and in a culturally appropriate manner.
CBD Guidance	IDB (Inter-American Development Bank)
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	Yes. The Inter-American Development Bank has a well-established environmental and social safeguard system designed to avoid, mitigate and manage potential adverse impacts of its financing on biodiversity, Indigenous Peoples and local communities. Through its Environmental and Social Policy Framework, including specific standards on biodiversity

CBD Guidance	IDB (Inter-American Development Bank)
	conservation, natural habitats, Indigenous Peoples, and stakeholder engagement, the IDB aligns its safeguard approach with international good practice and supports the objectives of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms.
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	Yes. The Inter-American Development Bank has an Environmental and Social Policy Framework designed to avoid, minimize and mitigate unintended adverse impacts on the rights and livelihoods of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, in accordance with national legislation and international standards. The framework includes specific requirements on Indigenous Peoples, biodiversity conservation, land use, resettlement and stakeholder engagement, and promotes opportunities to support inclusive development, culturally appropriate benefit-sharing and the strengthening of local livelihoods through project design and implementation.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	Yes. The Inter-American Development Bank's Environmental and Social Policy Framework recognizes the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions in supporting local livelihoods and resilience. The framework includes requirements for the identification and management of impacts on biodiversity, natural habitats and ecosystem services, particularly where communities depend on them for subsistence, income or cultural practices. These considerations are integrated into project selection, design and implementation through environmental and social assessments and management plans.
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	Yes. The Inter-American Development Bank's safeguard framework recognizes biodiversity's intrinsic values in addition to its ecological and socio-economic functions. The policy emphasizes the conservation of natural and critical habitats and legally protected areas, reflecting the importance of biodiversity beyond its instrumental value for human use. It requires avoidance or minimization of significant impacts on sensitive ecosystems and promotes a precautionary approach to biodiversity conservation.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and	

CBD Guidance	IDB (Inter-American Development Bank)
principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	Yes. The Inter-American Development Bank's Environmental and Social Policy Framework clearly defines the rights and responsibilities of project actors and stakeholders in an equitable manner. The framework establishes obligations for borrowers related to environmental and social risk management, stakeholder engagement, protection of vulnerable groups, Indigenous Peoples' rights, land use and biodiversity conservation. These roles and responsibilities are set out through policy standards, project-level environmental and social management instruments, and supervision arrangements.
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. The Inter-American Development Bank's Environmental and Social Policy Framework requires effective and meaningful participation of relevant stakeholders in the definition and implementation of roles and responsibilities. The framework mandates early and ongoing stakeholder engagement, information disclosure and consultation processes throughout the project lifecycle, ensuring that the perspectives of affected communities and other stakeholders are considered in project design, decision-making and implementation.
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes, where applicable. The Inter-American Development Bank's Environmental and Social Policy Framework requires the Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) of Indigenous Peoples in specific circumstances, such as when projects may have significant impacts on Indigenous lands, territories, natural resources, cultural heritage or livelihoods. The framework also requires culturally appropriate engagement and the active involvement of Indigenous Peoples in decision-making processes related to project design, implementation and benefit-sharing.
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	Yes. The Inter-American Development Bank's Environmental and Social Policy Framework is informed by relevant international agreements and principles, including the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. The framework reflects core CBD principles related to biodiversity conservation, sustainable use and equity, and incorporates international human rights standards into its requirements for Indigenous Peoples, biodiversity protection and stakeholder engagement.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention	

CBD Guidance	IDB (Inter-American Development Bank)
on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	Yes. The Inter-American Development Bank's safeguard system is grounded in local circumstances through country- and project-specific environmental and social assessments. The Environmental and Social Policy Framework requires consideration of local environmental, social, cultural and institutional contexts, including national legislation, customary practices and community conditions, and the adaptation of mitigation and management measures to these local realities.
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes. The Inter-American Development Bank's Environmental and Social Policy Framework requires safeguards to be applied in a manner consistent with country-driven processes, national legislation and development priorities. Borrowers are required to comply with applicable national laws and regulations, and the framework supports alignment with national policies while ensuring minimum environmental and social standards consistent with international good practice.
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	Yes. The Inter-American Development Bank's Environmental and Social Policy Framework takes into account relevant international agreements and instruments, including those referenced under point B.4, as well as international human rights treaties and gender equality commitments. The framework integrates principles derived from international conventions such as the Convention on Biological Diversity, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and other human rights instruments, and aligns safeguard requirements with broader commitments related to non-discrimination, gender equality and climate resilience, as appropriate.
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Yes. The Inter-American Development Bank has established appropriate and effective institutional frameworks to ensure the application of its safeguards. These include clearly defined roles and responsibilities for the Bank and borrowers, mandatory environmental and social management instruments at the project level, supervision and implementation support mechanisms, and dedicated environmental and social specialists involved throughout the project lifecycle.

CBD Guidance	IDB (Inter-American Development Bank)
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	Yes. The Inter-American Development Bank's safeguard system includes enforcement and evaluation mechanisms to ensure compliance with its Environmental and Social Policy Framework. These mechanisms include project supervision and monitoring, reporting requirements, corrective action measures, and internal review processes. In addition, independent accountability mechanisms, such as the Independent Consultation and Investigation Mechanism (MICI), provide avenues for evaluation, accountability and redress.
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes. Transparency and accountability are integral components of the Inter-American Development Bank's Environmental and Social Policy Framework. The framework requires disclosure of relevant environmental and social information, including assessment documents and management plans, and promotes ongoing stakeholder engagement throughout the project lifecycle. Accountability is further supported through monitoring and reporting obligations, project-level grievance mechanisms, and access to independent accountability mechanisms.
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	Generally yes, subject to supervision and enforcement. The Inter-American Development Bank requires borrowers and other relevant stakeholders involved in financed projects to comply with applicable environmental and social safeguards. Compliance is monitored through supervision, reporting and review processes, and corrective actions are required where non-compliance or gaps are identified. While implementation challenges may arise, the institutional framework is designed to promote adherence to safeguards throughout the project lifecycle.
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Yes. The Inter-American Development Bank's Environmental and Social Policy Framework includes provisions to promote equity and reduce risks of inequity in benefit-sharing. The framework requires the identification of affected and vulnerable groups and the design of measures to ensure inclusive and equitable distribution of project benefits. Specific provisions related to Indigenous Peoples emphasize culturally appropriate benefit-sharing aligned with community priorities, livelihoods and development needs.
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	Yes. The Inter-American Development Bank's safeguard instruments include procedures to assess cultural impacts, particularly through provisions on Indigenous Peoples and cultural heritage. The Environmental and Social Policy Framework requires the identification and assessment of impacts on tangible and intangible cultural heritage, including spiritual values, beliefs and practices of Indigenous Peoples and local

CBD Guidance	IDB (Inter-American Development Bank)
	communities, and mandates culturally appropriate mitigation measures developed in consultation with affected communities.
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Yes. The Inter-American Development Bank's Environmental and Social Policy Framework considers customary use of land and natural resources in the identification and avoidance of risks. Provisions related to land use, Indigenous Peoples and biodiversity require recognition of customary tenure and traditional resource use, and mandate measures to avoid or minimize adverse impacts on livelihoods and culturally significant practices.
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Yes. The Inter-American Development Bank's Environmental and Social Policy Framework includes safeguards related to the traditional knowledge of Indigenous Peoples and local communities. The framework requires respect for traditional knowledge, innovations and practices, and includes provisions to protect knowledge rights, ensuring that such knowledge is accessed, used and shared only with the informed consent of the communities concerned and in a culturally appropriate manner.

CBD Guidance	Asian Development Bank
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	Yes. The Asian Development Bank has an established safeguard system designed to address environmental and social risks associated with its financing, including impacts on biodiversity, Indigenous Peoples and local communities. Through its Safeguard Policy Statement (SPS), ADB integrates requirements related to biodiversity conservation, natural habitats, Indigenous Peoples' rights and stakeholder engagement, aligning its safeguard approach with international good practice and supporting the objectives of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms.
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	Yes. The Asian Development Bank has a safeguard system under its Safeguard Policy Statement (SPS) designed to avoid, minimize and mitigate unintended adverse impacts on the rights and livelihoods of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, in accordance with national legislation and international standards. The SPS includes specific requirements on Indigenous Peoples, biodiversity conservation, land acquisition and resettlement, and stakeholder consultation, and promotes opportunities to support inclusive development, culturally appropriate benefit-sharing and sustainable livelihoods through project design and implementation.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	

CBD Guidance	Asian Development Bank
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	Yes. The Asian Development Bank's Safeguard Policy Statement recognizes the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions in supporting local livelihoods and resilience. The policy requires the identification and management of impacts on natural habitats, biodiversity and ecosystem services, particularly where communities depend on these resources for subsistence, income generation or cultural practices. These considerations are integrated into project selection, design and implementation through environmental assessments and mitigation measures.
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	Yes. The Asian Development Bank's Safeguard Policy Statement recognizes biodiversity's intrinsic values alongside its ecological and socio-economic functions. The policy emphasizes the protection of critical habitats, natural habitats and legally protected areas, reflecting the importance of biodiversity beyond its direct use for human activities, and applies a precautionary approach to avoid significant adverse impacts on sensitive ecosystems.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	Yes. The Asian Development Bank's Safeguard Policy Statement clearly defines the rights and responsibilities of project actors and stakeholders in an equitable manner. The policy establishes obligations for borrowers related to environmental and social risk management, biodiversity protection, Indigenous Peoples' rights, land acquisition and resettlement, and stakeholder engagement, with roles and responsibilities specified through safeguard requirements and project-level management instruments.
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. The Asian Development Bank's Safeguard Policy Statement requires effective and meaningful participation of relevant stakeholders in the definition and implementation of roles and responsibilities. The policy mandates early and ongoing consultation, disclosure of information, and engagement with affected communities throughout the project lifecycle, ensuring that stakeholder perspectives are considered in project design, decision-making and implementation.
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes, where applicable. The Asian Development Bank's Safeguard Policy Statement requires meaningful consultation and participation of Indigenous Peoples in project decision-making and, in certain circumstances, their consent. The policy requires

CBD Guidance	Asian Development Bank
	culturally appropriate engagement, good faith negotiations, and the informed participation of Indigenous Peoples in the definition of project roles, responsibilities and benefit-sharing arrangements, particularly where projects may have significant impacts on their lands, resources, livelihoods or cultural heritage.
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	Yes. The Asian Development Bank's Safeguard Policy Statement is informed by relevant international agreements and principles, including the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. The policy reflects core CBD principles related to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, and incorporates international human rights standards in its provisions on Indigenous Peoples, biodiversity protection and stakeholder engagement.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	Yes. The Asian Development Bank's safeguard system is grounded in local circumstances through country- and project-specific environmental and social assessments. The Safeguard Policy Statement requires consideration of local environmental, social, cultural and institutional contexts, including national legislation, customary practices and community conditions, and the adaptation of mitigation and management measures to local realities.
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes. The Asian Development Bank's Safeguard Policy Statement requires safeguards to be applied in a manner consistent with country-driven processes, national legislation and development priorities. Borrowers are required to comply with applicable national laws and regulations, and the policy supports alignment with national systems while maintaining minimum environmental and social standards consistent with international good practice.
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	Yes. The Asian Development Bank's Safeguard Policy Statement takes into account relevant international agreements and instruments, including those referenced under point B.4, as well as international human rights treaties and gender equality commitments. The policy integrates principles derived from the Convention on Biological Diversity, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and other international

CBD Guidance	Asian Development Bank
	standards, and aligns safeguard requirements with broader commitments related to non-discrimination, gender equality and climate resilience, as appropriate.
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Yes. The Asian Development Bank has established appropriate and effective institutional frameworks to ensure the application of its safeguards. These include clearly defined roles and responsibilities for the Bank and borrowers, mandatory environmental and social management instruments at the project level, supervision and implementation support arrangements, and the involvement of dedicated environmental and social specialists throughout the project lifecycle.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	Yes. The Asian Development Bank's safeguard system includes enforcement and evaluation mechanisms to ensure compliance with the Safeguard Policy Statement. These mechanisms include project supervision and monitoring, reporting requirements, corrective action measures, and internal review processes. In addition, ADB's Accountability Mechanism provides independent avenues for evaluation, compliance review and grievance redress related to safeguard implementation.
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes. Transparency and accountability are integral components of the Asian Development Bank's Safeguard Policy Statement. The policy requires disclosure of relevant environmental and social information, including assessment documents and management plans, and promotes ongoing stakeholder engagement throughout the project lifecycle. Accountability is further supported through monitoring and reporting obligations, project-level grievance redress mechanisms, and access to ADB's independent Accountability Mechanism.
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	Generally yes, subject to supervision and enforcement. The Asian Development Bank requires borrowers and other relevant stakeholders involved in financed projects to comply with applicable safeguard requirements under the Safeguard Policy Statement. Compliance is monitored through supervision, reporting and review processes, and corrective actions are required where gaps or non-compliance are identified. While implementation challenges may occur, the institutional framework is designed to promote adherence to safeguards throughout the project lifecycle.

CBD Guidance	Asian Development Bank
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Yes. The Asian Development Bank's safeguard framework includes provisions aimed at promoting equity and reducing risks of inequitable benefit-sharing. These include requirements for social impact assessments, inclusive stakeholder engagement, attention to vulnerable and marginalized groups, and measures to ensure that project benefits are distributed in a fair and inclusive manner, particularly where indigenous peoples and local communities are affected.
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	Yes. The Asian Development Bank's safeguard instruments include procedures for assessing social and cultural impacts, particularly through its policies on Indigenous Peoples. These procedures require consideration of cultural heritage, traditional practices, and respect for the spiritual and cultural values of indigenous peoples and local communities where projects may affect them.
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Yes. The Asian Development Bank's safeguard framework considers customary use of land and natural resources, particularly in projects affecting Indigenous Peoples and local communities. Customary land tenure and resource use are taken into account in risk avoidance, impact assessment, and the design of mitigation measures.
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Yes. ADB's safeguard policies include provisions to protect the traditional knowledge of Indigenous Peoples and local communities. The framework requires respect for Indigenous Peoples' cultural heritage, knowledge systems, and intellectual property, and seeks to prevent unauthorized use or misappropriation of traditional knowledge within project design and implementation.

CBD Guidance	CAF (Corporación Andina de Fomento/ Andean Development Corporation)
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	The voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms under the CBD aim to ensure that biodiversity finance does not cause unintended harm to people or ecosystems. Their purpose is to provide a common set of principles to prevent, mitigate and manage environmental and social risks, promote transparency and accountability, protect the rights and livelihoods of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, and ensure that biodiversity-related investments generate positive and equitable outcomes. Although non-binding, the guidelines serve as a global reference for governments, financial institutions and organizations when designing or implementing biodiversity finance instruments.

CBD Guidance	CAF (Corporación Andina de Fomento/ Andean Development Corporation)
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	Yes. CAF's Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) includes safeguard requirements that aim to avoid, minimize or mitigate adverse impacts on Indigenous Peoples and local communities, in accordance with national legislation and international MDB practice. The framework requires the identification of Indigenous Peoples, culturally appropriate stakeholder engagement, assessment of potential impacts on land, resources and livelihoods, and the development of measures to protect their rights and ensure meaningful participation. While less detailed than IFC PS7, CAF's system includes provisions to support positive outcomes for Indigenous Peoples and local communities through risk management, consultation processes and project-level mitigation measures.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	Yes. CAF's Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) requires projects to assess impacts on biodiversity, natural habitats and ecosystem services, including those that support local livelihoods and community resilience. The framework also requires that these considerations be integrated into project design and mitigation measures, ensuring that ecosystem functions and their role for affected communities are taken into account during the selection and implementation of operations.
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	Yes. CAF's Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) recognizes the importance of conserving biodiversity and natural habitats, including their intrinsic ecological value beyond their instrumental or economic functions. The framework requires borrowers to avoid or minimize impacts on biodiversity and to protect critical habitats, reflecting an acknowledgement of biodiversity's intrinsic worth within project decision-making.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	

CBD Guidance	CAF (Corporación Andina de Fomento/ Andean Development Corporation)
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	Yes. CAF's Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) sets out the responsibilities of borrowers, project implementers and affected stakeholders regarding environmental and social risk management. The framework requires the identification of affected communities, disclosure of relevant information, engagement processes and the establishment of grievance mechanisms. Although less detailed than IFC or World Bank frameworks, CAF defines the rights and responsibilities of stakeholders in a manner consistent with MDB practice, aiming to ensure fair and equitable treatment throughout project preparation and implementation.
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Partially. CAF's ESMF requires stakeholder engagement and consultation during project preparation and implementation, ensuring that affected actors can participate in decisions related to project impacts. However, the definition of roles and responsibilities within the safeguard system itself was not developed through a documented participatory process with external stakeholders. Participation is therefore effective at the project level but not explicitly demonstrated in the formulation of the overarching safeguard framework.
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	No. There is no evidence that the development of CAF's safeguard framework involved free, prior and informed consent (FPIC), prior informed consent (PIC) or formal approval by Indigenous Peoples or local communities. While CAF requires culturally appropriate consultation and, where applicable, consent processes at the project level, these mechanisms were not part of the formulation of the overarching roles and responsibilities defined in the institution's safeguard system.
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	Partially. CAF's safeguard framework does not explicitly reference the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), its decisions or guidance, nor the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). However, the ESMF incorporates principles that are broadly consistent with these instruments, including biodiversity conservation, protection of natural habitats, recognition of community rights and culturally appropriate engagement with Indigenous Peoples. Alignment is therefore indirect rather than based on explicit consideration of CBD or UNDRIP guidance.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	

CBD Guidance	CAF (Corporación Andina de Fomento/ Andean Development Corporation)
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	Yes. CAF's Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) requires that environmental and social risk assessments consider local socio-environmental conditions, including biodiversity features, land use, community dynamics and context-specific impacts. The framework mandates that mitigation measures and project design be adapted to local circumstances and national systems, ensuring that safeguard implementation reflects the realities of each country and affected area.
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes. CAF's Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) requires compliance with national legislation and alignment with country systems, policies and regulatory requirements. The framework mandates that borrowers identify applicable national laws and sectoral regulations and incorporate them into project design, risk assessments and mitigation measures. In this way, CAF's safeguards are applied in a manner consistent with country-driven processes, domestic priorities and legal frameworks across its member countries.
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	Partially. CAF's ESMF does not explicitly reference the CBD, UNDRIP, UNFCCC, CEDAW or other international human rights treaties in its safeguard formulations. However, the framework incorporates principles that are broadly consistent with these instruments, such as biodiversity conservation, protection of natural habitats, non-discrimination, gender considerations, and respect for community rights. Alignment is therefore indirect, through general MDB-standard requirements, rather than through explicit consideration of the international instruments listed in this guideline.
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Yes, to a significant extent. CAF has institutional structures in place to support the application of its safeguards, including dedicated environmental and social (E&S) risk management units, due diligence procedures, supervision protocols and requirements for borrowers to prepare and implement E&S management instruments. While the framework is less detailed than those of more established MDBs, it provides an operational structure that enables the application of safeguards across project lifecycles.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	Yes, partially. CAF's safeguard system includes enforcement and evaluation mechanisms through its due diligence procedures, project supervision, monitoring requirements and periodic reporting by borrowers. Borrowers must implement Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) and maintain grievance mechanisms. CAF reviews

CBD Guidance	CAF (Corporación Andina de Fomento/ Andean Development Corporation)
	compliance during project implementation. However, the system is less detailed and less formalized than those of more mature MDBs, and enforcement mechanisms are not as explicitly articulated or independently verified.
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes, to some extent. CAF's safeguard framework incorporates transparency and accountability requirements through disclosure of environmental and social documentation, stakeholder engagement obligations and project-level grievance mechanisms. Borrowers must provide information to affected communities and maintain accessible channels for complaints. While these elements support transparency, CAF's disclosure requirements are less comprehensive than those of other MDBs with more robust public information policies.
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	Partially. CAF requires borrowers and project implementers to comply with the Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) as a condition for project approval and implementation. Compliance is monitored through due diligence, supervision missions and reporting. However, the degree of compliance varies by project, and CAF does not yet have fully developed independent verification mechanisms to systematically ensure that all stakeholders consistently comply with the safeguards.
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Partially. CAF's safeguard framework includes general provisions on social inclusion, non-discrimination and the fair distribution of project benefits, which can help reduce risks of inequity. The ESMF requires assessment of social impacts, stakeholder engagement and measures to avoid disproportionate impacts on vulnerable groups. However, CAF does not have explicit, standalone provisions on benefit-sharing comparable to those under the CBD, and equity considerations are integrated only indirectly through broader social safeguards.
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	Partially. CAF's safeguard framework requires assessment of social impacts, including impacts on cultural heritage, and mandates measures to avoid or mitigate adverse effects on culturally significant sites. However, the framework does not include a dedicated cultural impact assessment instrument, nor does it explicitly reference spiritual values or the specific cultural rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities. Consideration of cultural aspects is therefore indirect and embedded within broader social and environmental assessments.
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Partially. CAF's safeguard system requires the identification of social risks, including those affecting communities that depend on natural resources, and it mandates measures to

CBD Guidance	CAF (Corporación Andina de Fomento/ Andean Development Corporation)
	avoid or mitigate adverse impacts on their livelihoods. However, the framework does not explicitly reference customary use or traditional resource rights. Consideration of customary practices occurs only indirectly through broader social impact assessment and stakeholder engagement processes.
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Partially. CAF's safeguard framework includes general provisions on protecting cultural heritage and avoiding adverse impacts on communities, but it does not contain explicit safeguards for the protection of traditional knowledge or knowledge rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities. Any consideration of traditional knowledge occurs indirectly through broader social impact assessments and stakeholder engagement, rather than through dedicated procedures or rights-based protections.

CBD Guidance	Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	SPREP has institutional policies and procedures aimed at minimizing environmental and social risks and supporting positive outcomes for biodiversity and local communities. While SPREP does not operate a formal safeguard system equivalent to those of multilateral development banks, its project management, environmental and social screening processes, and strong alignment with regional and international environmental agreements contribute to addressing key safeguard objectives consistent with the CBD's voluntary guidelines.
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	SPREP does not have a standalone safeguard system comparable to those of multilateral development banks. However, it applies environmental and social screening, risk management procedures, and participatory approaches that aim to avoid or mitigate adverse impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities, in line with national legislation of Pacific Island countries. Its programmes also seek to support local communities through capacity-building, ecosystem-based management, and community-led conservation initiatives.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	Yes. SPREP explicitly recognizes the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions in supporting local livelihoods and resilience. Its programmes and projects are designed around ecosystem-based management, climate resilience, and community-based

	conservation, reflecting the strong dependence of Pacific Island communities on healthy ecosystems for food security, cultural practices, and economic well-being.
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	Yes. SPREP recognizes biodiversity's intrinsic values beyond its utilitarian benefits. Its policies and regional frameworks emphasize the conservation of ecosystems, species, and natural heritage as values in themselves, closely linked to cultural identity, traditional knowledge, and the spiritual relationships that Pacific Island communities maintain with nature.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	Yes, to a large extent. SPREP's governance arrangements, project frameworks, and regional policies clearly define the roles and responsibilities of participating governments, partners, implementing agencies, and stakeholders. These are generally framed in an equitable manner, with particular attention to the roles of Pacific Island countries and territories, and the responsibilities of partners to respect national sovereignty, local communities, and customary governance systems.
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. SPREP places strong emphasis on inclusive and participatory processes. The roles and responsibilities of actors are typically defined through consultations with member governments, regional organizations, development partners, and, where relevant, local communities. SPREP's mandate as a regional intergovernmental organization ensures that Pacific Island countries actively participate in decision-making and in shaping project design and implementation frameworks.
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Partially. SPREP operates in a regional context where indigenous peoples and local communities are central actors, and its programmes generally promote community engagement, consultation, and culturally appropriate decision-making. While SPREP supports principles aligned with free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) through participatory approaches and respect for customary governance systems, FPIC is not always articulated as a formal, standalone requirement across all safeguard instruments, but is applied in practice through community-based and country-led processes.
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	Yes. SPREP's mandate is closely aligned with the implementation of multilateral environmental agreements, including the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). Its programmes and safeguard-related approaches explicitly reflect CBD objectives, decisions, and guiding principles. In addition, SPREP operates in a context where the

	rights, cultures, and traditional governance systems of indigenous peoples are central, and its work is broadly consistent with the principles of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, even when not always cited verbatim in all documents.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	Yes. SPREP's safeguards and operational approaches are strongly grounded in local circumstances. They are designed for Pacific Island countries and territories and explicitly take into account local ecological conditions, small island contexts, customary land and resource tenure systems, and the social, cultural, and economic realities of Pacific communities.
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes. SPREP's safeguards are implemented in close coordination with country-driven processes and are aligned with national legislation, policies, and priorities of its member countries. As a regional intergovernmental organization, SPREP works through national governments and institutions, ensuring that project design and implementation are consistent with domestic legal frameworks and nationally determined environmental and development objectives.
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	Yes. SPREP's work is explicitly grounded in multiple international environmental and human rights instruments. In addition to the Convention on Biological Diversity, SPREP actively supports implementation of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and other multilateral environmental agreements. Its programmes also take into account relevant international human rights principles, including gender equality and social inclusion, as reflected in its policies and regional strategies, even when specific treaties (such as CEDAW) are not always referenced in safeguard documents.
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	

D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Yes. SPREP has established appropriate and effective institutional frameworks to support the application of safeguards, including clear governance structures, project management procedures, and defined roles and responsibilities for environmental and social risk management. These frameworks are applied across SPREP-supported activities and projects, in collaboration with national institutions in member countries.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	Yes. SPREP includes evaluation and oversight mechanisms to monitor compliance with environmental and social requirements, such as project monitoring, progress reporting, and periodic reviews. While direct enforcement authority is limited, SPREP works with implementing partners and national authorities to ensure corrective measures are taken when safeguard requirements are not met.
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes. SPREP's institutional and project frameworks include requirements for transparency and accountability, such as clear reporting procedures, information sharing with member countries and partners, and oversight by governing bodies. These mechanisms help ensure that safeguard-related decisions and project outcomes are subject to review and accountability.
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	Largely yes. SPREP requires implementing partners, national agencies, and other stakeholders involved in its projects to comply with applicable environmental and social safeguards. Compliance is promoted through project agreements, monitoring, and reporting processes, although the level of compliance ultimately depends on national implementation capacity and partner adherence.
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Yes. SPREP's programmes place strong emphasis on equity and inclusive benefit-sharing, particularly for local communities and indigenous peoples in Pacific Island countries. Project design commonly incorporates community participation, equitable access to benefits, and attention to vulnerable groups, helping to reduce risks of inequity in the distribution of project benefits.
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	Yes, to a significant extent. SPREP's safeguard approaches and project practices recognize cultural impacts and the importance of indigenous and local community values. While formal stand-alone "cultural impact assessments" may not always be required, project design and implementation commonly incorporate respect for customary practices, traditional governance systems, and the spiritual relationship of Pacific peoples with land and sea.
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Yes. Customary use of land, marine areas, and natural resources is a central consideration in SPREP's work. Safeguard approaches and project designs explicitly take into account

	traditional and customary resource use to avoid or minimize risks to local livelihoods, cultural practices, and community well-being.
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Yes. SPREP recognizes and supports the protection of traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities. Its programmes and regional strategies promote respect for customary knowledge systems, ensure that traditional knowledge is used with appropriate acknowledgement and consent, and seek to prevent misuse, particularly in biodiversity conservation, ecosystem management, and climate-related initiatives.

CBD Guidance	Council of Europe Development Bank (CEB)
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	Yes. The CEB applies an Environmental and Social Safeguards Framework designed to prevent, mitigate, and manage adverse environmental and social impacts of its financing operations, including impacts on communities and vulnerable groups, in line with national legislation and European and international standards.
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	Yes. CEB's safeguard system aims to identify, avoid, and mitigate adverse social and environmental impacts, including impacts on local communities and vulnerable populations. While indigenous peoples are less prominent in its European operational context, the framework emphasizes social inclusion, protection of livelihoods, and compliance with national laws.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	Partially yes. Biodiversity and ecosystem considerations are addressed through environmental risk assessment and impact mitigation requirements, particularly where projects may affect natural resources relevant to local livelihoods and resilience.
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	Yes, to a limited extent. Biodiversity protection is recognized primarily through environmental safeguards focused on impact avoidance and mitigation, rather than through an explicit emphasis on biodiversity's intrinsic values.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and	

principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	Yes. CEB's Environmental and Social Safeguards Framework clearly defines the roles and responsibilities of the Bank, borrowers, and implementing partners with regard to environmental and social risk management, in line with applicable national legislation and European standards.
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Partially yes. Stakeholder participation is required as part of project preparation and implementation, including consultation processes appropriate to the scale and nature of the project. However, participation is generally framed within national and project-level procedures rather than co-design of the safeguard framework itself.
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Partially applicable. CEB requires consultation and engagement with affected communities, but explicit FPIC requirements are not systematically emphasized, reflecting the European operational context where indigenous peoples are less commonly affected and national legal frameworks apply.
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	Partially yes. CEB's safeguards are consistent with European and international environmental and social standards and indirectly support CBD objectives. While CBD decisions and UNDRIP are not always explicitly referenced, their principles are reflected through compliance with national legislation, EU policies, and international human rights norms.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	Yes. CEB's safeguards are applied in accordance with local circumstances through compliance with national legislation, context-specific environmental and social assessments, and project-level risk analysis tailored to the country and sector of operation.
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes. CEB requires all financed projects to comply with applicable national laws, regulations, and policies, and aligns its safeguard requirements with country-driven processes and national development priorities within its member states.
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the	Partially yes. CEB's safeguard framework is aligned with European Union standards and international environmental and social principles, and indirectly reflects relevant

Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	international agreements, including biodiversity and human rights conventions, even if not explicitly referenced in safeguard documents.
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Yes. CEB has established institutional frameworks, policies, and procedures to ensure the application of environmental and social safeguards, including internal review processes and oversight throughout the project cycle.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	Yes. CEB includes monitoring, supervision, and evaluation mechanisms to track compliance with safeguard requirements. Corrective actions may be required where deficiencies or non-compliance are identified.
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes. CEB's framework includes transparency and accountability measures such as reporting requirements, disclosure of relevant project information, and oversight by governing and supervisory bodies.
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	Largely yes. CEB requires borrowers and implementing partners to comply with applicable safeguard requirements. Compliance is monitored through supervision and reporting, though effectiveness depends on national implementation capacity.
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Yes. Promoting social inclusion and reducing inequality is a core objective of CEB's mandate. Its financing prioritizes vulnerable groups and disadvantaged regions, helping to reduce risks of inequity in the distribution of project benefits.
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	Partially. Cultural and social impacts are considered within environmental and social assessments, particularly where projects may affect cultural heritage. However, explicit cultural impact assessments or references to spiritual values are not systematically required.
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Partially. Where relevant, CEB's safeguard assessments consider existing land use and livelihood practices to avoid or mitigate social risks. Explicit references to customary use are limited, reflecting the European context of operations.

H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Limited. CEB's safeguard framework does not explicitly focus on traditional knowledge protection, but indirectly supports knowledge rights through compliance with national legislation, cultural heritage protection, and broader human rights standards.
--	--

CBD Checklist	GEF
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	Yes. The GEF applies a comprehensive Environmental and Social Safeguards Framework designed to prevent, mitigate, and manage environmental and social risks and impacts, fully aligned with the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity and other multilateral environmental agreements.
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	Yes. The GEF safeguard system explicitly addresses the protection of the rights, livelihoods, and well-being of indigenous peoples and local communities. It includes requirements on stakeholder engagement, Indigenous Peoples policies, benefit-sharing, and grievance mechanisms, consistent with national legislation and international standards.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	Yes. Recognition of the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions in supporting local livelihoods and resilience is a core principle of the GEF. This is integrated into project selection, design, and implementation across biodiversity, climate, and land degradation focal areas.
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	Yes. The GEF explicitly recognizes biodiversity's intrinsic values, in addition to its ecological, social, and economic functions, consistent with the objectives and principles of the Convention on Biological Diversity.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	Yes. The GEF's Environmental and Social Safeguards Framework clearly defines the roles and responsibilities of GEF Agencies, executing entities, governments, and other

	stakeholders, including specific provisions related to indigenous peoples, local communities, and affected groups.
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. The GEF requires stakeholder engagement throughout the project cycle, including consultation during project design and implementation. Participation of relevant actors, including local communities and civil society, is a mandatory element of GEF-funded projects.
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. The GEF explicitly requires Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) for projects affecting indigenous peoples, in line with international standards, and ensures their involvement in project design, implementation, and monitoring.
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	Yes. The GEF operates as a financial mechanism of the Convention on Biological Diversity and is explicitly guided by CBD decisions and principles. Its safeguards are also aligned with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and other relevant international frameworks.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	Yes. GEF safeguards are applied in a context-specific manner, taking into account local environmental, social, cultural, and institutional conditions in recipient countries, including customary land tenure systems and local governance structures.
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes. GEF-funded projects must comply with national legislation and are designed to align with country-driven priorities, strategies, and policies, including National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans and other national development frameworks.
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	Yes. GEF safeguards explicitly consider and align with the Convention on Biological Diversity, UNDRIP, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties, and other relevant international agreements, as appropriate.

Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Yes. The GEF has well-established institutional frameworks, including a dedicated Environmental and Social Safeguards Policy, oversight by the GEF Secretariat, and implementation through accredited GEF Agencies, ensuring consistent application of safeguards.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	Yes. The GEF includes monitoring, supervision, evaluation, and compliance mechanisms throughout the project cycle, supported by independent evaluation and accountability processes to address non-compliance and ensure corrective action.
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes. Transparency and accountability are core elements of the GEF system, including public disclosure of project information, reporting requirements, grievance mechanisms, and independent evaluation and accountability structures.
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	Largely yes. Compliance with safeguards is mandatory for GEF Agencies and project partners and is monitored through reporting, supervision, and evaluation, although effectiveness may vary depending on implementation capacity.
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Yes. Equity and fair benefit-sharing are central principles of the GEF. Projects are required to identify and promote equitable distribution of benefits, particularly for indigenous peoples, local communities, women, and other vulnerable groups.
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	Yes. The GEF safeguard framework includes assessment of cultural and social impacts, with explicit requirements to respect the cultural and spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities where projects may affect them.
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Yes. GEF safeguards require consideration of customary land and resource use, traditional livelihoods, and community practices in order to avoid or minimize risks to indigenous peoples and local communities.
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Yes. The GEF includes explicit safeguards for the protection of traditional knowledge, requiring respect for knowledge rights, appropriate consent, and benefit-sharing in line with CBD principles, including those related to access and benefit-sharing.

CBD Checklist	Conservation International
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	Yes. Conservation International applies an Environmental and Social Safeguards System designed to ensure that conservation and biodiversity financing activities avoid, mitigate, and manage adverse environmental and social impacts, in line with the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity.
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	Yes. CI has a formal safeguard system that explicitly addresses the rights, livelihoods, and well-being of indigenous peoples and local communities, including requirements on participation, Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), benefit-sharing, and grievance mechanisms.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	Yes. Recognition of the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions in supporting local livelihoods, resilience, and sustainable development is central to CI's conservation and financing approach.
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	Yes. CI recognizes biodiversity's intrinsic values alongside its ecological, cultural, and socio-economic importance.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	Yes. CI's safeguard policies clearly define the rights and responsibilities of implementing partners, project proponents, and stakeholders, including specific provisions related to indigenous peoples and local communities.
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. CI requires meaningful and inclusive stakeholder engagement throughout the project cycle, ensuring effective participation of affected communities, indigenous peoples, and other relevant actors.
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. CI explicitly requires Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) for activities affecting indigenous peoples and local communities, in line with international best practice.

CBD Checklist	Conservation International
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	Yes. CI's safeguard framework is aligned with the Convention on Biological Diversity, its relevant decisions and principles, and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	Yes. CI's safeguards are designed to be applied in a context-specific manner, taking into account local ecological, social, cultural, and governance conditions, including customary land and resource tenure systems.
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes. CI requires compliance with national legislation and alignment with country-driven priorities, and works in partnership with national and local authorities to ensure consistency with domestic frameworks.
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	Yes. CI's safeguard system explicitly considers the Convention on Biological Diversity, UNDRIP, international human rights treaties, and other relevant international agreements, as appropriate.
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Yes. CI has established institutional frameworks, policies, and internal procedures to ensure consistent application of environmental and social safeguards across its conservation and financing activities.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	Yes. CI includes monitoring, evaluation, and compliance mechanisms, including project supervision, reporting requirements, and internal review processes to address non-compliance and ensure corrective action

CBD Checklist	Conservation International
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes. Transparency and accountability are integral to CI's safeguard system, including disclosure of relevant information, reporting to stakeholders, and grievance and accountability mechanisms.
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	Largely yes. CI requires implementing partners and stakeholders to comply with safeguard requirements, with compliance monitored throughout the project cycle, though effectiveness may vary by context.
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Yes. CI's safeguards include explicit provisions to promote equitable benefit-sharing, with particular attention to indigenous peoples, local communities, women, and vulnerable groups, to reduce risks of inequity.
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	Yes. CI requires assessment of social and cultural impacts and explicitly recognizes and respects the cultural and spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities in project design and implementation.
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Yes. CI's safeguards explicitly consider customary land and resource use, traditional livelihoods, and community practices to avoid or minimize risks to local communities.
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Yes. CI includes safeguards to protect traditional knowledge, requiring prior informed consent, appropriate use of knowledge, and fair benefit-sharing in line with CBD principles.

CBD Checklist	WWF (World Wide Fund for Nature)
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	Yes. WWF applies a comprehensive set of environmental and social safeguard policies and standards to ensure that biodiversity finance and conservation initiatives avoid, mitigate, and manage adverse environmental and social impacts, consistent with the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity.
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	Yes. WWF has established safeguard policies that explicitly address the rights, livelihoods, and well-being of indigenous peoples and local communities, including requirements for participation, Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), benefit-sharing, and grievance mechanisms.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should	

CBD Checklist	WWF (World Wide Fund for Nature)
be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	Yes. Recognition of the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions in supporting local livelihoods, resilience, and sustainable development is central to WWF's conservation and financing-related activities.
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	Yes. WWF explicitly recognizes biodiversity's intrinsic values, alongside its ecological, cultural, and socio-economic importance.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	Yes. WWF's safeguard policies and standards clearly define the roles and responsibilities of implementing partners, project teams, and stakeholders, including specific provisions related to indigenous peoples and local communities.
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. WWF requires meaningful and inclusive stakeholder engagement throughout the project cycle, ensuring effective participation of affected communities, indigenous peoples, civil society, and other relevant actors.
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. WWF explicitly requires Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) for activities that may affect indigenous peoples and local communities, in line with international best practice.
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	Yes. WWF's safeguard framework is aligned with the Convention on Biological Diversity, its relevant decisions and principles, and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention	

CBD Checklist	WWF (World Wide Fund for Nature)
on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	Yes. WWF's safeguards are applied in a context-specific manner, taking into account local ecological conditions, social and cultural contexts, governance systems, and customary land and resource use.
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes. WWF requires compliance with national legislation and alignment with country-driven priorities and policies, and works closely with national and local partners to ensure consistency with domestic frameworks.
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	Yes. WWF's safeguards explicitly consider the Convention on Biological Diversity, UNDRIP, international human rights treaties, and other relevant international agreements, as appropriate.
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Yes. WWF has established institutional frameworks, internal policies, and operational procedures to ensure the consistent application of environmental and social safeguards across its programmes and projects.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	Yes. WWF includes monitoring, evaluation, and compliance mechanisms, such as project supervision, reporting requirements, internal audits, and corrective action processes to address non-compliance.
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes. Transparency and accountability are integral to WWF's safeguard system, including disclosure of relevant information, reporting to stakeholders, and accessible grievance and accountability mechanisms
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	Largely yes. WWF requires implementing partners and stakeholders to comply with safeguard requirements, with compliance monitored throughout the project cycle, though effectiveness may vary depending on context and partner capacity.
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	

CBD Checklist	WWF (World Wide Fund for Nature)
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Yes. WWF's safeguards include explicit provisions to promote equitable benefit-sharing, with particular attention to indigenous peoples, local communities, women, and other vulnerable groups, to reduce risks of inequity.
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	Yes. WWF requires assessment of social and cultural impacts and explicitly recognizes and respects the cultural and spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities in project design and implementation.
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Yes. WWF's safeguards explicitly consider customary land and resource use, traditional livelihoods, and community practices to avoid or minimize risks to local communities.
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Yes. WWF includes safeguards to protect traditional knowledge, requiring prior informed consent, appropriate use of knowledge, and fair benefit-sharing in line with CBD principles.

CBD Checklist	United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO)
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	Yes. FAO's Framework for Environmental and Social Management (FESM) is designed to ensure that FAO-supported programmes and financing mechanisms avoid, minimize, and manage adverse environmental and social impacts, in line with the objectives and principles of the Convention on Biological Diversity.
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	Yes. The FESM includes Environmental and Social Standards (ESS) and Operational Policies (ESOPs) that explicitly address the protection of the rights, livelihoods, and well-being of indigenous peoples and local communities, consistent with national legislation and international standards.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	Yes. The FESM explicitly recognizes the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions in supporting livelihoods, food security, and resilience, and integrates these considerations into programme and project design.
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	Yes. FAO recognizes biodiversity's intrinsic values alongside its ecological, social, and economic importance, consistent with the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective	

CBD Checklist	United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO)
participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	Yes. The FESM clearly defines the roles and responsibilities of FAO, implementing partners, governments, and other stakeholders through its Environmental and Social Standards (ESS) and Environmental and Social Operational Policies (ESOPs), ensuring equitable treatment of affected groups.
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. The FESM requires stakeholder engagement throughout the project cycle, including consultation and participation of affected stakeholders, indigenous peoples, and local communities, particularly during project design and implementation.
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. The FESM includes explicit requirements for Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) in projects affecting indigenous peoples, in line with UN standards and international best practice.
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	Yes. FAO's FESM is aligned with the Convention on Biological Diversity and explicitly reflects the principles of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, as well as other relevant international environmental and human rights instruments.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	Yes. The FESM is designed to be applied in a context-specific manner, taking into account local environmental, social, cultural, and institutional conditions, including customary land tenure and local governance systems.
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes. FAO requires that all activities comply with national legislation and align with country-driven priorities, policies, and strategies, working in coordination with national authorities and local partners.

CBD Checklist	United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO)
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	Yes. The FESM explicitly considers the Convention on Biological Diversity, UNDRIP, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties, and other relevant international agreements, as appropriate.
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Yes. FAO has established appropriate institutional frameworks to ensure the application of safeguards, including the FESM, dedicated environmental and social risk management procedures, and internal oversight and review mechanisms throughout the project cycle.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	Yes. The FESM includes monitoring, supervision, and evaluation mechanisms to assess compliance with environmental and social standards, with provisions for corrective actions where non-compliance is identified.
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes. Transparency and accountability are integral to the FESM, including disclosure of relevant information, reporting requirements, stakeholder engagement processes, and access to grievance and accountability mechanisms.
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	Largely yes. FAO requires implementing partners and stakeholders to comply with applicable environmental and social safeguards, with compliance monitored throughout implementation, although effectiveness may vary depending on context and capacity.
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Yes. The FESM includes provisions to promote equity and fair benefit-sharing, with particular attention to indigenous peoples, local communities, women, and vulnerable groups, aiming to reduce risks of inequity in project benefits.
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	Yes. The FESM requires assessment of social and cultural impacts, including respect for the cultural and spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities, particularly where projects may affect traditional practices or cultural heritage.

CBD Checklist	United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO)
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Yes. The FESM explicitly considers customary land and resource use and traditional livelihoods in risk assessment and mitigation measures, in order to avoid or minimize adverse impacts on local communities.
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Yes. The FESM includes safeguards for the protection of traditional knowledge, requiring prior informed consent, respect for knowledge rights, and appropriate benefit-sharing in line with CBD principles and international standards.

CBD Checklist	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	Yes. UNDP's Social and Environmental Standards (SES) provide a comprehensive safeguard framework to ensure that UNDP-supported programmes and financing mechanisms avoid, minimize, and manage adverse environmental and social impacts, consistent with the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity.
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	Yes. The UNDP SES explicitly address the protection of the rights, livelihoods, and well-being of indigenous peoples and local communities, including requirements on participation, Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC), benefit-sharing, and access to grievance mechanisms.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	Yes. The SES recognize the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions in supporting livelihoods, resilience, and sustainable development, and integrate these considerations into programme and project design.
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	Yes. UNDP recognizes biodiversity's intrinsic values alongside its ecological, social, and economic importance, consistent with CBD principles.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and	

CBD Checklist	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	Yes. The UNDP SES clearly define the roles and responsibilities of UNDP, implementing partners, governments, and other stakeholders, including specific provisions related to indigenous peoples, local communities, and affected groups.
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. The SES require meaningful stakeholder engagement throughout the project cycle, ensuring effective participation of affected stakeholders, indigenous peoples, local communities, and civil society organizations.
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. The UNDP SES include explicit requirements for Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) in projects that may affect indigenous peoples, in line with international standards and UN system policies.
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	Yes. The UNDP SES are aligned with the Convention on Biological Diversity and explicitly reflect the principles of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, as well as other relevant international environmental and human rights instruments.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	Yes. The UNDP SES require that safeguards be applied in a context-specific manner, taking into account local environmental, social, cultural, and institutional conditions, including country contexts and local community realities.
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes. The SES emphasize alignment with national laws, policies, and development priorities, while also ensuring consistency with international standards when national frameworks are weaker or less comprehensive.
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	Yes. The UNDP SES are explicitly grounded in international environmental and human rights instruments, including the Convention on Biological Diversity, the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, CEDAW, and core international human rights treaties.

CBD Checklist	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Yes. UNDP has a clear institutional framework for the application of its SES, including defined roles and responsibilities across UNDP offices, mandatory screening processes, and oversight mechanisms to ensure safeguards are applied throughout the project cycle.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	Yes. The SES include compliance, monitoring, and evaluation mechanisms, including project-level monitoring, periodic reviews, and the possibility of corrective actions when non-compliance is identified.
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes. Transparency and accountability are integral to the SES, including requirements for information disclosure, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and access to grievance and accountability mechanisms.
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	Generally yes. UNDP requires all implementing partners and stakeholders to comply with the SES. Compliance is supported through contractual obligations, monitoring, and capacity-building, although effectiveness may vary by context.
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Yes. The SES include explicit provisions to promote equity and social inclusion, ensuring fair and equitable access to project benefits, with particular attention to vulnerable and marginalized groups.
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	Yes. The SES require assessment of social and cultural impacts, including respect for cultural heritage and spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities.
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Yes. The SES recognize customary land use, resource use, and traditional practices, and require that risks to such uses be identified, avoided, or mitigated.
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Yes. The SES include safeguards to protect traditional knowledge, requiring respect for knowledge rights, benefit-sharing, and consent where traditional knowledge is involved.

CBD Checklist	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	Yes. UNEP's Environmental and Social Sustainability Framework (ESSF) provides a safeguard system aligned with the purpose of the CBD's voluntary guidelines, aiming to avoid, mitigate, and manage adverse environmental and social impacts while promoting positive outcomes for biodiversity, indigenous peoples, and local communities.
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	Yes. UNEP's Environmental and Social Sustainability Framework (ESSF) includes safeguard standards that address the rights, livelihoods, and well-being of indigenous peoples and local communities, requiring impact assessment, mitigation measures, stakeholder engagement, and grievance mechanisms in line with national legislation.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	Yes. UNEP's Environmental and Social Sustainability Framework explicitly recognizes the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions in supporting local livelihoods and resilience, and requires these aspects to be considered in project design, implementation, and monitoring.
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	Yes. UNEP's Environmental and Social Sustainability Framework recognizes the intrinsic value of biodiversity beyond its economic and livelihood benefits, emphasizing ecosystem integrity, conservation, and sustainable use as core environmental principles.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	Yes. UNEP's Environmental and Social Sustainability Framework clearly defines the roles, responsibilities, and obligations of UNEP, implementing partners, and other stakeholders, including requirements related to environmental and social risk management, compliance, and accountability.
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. UNEP's Environmental and Social Sustainability Framework promotes stakeholder engagement and consultation processes, requiring implementing partners to ensure

CBD Checklist	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
	meaningful participation of relevant stakeholders throughout the project cycle, particularly during project design and implementation.
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes, where applicable. UNEP's Environmental and Social Sustainability Framework requires respect for the rights of Indigenous Peoples, including the application of free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) in projects that may affect Indigenous Peoples, in line with international human rights standards.
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	Yes. UNEP's Environmental and Social Sustainability Framework is explicitly aligned with the Convention on Biological Diversity and takes into account relevant international agreements, including CBD decisions and guidance, as well as the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	Yes. UNEP's Environmental and Social Sustainability Framework requires that environmental and social risks and impacts are assessed in relation to local contexts, including country-specific conditions, environmental sensitivities, and social and cultural characteristics.
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes. UNEP's Environmental and Social Sustainability Framework requires compliance with applicable national legislation and alignment with country-driven processes and priorities, while also ensuring consistency with international environmental and social standards.
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	Yes. UNEP's Environmental and Social Sustainability Framework is informed by and aligned with key international instruments, including the Convention on Biological Diversity, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties, and relevant United Nations policies and standards, as appropriate.

CBD Checklist	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Yes. UNEP has established an institutional framework to ensure the application of safeguards, including dedicated environmental and social risk management procedures, oversight responsibilities, and requirements for implementing partners to comply with the Environmental and Social Sustainability Framework.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	Yes. UNEP's Environmental and Social Sustainability Framework includes mechanisms for monitoring, reporting, and evaluation of environmental and social performance, as well as corrective actions to address non-compliance with safeguard requirements.
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes. UNEP's Environmental and Social Sustainability Framework includes requirements for transparency and accountability, such as disclosure of relevant environmental and social information, reporting obligations, and the operation of grievance and response mechanisms.
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	UNEP requires all implementing partners and relevant stakeholders to comply with the Environmental and Social Sustainability Framework through contractual obligations, monitoring processes, and oversight mechanisms, although the level of compliance may vary depending on partner capacity and project context.
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Yes. UNEP's Environmental and Social Sustainability Framework includes provisions aimed at promoting equity and reducing risks of inequity, including requirements to assess social impacts, support inclusive benefit-sharing, and avoid disproportionate negative impacts on vulnerable groups.
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	Yes. UNEP's Environmental and Social Sustainability Framework requires the assessment of social and cultural impacts where relevant, including respect for the cultural and spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities as part of environmental and social risk management.
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Yes. UNEP's Environmental and Social Sustainability Framework recognizes customary use of natural resources and requires that project-related risks to traditional and customary

CBD Checklist	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
	practices of indigenous peoples and local communities are identified, avoided, or mitigated.
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Yes. UNEP's Environmental and Social Sustainability Framework includes safeguards related to the protection of traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, requiring respect for knowledge rights and appropriate measures to prevent unauthorized use or disclosure.

CBD Checklist	Green Climate Fund (GCF)
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	The Green Climate Fund applies an Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) system and Indigenous Peoples Policy designed to prevent, minimize, mitigate, or compensate for adverse environmental and social impacts of funded activities, while promoting sustainable development, climate resilience, and co-benefits for biodiversity and local communities, in line with international standards.
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	Yes. The Green Climate Fund has an Environmental and Social Safeguards system and a dedicated Indigenous Peoples Policy that aim to avoid, minimize, mitigate, or compensate for adverse impacts on the rights, livelihoods, and well-being of indigenous peoples and local communities, while enhancing positive outcomes in accordance with national legislation and international standards.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	Yes. The Green Climate Fund recognizes the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions in supporting local livelihoods and resilience, particularly through its promotion of ecosystem-based approaches to climate adaptation and mitigation, which are integrated into project selection, design, and implementation.
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	Yes. The Green Climate Fund's Environmental and Social Safeguards recognize the intrinsic value of biodiversity by requiring the avoidance of significant adverse impacts on natural habitats and biodiversity, and by promoting conservation and sustainable management of ecosystems.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of	

CBD Checklist	Green Climate Fund (GCF)
indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	Yes. The Green Climate Fund defines the rights and responsibilities of accredited entities, executing entities, and other stakeholders through its Environmental and Social Safeguards, Indigenous Peoples Policy, and accreditation requirements, ensuring roles and obligations are clearly articulated and applied in an equitable manner.
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. The Green Climate Fund requires stakeholder engagement and consultation processes throughout the project cycle, including during project preparation and implementation, to ensure the effective participation of relevant actors in defining and applying roles and responsibilities.
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. The Green Climate Fund requires free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) of indigenous peoples for projects that may affect their rights, lands, territories, or resources, as set out in its Indigenous Peoples Policy, ensuring their involvement in decision-making processes.
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	Yes. The Green Climate Fund's safeguard framework is aligned with relevant international agreements and standards, including principles consistent with the Convention on Biological Diversity and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	Yes. The Green Climate Fund requires environmental and social risk assessments to be conducted in relation to local circumstances, including country-specific environmental, social, cultural, and institutional contexts, to ensure safeguards are appropriately applied.
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes. The Green Climate Fund requires compliance with applicable national legislation and alignment with country-driven strategies and priorities, while ensuring consistency with its Environmental and Social Safeguards and international standards.

CBD Checklist	Green Climate Fund (GCF)
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	Yes. The Green Climate Fund's safeguard framework is informed by and aligned with key international instruments, including the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties, and principles consistent with the Convention on Biological Diversity and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Yes. The Green Climate Fund has established an institutional framework to ensure the application of safeguards, including accreditation requirements, oversight by the Secretariat, independent accountability mechanisms, and obligations for accredited entities to implement the Environmental and Social Safeguards and the Indigenous Peoples Policy.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	Yes. The Green Climate Fund's safeguard system includes enforcement and evaluation mechanisms such as monitoring and reporting requirements, periodic reviews of project performance, corrective action plans, and access to an Independent Redress Mechanism to address non-compliance.
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes. The Green Climate Fund includes transparency and accountability requirements through public disclosure of project information, environmental and social documentation, reporting obligations, and access to its Independent Redress Mechanism.
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	The Green Climate Fund requires all accredited entities and implementing partners to comply with its Environmental and Social Safeguards and Indigenous Peoples Policy through contractual obligations, monitoring and reporting processes, and oversight mechanisms, although the level of compliance may vary depending on partner capacity and project context.
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Yes. The Green Climate Fund includes provisions to promote equity and reduce risks of inequity, particularly through its Environmental and Social Safeguards and Indigenous Peoples Policy, which require inclusive benefit-sharing, protection of vulnerable groups, and equitable access to project benefits.

CBD Checklist	Green Climate Fund (GCF)
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	Yes. The Green Climate Fund's Environmental and Social Safeguards and Indigenous Peoples Policy require the assessment of social and cultural impacts, including respect for the cultural identity, traditions, and spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities where projects may affect them.
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Yes. The Green Climate Fund recognizes customary use of land, territories, and natural resources by indigenous peoples and local communities, and requires that risks to such customary uses are identified, avoided, or mitigated through its Environmental and Social Safeguards and Indigenous Peoples Policy.
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Yes. The Green Climate Fund's safeguard framework includes specific provisions to protect the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, requiring respect for knowledge rights and measures to prevent unauthorized use or disclosure of such knowledge.

CBD Checklist	Climate, Community & Biodiversity (CCB)
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	The Climate, Community & Biodiversity (CCB) Standards are designed to ensure that climate-related projects deliver net positive benefits for biodiversity and local communities, while avoiding or mitigating negative environmental and social impacts, in line with internationally recognized safeguards and best practices.
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	Yes. The CCB Standards include a comprehensive safeguard framework that requires projects to identify, avoid, and mitigate negative impacts on the rights, livelihoods, and well-being of indigenous peoples and local communities, while enhancing positive social and livelihood outcomes in compliance with national legislation and international best practices.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	Yes. The CCB Standards explicitly recognize the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions in supporting local livelihoods and resilience, requiring projects to demonstrate net positive impacts on biodiversity and to show how ecosystem services contribute to community well-being and climate resilience.

A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	Yes. The CCB Standards explicitly recognize the intrinsic value of biodiversity by requiring projects to deliver net positive biodiversity outcomes, protect high conservation value areas, and avoid or mitigate impacts on species, habitats, and ecosystem integrity.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	Yes. The CCB Standards require clear identification of stakeholders and define their roles, rights, and responsibilities within project governance, ensuring that these are addressed in a fair and equitable manner as part of project design and implementation.
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. The CCB Standards require meaningful stakeholder participation, including inclusive consultation processes during project design, implementation, and monitoring, to ensure that all relevant actors effectively participate in defining roles, responsibilities, and project decisions.
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. The CCB Standards require free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) for projects affecting indigenous peoples, and ensure their active involvement in decision-making processes related to project design, implementation, and governance.
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	Yes. The CCB Standards are consistent with the objectives and principles of the Convention on Biological Diversity and explicitly align with international norms such as the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, particularly through their requirements on biodiversity conservation, FPIC, and community rights.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	Yes. The CCB Standards require that projects are designed and implemented based on local ecological, social, and cultural contexts, including site-specific assessments of biodiversity, community conditions, and local governance structures.

C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes. The CCB Standards require projects to comply with applicable national legislation and to be consistent with country-specific policies, regulations, and priorities, while applying internationally recognized best practices for biodiversity conservation and community engagement.
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	Yes. The CCB Standards are informed by and consistent with key international instruments, including the Convention on Biological Diversity, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties, and principles reflected in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, as appropriate.
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Yes. The CCB Standards are supported by an institutional framework that includes independent third-party validation and verification, clear governance requirements, and standardized procedures to ensure consistent application of safeguard requirements across projects.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	Yes. The CCB Standards include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms through mandatory third-party validation and periodic verification, as well as corrective action requirements in cases of non-compliance with safeguard criteria.
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes. The CCB Standards include strong transparency and accountability requirements, including public disclosure of project design documents, validation and verification reports, and ongoing reporting on environmental and social performance.
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	The CCB Standards require project proponents and relevant stakeholders to comply with safeguard requirements through binding project design commitments, independent third-party validation and verification, and ongoing monitoring, although levels of compliance may vary depending on project capacity and context.
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Yes. The CCB Standards include explicit provisions to promote equity and reduce risks of inequity by requiring projects to demonstrate positive and equitable benefits for local communities, including fair benefit-sharing arrangements and attention to vulnerable and marginalized groups.

F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	Yes. The CCB Standards require assessment of social and cultural impacts, including explicit consideration of cultural identity, traditional practices, and spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities, as part of project design and implementation.
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Yes. The CCB Standards recognize customary use of land and natural resources by indigenous peoples and local communities and require projects to identify, respect, and avoid or mitigate risks to customary and traditional uses.
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Yes. The CCB Standards include safeguards to protect the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, requiring respect for knowledge rights, appropriate consent, and measures to prevent misuse or unauthorized disclosure of such knowledge.

CBD Checklist	Gold Standard for the Global Goals
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	Yes. The Gold Standard for the Global Goals includes a robust safeguard system designed to avoid, mitigate, and manage unintended negative impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities, in alignment with national legislation and international standards, while actively promoting sustainable development benefits and positive social outcomes.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	Yes. The Gold Standard for the Global Goals explicitly recognizes the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions in supporting local livelihoods and community resilience. Project selection, design, and implementation require the identification and enhancement of co-benefits related to ecosystem services, climate resilience, and sustainable use of natural resources, ensuring positive outcomes for local communities.
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	Yes. The Gold Standard for the Global Goals recognizes the intrinsic value of biodiversity beyond its utilitarian benefits. The standard promotes the protection, conservation, and enhancement of biodiversity as an essential objective in itself, ensuring that project activities avoid harm to ecosystems and contribute positively to biodiversity conservation.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the	

CBD Checklist	Gold Standard for the Global Goals
national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	Yes. The Gold Standard for the Global Goals clearly defines the rights and responsibilities of all relevant actors and stakeholders through its requirements on stakeholder identification, roles, and responsibilities. The standard promotes equitable engagement, ensuring that affected communities, including indigenous peoples and local communities where applicable, have clearly articulated roles and that project developers are accountable for respecting rights and fulfilling responsibilities.
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. The Gold Standard for the Global Goals requires meaningful and effective stakeholder participation throughout the project cycle. This includes early consultation, continuous engagement, and documented feedback processes, ensuring that all relevant actors have the opportunity to participate in defining roles and responsibilities and to influence project design and implementation.
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. The Gold Standard for the Global Goals requires Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) where indigenous peoples are affected. Its safeguard framework mandates culturally appropriate consultations, disclosure of relevant information, and documented consent or broad community support, ensuring the active involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in defining roles, responsibilities, and project decisions
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	Yes. The Gold Standard for the Global Goals is aligned with the objectives and principles of the Convention on Biological Diversity through its emphasis on biodiversity protection, ecosystem integrity, and sustainable development. It also reflects the principles of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples by requiring respect for indigenous rights, FPIC, inclusive participation, and protection of cultural and social values within project design and implementation.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention	

CBD Checklist	Gold Standard for the Global Goals
on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	Yes. Gold Standard safeguards are grounded in local circumstances through mandatory local stakeholder consultations, context-specific risk assessments, and adaptive project design. Projects must demonstrate an understanding of local environmental, social, cultural, and economic conditions, ensuring that safeguards are applied in a manner that is relevant and responsive to local realities.
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes. Gold Standard safeguards require projects to comply with applicable national legislation, regulations, and country-specific policies. Project developers must demonstrate consistency with national priorities and development frameworks, and any conflicts with domestic laws or country-driven processes must be identified and addressed to ensure full legal and policy alignment.
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	Yes. Gold Standard is explicitly aligned with international agreements and normative frameworks, including the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and international human rights standards. Its requirements incorporate principles related to gender equality, non-discrimination, and stakeholder inclusion, reflecting consistency with instruments such as CEDAW and broader international human rights treaties, as appropriate.
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Yes. Gold Standard has an established institutional framework to ensure the application of its safeguards, including clearly defined standards, validation and verification procedures, and oversight mechanisms. These frameworks support consistent implementation of safeguards across projects and provide guidance to ensure compliance throughout the project cycle.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	Yes. Gold Standard includes enforcement and evaluation mechanisms through mandatory validation and verification by independent third parties, regular monitoring requirements, and corrective action procedures. Non-compliance with safeguard requirements can result in suspension or rejection of project certification.
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes. Transparency and accountability are core principles of the Gold Standard. Project documentation, stakeholder consultation outcomes, monitoring reports, and verification

CBD Checklist	Gold Standard for the Global Goals
	results are publicly disclosed. Clear accountability mechanisms are in place through independent auditing, grievance procedures, and public access to information.
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	Yes. Compliance with relevant safeguards is mandatory for all stakeholders involved in Gold Standard-certified activities. Project developers, validation and verification bodies, and implementing partners must adhere to the Gold Standard requirements, including social, environmental, and human rights safeguards, with compliance monitored through independent audits and periodic reviews.
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Yes. Gold Standard includes explicit provisions to promote equitable benefit-sharing through its requirements on stakeholder consultation, sustainable development contributions, and safeguards against negative social impacts. Projects must demonstrate fair distribution of benefits, including to local communities, and address risks of inequity as part of project design, monitoring, and reporting.
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	Partially. Gold Standard requires assessment of social and cultural impacts through stakeholder consultation processes and safeguard principles. While it promotes respect for local cultures and community values, including those of indigenous peoples, it does not establish a standalone cultural impact assessment focused specifically on spiritual values, but these aspects can be addressed within the broader social safeguards framework.
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Yes. Gold Standard requires project developers to identify and assess risks related to land use, access to natural resources, and local livelihoods through stakeholder consultations. Customary use of land and resources by local communities and indigenous peoples is considered as part of the risk identification and mitigation process, particularly to avoid negative impacts on traditional practices and livelihoods.
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Yes. Gold Standard includes safeguards to protect the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities through its stakeholder consultation requirements and social safeguard principles. Projects must ensure that traditional knowledge is not used without consent and that communities are appropriately consulted and respected, particularly where such knowledge is relevant to project design, implementation, or benefit-sharing arrangements.

CBD Checklist	Plan Vivo
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	Yes. Plan Vivo operates a certification standard designed to ensure that biodiversity financing mechanisms avoid or mitigate negative environmental and social impacts while enhancing positive outcomes for local communities. Its safeguard approach emphasizes community-led project design, protection of livelihoods, respect for customary land use, and alignment with international best practices relevant to biodiversity, climate, and sustainable development.
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	Yes. Plan Vivo's certification system includes safeguards specifically designed to protect the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities. The standard requires community ownership or clear rights to land and resources, participatory decision-making, benefit-sharing mechanisms, and compliance with national legislation. It aims to minimize risks while maximizing social, livelihood, and environmental benefits through locally led project implementation.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	Yes. Plan Vivo explicitly recognizes the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions in supporting local livelihoods and community resilience. The standard requires projects to be designed around sustainable land-use practices that enhance ecosystem services, improve biodiversity conservation, and contribute directly to the economic and social well-being of participating communities.
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	Yes. Plan Vivo recognizes biodiversity's intrinsic values by promoting conservation-focused land-use practices that go beyond economic benefits. The standard emphasizes the protection and enhancement of natural ecosystems, native species, and ecological integrity as core objectives of project design and implementation.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	

CBD Checklist	Plan Vivo
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	Yes. Plan Vivo clearly defines the rights and responsibilities of all actors involved, including project coordinators, smallholders, and local communities. The standard establishes transparent roles related to land tenure, benefit-sharing, project implementation, monitoring, and decision-making, ensuring equitable treatment of stakeholders.
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. Plan Vivo requires the effective participation of all relevant actors, particularly local communities and smallholders, in the definition of roles and responsibilities. Participation is ensured through inclusive project design processes, community consultations, and locally driven governance structures that allow stakeholders to actively shape project decisions.
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. Plan Vivo explicitly requires Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) from indigenous peoples and local communities. The certification standard mandates documented consent processes, culturally appropriate information sharing, and ongoing community involvement in decision-making throughout the project lifecycle.
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	Yes. While Plan Vivo does not explicitly reference the Convention on Biological Diversity in all provisions, its standard is aligned with CBD principles, particularly regarding community-based conservation, sustainable use of biodiversity, benefit-sharing, and respect for indigenous peoples' rights, consistent with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	Yes. Plan Vivo's safeguard framework is explicitly grounded in local circumstances, as projects are designed, implemented, and monitored at the community level, taking into account local ecological, social, cultural, and economic conditions.
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes. Plan Vivo projects are required to comply with applicable national laws, regulations, and country-specific policies. The certification standard emphasizes alignment with national priorities, land tenure frameworks, and local governance structures in host countries.
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the	Yes. The Plan Vivo Standard is aligned with international human rights principles and climate-related frameworks, including the UNFCCC. It incorporates safeguards related to

CBD Checklist	Plan Vivo
Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	gender equity, non-discrimination, and respect for internationally recognized human rights, although it does not explicitly reference all CBD-related decisions.
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Yes. Plan Vivo has an established institutional framework that ensures the application of safeguards through certification requirements, third-party validation and verification processes, and oversight by the Plan Vivo Foundation. Clear procedures and governance structures support consistent implementation.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	Yes. Plan Vivo includes enforcement and evaluation mechanisms through mandatory monitoring, periodic third-party verification, and corrective action requirements for certified projects. Non-compliance can result in suspension or loss of certification.
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes. Plan Vivo includes transparency and accountability requirements through publicly available project documentation, clear reporting obligations, independent third-party verification, and stakeholder grievance mechanisms that allow concerns to be raised and addressed.
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	Yes, compliance with relevant safeguards is required from all stakeholders involved in Plan Vivo–certified projects. Project developers, partners, and participating communities must adhere to Plan Vivo standards, which are monitored through ongoing reporting, audits, and third-party verification processes.
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Yes, equity in benefit-sharing is a core principle of the Plan Vivo Standard. The mechanism requires transparent and fair benefit-sharing arrangements that prioritize local communities and smallholders, ensuring they receive a significant share of project benefits. Benefit distribution agreements are defined jointly with communities to reduce risks of inequity and elite capture.
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	Yes. The Plan Vivo Standard requires project developers to assess social and cultural impacts as part of project design and validation. It explicitly recognizes and respects the cultural identities, traditional practices, and spiritual values of indigenous peoples and

CBD Checklist	Plan Vivo
	local communities, and requires that projects do not negatively affect culturally significant sites or practices.
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Yes. The Plan Vivo Standard explicitly recognizes customary land use, resource use, and traditional livelihood practices of indigenous peoples and local communities. Projects must demonstrate that customary rights and uses are respected and that project activities do not restrict or negatively affect traditional access to land and natural resources without the free, prior and informed consent of the affected communities.
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Yes. The Plan Vivo Standard includes explicit safeguards for the protection of traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities. It requires that traditional knowledge used in project design or implementation is recognized, respected, and applied only with the free, prior and informed consent of knowledge holders. The standard also promotes benefit-sharing and safeguards against misappropriation of traditional knowledge.

CBD Guidance	Biodiversity Credit Alliance (BCA)
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	The Biodiversity Credit Alliance does not operate as a financing mechanism itself, but develops principles, guidance, and frameworks to support the design of biodiversity credit markets. Its work aligns with the purpose of the CBD voluntary guidelines on safeguards by promoting high-integrity biodiversity outcomes, respect for rights, and risk mitigation in biodiversity-related financial mechanisms.
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	As the Biodiversity Credit Alliance is not a financing mechanism and does not directly implement or finance projects, it does not have an operational safeguard system. However, its guidance and principles explicitly emphasize the need for biodiversity credit schemes to include robust safeguards to avoid adverse impacts on indigenous peoples and local communities, in line with national legislation, and to support positive social outcomes.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	

CBD Guidance	Biodiversity Credit Alliance (BCA)
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	Yes, at the level of principles and guidance. The Biodiversity Credit Alliance recognizes the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions in supporting local livelihoods and socio-ecological resilience, and promotes their consideration in the design of biodiversity credit frameworks, although it does not directly select, design, or implement projects.
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	Yes. The Biodiversity Credit Alliance explicitly recognizes biodiversity as having intrinsic value beyond its economic or instrumental use. Its approach emphasizes biodiversity conservation outcomes, ecosystem integrity, and nature-positive impacts as core objectives of biodiversity crediting, not solely as means to generate financial returns.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	Partially. The Biodiversity Credit Alliance defines roles and responsibilities for key actors involved in biodiversity credit generation, validation, and use, including project developers, standard-setting bodies, and buyers. However, detailed and binding definitions of rights and responsibilities for all stakeholders, particularly Indigenous Peoples and local communities, are still evolving as the framework is under development.
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Partially. The Biodiversity Credit Alliance promotes multi-stakeholder engagement and consultation processes involving governments, conservation organizations, private sector actors, and experts. However, participation mechanisms are still being developed, and consistent, systematic participation of all affected actors—especially Indigenous Peoples and local communities—is not yet fully ensured.
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Partially. The Biodiversity Credit Alliance acknowledges the importance of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) and the involvement of Indigenous Peoples and local communities. However, as the framework is still under development, clear and binding FPIC procedures are not yet consistently operationalized across all proposed biodiversity credit schemes.
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	Yes. The Biodiversity Credit Alliance has been developed in alignment with the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity, including its guidance on biodiversity finance and safeguards. It also makes reference to international principles related to Indigenous Peoples' rights, including those reflected in the United Nations

CBD Guidance	Biodiversity Credit Alliance (BCA)
	Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, although operational guidance is still evolving.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	Partially. The Biodiversity Credit Alliance emphasizes the need for biodiversity credits to be grounded in local ecological and social contexts, including site-specific assessments. However, as a global initiative still under development, detailed operationalization at the local level depends on the implementing partners and pilot projects.
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes, in principle. The Biodiversity Credit Alliance promotes alignment with national biodiversity strategies, country-specific legal frameworks, and existing policy priorities. Implementation of safeguards is expected to be consistent with national legislation, although practical application depends on national contexts and participating institutions.
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	Yes, at a general level. The Biodiversity Credit Alliance refers to internationally recognized environmental and social principles, including human rights and climate-related frameworks
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Partially. The Biodiversity Credit Alliance is developing institutional arrangements and governance structures to support the application of safeguards. While high-level frameworks and principles exist, detailed and fully operational institutional mechanisms are still being refined as the initiative evolves.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	Partially. The Biodiversity Credit Alliance foresees monitoring, reporting, and verification elements linked to biodiversity credits. However, concrete enforcement and evaluation

CBD Guidance	Biodiversity Credit Alliance (BCA)
	mechanisms are still under development and are expected to be strengthened as standards and pilot implementations mature.
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes, at a conceptual level. The Biodiversity Credit Alliance emphasizes transparency, accountability, and traceability in the design of biodiversity credits, including clear information on impacts, methodologies, and governance arrangements. Practical implementation mechanisms are still being further developed.
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	Partially. The Biodiversity Credit Alliance expects participating stakeholders to comply with relevant environmental and social safeguards. However, as the mechanism is still evolving, compliance depends on voluntary adherence and the safeguards applied by implementing partners rather than on a fully standardized enforcement system.
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Yes, in principle. The Biodiversity Credit Alliance promotes equitable benefit-sharing and seeks to ensure that local communities and Indigenous Peoples benefit from biodiversity credit activities. Nonetheless, concrete benefit-sharing arrangements are expected to be defined at the project level and vary by context.
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	Partially. The Biodiversity Credit Alliance recognizes the importance of cultural considerations and respect for Indigenous Peoples and local communities. While it encourages socially responsible approaches, explicit and standardized cultural impact assessment procedures, including specific references to spiritual values, are still under development and may depend on project-level safeguards.
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Partially. The Biodiversity Credit Alliance acknowledges the relevance of customary use of land and natural resources by Indigenous Peoples and local communities. Consideration of customary practices is encouraged to avoid social and environmental risks, but detailed operational guidance is expected to be addressed at the project level.
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Partially. The Biodiversity Credit Alliance recognizes the importance of protecting the traditional knowledge of Indigenous Peoples and local communities. While respect for knowledge rights is acknowledged at a principle level, specific safeguards and protection mechanisms are still evolving and are expected to be strengthened through future standards and implementation guidance.

CBD Guidance	The International Advisory Panel on Biodiversity Credits (IAPB)
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	Yes. The International Advisory Panel on Biodiversity Credits (IAPB) supports the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity by promoting the development of biodiversity credit systems that integrate environmental and social safeguards. Its work aims to ensure that biodiversity finance mechanisms avoid negative impacts and contribute positively to conservation outcomes and social considerations, in line with CBD principles.
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	Partially. The International Advisory Panel on Biodiversity Credits does not operate a financing mechanism itself, but provides strategic guidance and recommendations for the design of biodiversity credit systems. It promotes the inclusion of safeguards to avoid or mitigate negative impacts on Indigenous Peoples and local communities and encourages alignment with national legislation. However, implementation depends on the institutions and mechanisms adopting its guidance.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	Yes, at a conceptual level. The International Advisory Panel on Biodiversity Credits recognizes the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions in supporting local livelihoods and resilience. Its guidance emphasizes that biodiversity credit systems should be designed to deliver positive ecological outcomes while considering social and livelihood dimensions, although practical application depends on implementing mechanisms.
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	Yes. The International Advisory Panel on Biodiversity Credits explicitly recognizes the intrinsic value of biodiversity, emphasizing that biodiversity credits should reflect conservation outcomes beyond purely economic or instrumental benefits, and should support the protection of nature for its own sake.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	

CBD Guidance	The International Advisory Panel on Biodiversity Credits (IAPB)
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	Partially. The International Advisory Panel on Biodiversity Credits provides high-level guidance on the roles and responsibilities of actors involved in biodiversity credit systems, emphasizing fairness and accountability. However, detailed and legally binding definitions of rights and responsibilities are expected to be established by the institutions and mechanisms that implement biodiversity credit schemes.
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Partially. The International Advisory Panel on Biodiversity Credits promotes inclusive and multi-stakeholder engagement in the development of biodiversity credit systems. While it encourages participation of a broad range of actors, including experts and relevant stakeholders, the extent of effective participation ultimately depends on the processes established by the implementing institutions.
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Partially. The International Advisory Panel on Biodiversity Credits recognizes the importance of free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) for Indigenous Peoples and local communities in biodiversity-related initiatives. However, as an advisory body, it does not implement FPIC procedures directly; their application depends on the biodiversity credit mechanisms and projects that adopt the Panel's guidance.
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	Yes. The International Advisory Panel on Biodiversity Credits has been established in the context of the Convention on Biological Diversity and explicitly considers its objectives, decisions, and guidance.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	Partially. The International Advisory Panel on Biodiversity Credits emphasizes that biodiversity credit systems should be grounded in local ecological, social, and institutional contexts. However, as an advisory body, it does not apply safeguards directly; grounding in local circumstances is expected to be ensured by the implementing mechanisms and projects.
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes, in principle. The International Advisory Panel on Biodiversity Credits promotes alignment of biodiversity credit systems with national legislation, country-driven processes, and national biodiversity priorities. Its guidance stresses that implementation should respect domestic legal frameworks and policy objectives, although practical consistency is determined by the entities applying the guidance.

CBD Guidance	The International Advisory Panel on Biodiversity Credits (IAPB)
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	Yes, at a general level. The International Advisory Panel on Biodiversity Credits takes into account internationally recognized environmental, climate, and human rights instruments, including those referenced under the Convention on Biological Diversity. Its guidance aligns with broader international frameworks on climate action, human rights, and gender equality, although detailed operationalization is left to implementing mechanisms.
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Partially. The International Advisory Panel on Biodiversity Credits contributes to the development of governance and institutional frameworks by providing strategic advice and guidance on safeguards. However, it does not itself establish or enforce institutional frameworks; the effectiveness of such frameworks depends on the institutions and mechanisms that implement biodiversity credit systems based on its recommendations.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	Partially. As an advisory body, the International Advisory Panel on Biodiversity Credits does not include its own enforcement or evaluation mechanisms. It encourages the incorporation of monitoring, evaluation, and compliance measures within biodiversity credit systems, but responsibility for enforcement lies with the institutions and standards that adopt its guidance.
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes, at a conceptual level. The International Advisory Panel on Biodiversity Credits emphasizes the importance of transparency and accountability in the design and governance of biodiversity credit systems, including clear methodologies, disclosure of impacts, and credible governance arrangements. However, concrete transparency requirements depend on how its guidance is implemented by participating mechanisms.
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	Partially. The International Advisory Panel on Biodiversity Credits promotes compliance with relevant environmental and social safeguards among stakeholders involved in biodiversity credit systems. However, as an advisory body, it does not monitor or enforce compliance directly; adherence to safeguards depends on the governance and accountability mechanisms of the implementing institutions.
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	

CBD Guidance	The International Advisory Panel on Biodiversity Credits (IAPB)
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Yes, in principle. The International Advisory Panel on Biodiversity Credits highlights the importance of equitable benefit-sharing in biodiversity credit systems and encourages approaches that deliver fair outcomes for Indigenous Peoples and local communities. However, specific benefit-sharing provisions are expected to be designed and implemented at the level of individual mechanisms and projects.
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	Partially. The International Advisory Panel on Biodiversity Credits acknowledges the importance of cultural considerations and respect for Indigenous Peoples and local communities, including their spiritual values. However, as an advisory body, it does not prescribe detailed cultural impact assessment procedures; such procedures are expected to be incorporated by the biodiversity credit mechanisms and standards that apply its guidance.
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Partially. The International Advisory Panel on Biodiversity Credits recognizes the importance of customary use of land and natural resources by Indigenous Peoples and local communities when designing biodiversity credit systems. It encourages the consideration of customary practices to avoid social and environmental risks, although concrete measures are expected to be defined by implementing mechanisms.
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Partially. The International Advisory Panel on Biodiversity Credits recognizes the importance of protecting the traditional knowledge of Indigenous Peoples and local communities and encourages respect for knowledge rights within biodiversity credit systems. However, as an advisory body, it does not establish binding safeguards; specific protection measures are expected to be implemented by the mechanisms and standards that adopt its recommendations.

CBD Guidance	The FairWild Standard
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	Yes. The FairWild Standard supports the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity by promoting the sustainable use of wild plant resources through a safeguard system that integrates environmental conservation, social responsibility, and fair benefit-sharing. Its approach aligns with the purpose of the CBD's voluntary guidelines by seeking to prevent negative biodiversity and social impacts while supporting local livelihoods.
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of	Yes. The FairWild Standard includes a comprehensive safeguard system designed to avoid or mitigate negative impacts on the rights and livelihoods of Indigenous Peoples and local

CBD Guidance	The FairWild Standard
indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	communities. It promotes sustainable harvesting practices, respect for customary rights, fair trade principles, and compliance with national legislation, while seeking to enhance local economic and social benefits.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	Yes. The FairWild Standard explicitly recognizes the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions in supporting local livelihoods and resilience. Its certification system is designed to ensure sustainable use of wild plant resources while maintaining ecosystem health and supporting the long-term economic viability of harvesting communities.
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	Yes. The FairWild Standard recognizes the intrinsic value of biodiversity by emphasizing conservation of wild plant species and ecosystems beyond their economic use. Sustainable harvesting requirements are designed to maintain species populations and ecosystem integrity, reflecting biodiversity's inherent value.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	Yes. The FairWild Standard clearly defines the rights and responsibilities of all actors involved in wild collection and trade, including collectors, producers, and companies. It emphasizes fairness, legal compliance, and equitable relationships, with specific requirements related to access rights, benefit-sharing, and labour conditions.
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. The FairWild Standard has been developed through a participatory, multi-stakeholder process involving harvesters, local communities, experts, NGOs, and market actors. At the implementation level, the standard requires the participation of relevant stakeholders, including collectors and local communities, in management planning and decision-making processes.
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. The FairWild Standard requires respect for customary rights and legal access to wild resources and promotes the informed involvement of Indigenous Peoples and local communities in harvesting and management arrangements. While the standard does not

CBD Guidance	The FairWild Standard
	always use the explicit term FPIC, its requirements on legal compliance, participation, and consent are consistent with FPIC principles where Indigenous Peoples are present
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	Yes. The FairWild Standard is closely aligned with the objectives and principles of the Convention on Biological Diversity, particularly those related to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and equitable benefit-sharing. It also reflects relevant international principles on the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, including respect for customary rights and participation, consistent with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	Yes. The FairWild Standard is explicitly grounded in local ecological, social, and institutional circumstances. It requires site-specific resource assessments, locally adapted management plans, and consideration of local harvesting practices, governance structures, and socio-economic conditions.
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes. The FairWild Standard requires compliance with national legislation and country-specific regulatory frameworks governing access to and use of wild resources. Its safeguards are designed to be applied in a manner consistent with national priorities and legal requirements, while complementing country-driven conservation and sustainable use objectives.
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	Yes. The FairWild Standard reflects relevant international agreements and principles, including those under the Convention on Biological Diversity and international human rights frameworks. Its provisions on non-discrimination, fair working conditions, gender equity, and community rights are consistent with broader international human rights instruments, while climate-related considerations are addressed indirectly through sustainable resource management.

CBD Guidance	The FairWild Standard
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Yes. The FairWild Standard is supported by an established institutional framework that includes clear certification requirements, third-party auditing, and governance structures to ensure consistent application of its safeguards. Responsibilities for implementation, verification, and oversight are clearly defined within the FairWild certification system.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	Yes. The FairWild Standard includes enforcement and evaluation mechanisms through independent third-party audits, periodic certification reviews, and corrective action requirements. Compliance with safeguard criteria is monitored regularly, and certification can be suspended or withdrawn in cases of non-compliance.
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes. The FairWild Standard includes clear requirements for transparency and accountability, including documentation of harvesting practices, management plans, benefit-sharing arrangements, and audit results. Certified operators are required to maintain records and make relevant information available for verification, supporting accountability across the supply chain.
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	Yes. Under the FairWild Standard, all certified stakeholders are required to comply with the applicable environmental and social safeguards. Compliance is verified through independent audits and ongoing monitoring, ensuring that collectors, producers, and companies adhere to the standard's requirements.
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Yes. Equity and fair benefit-sharing are core elements of the FairWild Standard. It requires fair pricing, transparent benefit-sharing arrangements, and improved working and livelihood conditions for collectors and local communities, thereby reducing risks of inequity.
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	Partially. The FairWild Standard includes requirements to respect cultural practices, customary rights, and traditional harvesting systems. While it does not mandate formal cultural impact assessments in all cases, it promotes respect for cultural and spiritual values associated with wild resource use, particularly where Indigenous Peoples and local communities are involved.

CBD Guidance	The FairWild Standard
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Yes. The FairWild Standard explicitly recognizes customary use of wild plant resources and requires that harvesting practices respect traditional knowledge, customary access rights, and long-standing resource-use practices to avoid social and ecological risks.
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Yes. The FairWild Standard includes safeguards to respect and protect traditional knowledge related to the use and management of wild plant resources. It promotes recognition of knowledge holders, prevents misappropriation, and supports the fair and respectful use of traditional knowledge within certified activities.

CBD Guidance	Verra
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	Yes. Verra's standards support the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity by promoting market-based mechanisms that integrate environmental integrity, social safeguards, and benefits
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	Yes. Verra's standards include comprehensive safeguard systems designed to avoid, mitigate, and manage potential negative impacts on the rights and livelihoods of Indigenous Peoples and local communities. These safeguards require compliance with national legislation, stakeholder engagement, respect for land and resource rights, and the promotion of social and environmental benefits through project activities.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	Yes. Verra's standards recognize the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions in supporting local livelihoods and resilience. Project design requirements emphasize the maintenance and enhancement of ecosystem services, sustainable land-use practices, and the generation of social co-benefits for local communities alongside environmental outcomes.
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	Yes. Verra's standards recognize the intrinsic value of biodiversity by requiring the protection of natural ecosystems and the avoidance of activities that cause significant harm to biodiversity. Through standards such as the Climate, Community & Biodiversity (CCB) Standards, Verra promotes conservation outcomes that go beyond economic benefits and emphasize the inherent value of biodiversity.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective	

CBD Guidance	Verra
participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	Yes. Verra's standards clearly define the rights and responsibilities of project proponents, stakeholders, and third parties. Requirements address legal compliance, land and resource tenure, stakeholder engagement, benefit-sharing, and grievance mechanisms, aiming to ensure equitable treatment and accountability among all actors involved.
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. Verra's standards require effective stakeholder engagement throughout the project cycle, including identification of affected stakeholders, inclusive consultation processes, and ongoing participation. Project proponents must document how stakeholders, including Indigenous Peoples and local communities, are engaged in defining roles, responsibilities, and benefit-sharing arrangements.
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. Verra's standards require the application of free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) where Indigenous Peoples are present. Project proponents must demonstrate that Indigenous Peoples and local communities have been appropriately informed, consulted, and have provided consent or approval for project activities that may affect their rights, lands, or livelihoods.
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	Yes. Verra's standards are consistent with the objectives and principles of the Convention on Biological Diversity, particularly those related to conservation, sustainable use, and benefit-sharing. They also reflect international norms on Indigenous Peoples' rights, including principles aligned with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, through requirements on land tenure, FPIC, and stakeholder engagement.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	

CBD Guidance	Verra
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	Yes. Verra's safeguards require project-specific assessments that are grounded in local ecological, social, and institutional contexts. Project design must reflect site-specific conditions, including local biodiversity values, land tenure arrangements, and community livelihoods.
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes. Verra's standards require compliance with applicable national laws and regulations and encourage alignment with country-driven processes and national priorities, including land-use planning and biodiversity strategies.
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	Yes. Verra's standards are informed by international environmental and social frameworks, including the CBD, climate-related instruments, and international human rights principles. Gender and social inclusion considerations are addressed through stakeholder engagement and safeguard requirements.
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Yes. Verra has established institutional frameworks, including standard-setting, accreditation of validation and verification bodies, and oversight mechanisms to ensure consistent application of safeguards.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	Yes. Enforcement and evaluation are ensured through independent third-party validation and verification, ongoing monitoring, and the possibility of corrective actions or suspension in cases of non-compliance.
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes. Verra requires transparency through public project documentation, stakeholder consultation records, monitoring reports, and grievance mechanisms, supporting accountability throughout the project lifecycle.
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	Yes, in principle. All project participants are required to comply with applicable safeguards, with compliance verified through independent audits and ongoing monitoring.
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Yes. Verra's standards promote equitable benefit-sharing through requirements on stakeholder engagement, social impact assessment, and documentation of benefits for local communities and Indigenous Peoples.

CBD Guidance	Verra
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	Partially. Verra requires assessment of social and cultural impacts and respect for Indigenous Peoples' cultural values, including spiritual connections to land, particularly where FPIC applies. Formal cultural impact assessments may vary by project.
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Yes. Verra's safeguards require recognition of customary land and resource use and mandate that projects avoid or mitigate risks to customary practices and livelihoods.
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Yes. Verra's standards include safeguards to respect and protect traditional knowledge, requiring appropriate consent, acknowledgment, and avoidance of misappropriation in project activities.

CBD Checklist	Equitable Earth
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	Yes. Equitable Earth aligns with the purpose of the Convention on Biological Diversity's voluntary guidelines on safeguards by promoting biodiversity finance mechanisms that are grounded in strong social and environmental safeguards. Its approach emphasizes equity, rights-based conservation, and the delivery of positive outcomes for biodiversity, Indigenous Peoples, and local communities, while avoiding or minimizing negative impacts.
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	Yes. Equitable Earth applies a safeguard system designed to prevent, avoid, and mitigate unintended negative impacts on biodiversity and human rights. Its framework emphasizes rights-based approaches, inclusive decision-making, and environmental and social risk management to ensure that biodiversity outcomes are achieved without harming Indigenous Peoples, local communities
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	Yes. Equitable Earth explicitly recognizes the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions in sustaining local livelihoods and strengthening social and ecological resilience. Its framework links biodiversity protection with community well-being, food security, climate resilience and long-term sustainability, and promotes mechanisms that support local stewardship and community-led conservation outcomes.
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	Yes. Equitable Earth recognizes the intrinsic value of biodiversity beyond its economic or instrumental benefits. Its approach emphasizes the protection and restoration of ecosystems for their own sake, acknowledging their ecological, cultural, and relational importance, and not solely their value as tradable or financial assets.

CBD Checklist	Equitable Earth
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	Yes. Equitable Earth clearly defines the rights and responsibilities of all relevant actors and stakeholders, including indigenous peoples, local communities, project developers and buyers. Its framework emphasizes equitable roles, community leadership, and shared accountability, ensuring that responsibilities for biodiversity protection and benefit delivery are clearly allocated and aligned with principles of fairness and inclusion.
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. Equitable Earth promotes the effective participation of all relevant actors in the definition of roles and responsibilities, with a strong emphasis on inclusive, community-led processes. Indigenous peoples and local communities are actively involved in decision-making, ensuring that their perspectives, priorities and knowledge inform the design, governance and implementation of the mechanism.
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. Equitable Earth explicitly requires the free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) or equivalent approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of roles and responsibilities. This process ensures that participation is voluntary, based on full and transparent information, culturally appropriate, and obtained before activities affecting their lands, resources or livelihoods are initiated
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	Yes. Equitable Earth is aligned with the objectives and principles of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), including the conservation of biodiversity, sustainable use of its components and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits. It also reflects relevant CBD decisions and guidance and is consistent with the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), particularly regarding rights to lands, territories, resources, participation, self-determination and respect for traditional knowledge.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention	

CBD Checklist	Equitable Earth
on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	Yes. Equitable Earth's safeguards are grounded in local circumstances, as the mechanism emphasizes context-specific design and implementation. Safeguards take into account local ecological conditions, social structures, cultural values and governance systems, and are adapted through participatory processes with indigenous peoples and local communities to ensure relevance, effectiveness and legitimacy at the local level.
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes. Equitable Earth's safeguards are designed to be consistent with country-driven processes, national legislation and development priorities. The mechanism requires alignment with applicable national laws, policies and regulatory frameworks, while allowing flexibility to reflect country-specific governance contexts and priorities related to biodiversity conservation, land tenure and community rights.
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	Yes. Equitable Earth's safeguard framework explicitly considers relevant international instruments, including the Convention on Biological Diversity and its related decisions, as well as applicable international human rights standards. The framework is aligned with broader international commitments such as the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and international human rights principles, including gender equality and non-discrimination, as reflected in the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, where relevant.
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Yes. Equitable Earth has established appropriate institutional frameworks to ensure the effective application of its safeguards. These include clearly defined governance structures, roles and responsibilities for safeguard implementation, and internal procedures to oversee compliance throughout the design, validation and monitoring of biodiversity credit activities. These frameworks are intended to ensure that safeguards are systematically applied across all stages of the mechanism.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	Yes. Equitable Earth's safeguard system includes mechanisms for enforcement and evaluation. Compliance with safeguards is assessed through validation and periodic monitoring processes, including independent verification where applicable. Corrective actions are required if non-compliance is identified, and ongoing evaluation helps ensure that safeguards remain effective and responsive over time.

CBD Checklist	Equitable Earth
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes. Equitable Earth includes clear requirements for transparency and accountability within its safeguard framework. These include documentation and disclosure of project information, decision-making processes, benefit-sharing arrangements, and safeguard compliance. Mechanisms for reporting, grievance handling, and stakeholder communication are in place to ensure accountability to indigenous peoples, local communities, and other relevant actors.
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	Yes. Equitable Earth requires all stakeholders involved—including project developers, implementing partners, and intermediaries—to comply with its relevant environmental and social safeguards. Compliance is ensured through clear roles and responsibilities, monitoring and reporting requirements, and mechanisms for oversight and corrective action where non-compliance is identified.
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Yes. Equitable Earth includes explicit provisions to promote equity and reduce risks of inequity in benefit-sharing. Its framework emphasizes fair and inclusive distribution of benefits, with particular attention to indigenous peoples, local communities, women, and other marginalized groups. Benefit-sharing arrangements are designed to be transparent, culturally appropriate, and responsive to local priorities, helping ensure that conservation outcomes also support social justice and livelihoods.
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	Yes. Equitable Earth includes cultural impact considerations within its safeguard instruments. These procedures recognize and respect the cultural and spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities, ensuring that conservation and financing activities do not undermine cultural heritage, customary practices, or spiritual relationships with land and nature. Cultural sensitivity and community-defined values are integrated into project design, implementation, and monitoring processes.
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Yes. Equitable Earth explicitly considers customary use of land, resources, and biodiversity in its risk avoidance and mitigation measures. Safeguards are designed to ensure that traditional and customary practices of indigenous peoples and local communities are recognized, respected, and not adversely affected by project activities. This includes incorporating customary tenure, resource management systems, and traditional livelihoods into project planning and decision-making to prevent harm and support sustainable use.

CBD Checklist	Equitable Earth
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Yes. Equitable Earth includes safeguards to protect the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities. These safeguards ensure that traditional knowledge is used only with free, prior and informed consent, that intellectual and cultural rights are respected, and that any use of such knowledge is appropriately acknowledged and, where relevant, equitably compensated. Measures are also in place to prevent misappropriation and to ensure that traditional knowledge holders retain control over how their knowledge is shared and applied.

CBD Checklist	Equator Principles (Framework)
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	Yes. The Equator Principles establish a comprehensive environmental and social risk management framework aimed at identifying, assessing, and managing potential adverse impacts of financed projects. While primarily focused on project finance, the framework includes safeguards aligned with national legislation and international standards to avoid or mitigate negative impacts on indigenous peoples and local communities. The Equator Principles also promote meaningful stakeholder engagement, respect for human rights, and grievance mechanisms, thereby creating opportunities to support local livelihoods and social sustainability.
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	Yes. The Equator Principles provide a structured environmental and social risk management framework designed to identify, assess, and manage potential adverse impacts of financed projects. The framework is aligned with national legislation and international standards, including the IFC Performance Standards, and includes specific provisions related to indigenous peoples, local communities, human rights, stakeholder engagement, and grievance mechanisms. Through these safeguards, the Equator Principles aim to avoid or mitigate unintended negative impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities, while also promoting opportunities to enhance social sustainability and local development outcomes.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	Yes, partially. The Equator Principles recognize the importance of biodiversity and ecosystem services through their alignment with the IFC Performance Standards, particularly Performance Standard 6 on Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources. This includes consideration of ecosystem

CBD Checklist	Equator Principles (Framework)
	services that support local livelihoods and community resilience in project selection, design, and implementation. However, the focus is primarily on risk management and impact mitigation rather than explicitly promoting biodiversity-based livelihood resilience as a core objective.
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	Partially. The Equator Principles acknowledge biodiversity mainly in terms of its ecological functions, conservation value, and the risks associated with biodiversity loss, through their adoption of IFC Performance Standard 6. While biodiversity is protected for its ecological significance and to prevent critical habitat degradation, the framework does not explicitly recognize biodiversity's intrinsic values independent of human use or economic considerations.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	Yes. Under the Equator Principles, the rights and responsibilities of key actors are clearly defined. Financial institutions (Equator Principles Financial Institutions – EPFIs) are responsible for conducting due diligence, ensuring compliance with the Equator Principles, and monitoring projects. Project sponsors are required to identify risks and impacts, comply with applicable environmental and social standards (notably the IFC Performance Standards), and implement management plans. While the framework is primarily lender-driven, it establishes a clear allocation of responsibilities among financiers, borrowers, and relevant stakeholders.
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Partially. The Equator Principles were developed through a collaborative process involving financial institutions and are periodically reviewed through stakeholder consultations, including input from civil society and experts. However, the direct participation of affected communities and indigenous peoples in defining roles and responsibilities is limited, as the framework primarily operates at the level of financial institutions and project sponsors rather than through participatory governance mechanisms at the community level.
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Indirectly. The Equator Principles require projects to comply with the IFC Performance Standards, which include provisions on Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) for indigenous peoples in specific circumstances. However, the Equator Principles themselves

CBD Checklist	Equator Principles (Framework)
	do not establish independent procedures for obtaining FPIC nor do they involve indigenous peoples and local communities directly in defining roles and responsibilities at the framework level. Implementation depends on project sponsors and national legal requirements.
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	Indirectly. The Equator Principles do not explicitly reference the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) or its specific decisions and guidance. However, through their mandatory alignment with the IFC Performance Standards and the World Bank Environmental and Social Framework, they indirectly reflect international environmental and social norms, including elements consistent with CBD objectives and UNDRIP principles. Consideration of these instruments is therefore implicit rather than explicit and depends on their incorporation within applicable international standards and national legislation.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	Yes. The Equator Principles require projects to comply with host country laws and regulations and to conduct context-specific environmental and social impact assessments. Safeguard application is therefore grounded in local circumstances, including national legal frameworks, institutional capacity, and local social and environmental conditions, while being complemented by international standards where gaps exist.
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes. Under the Equator Principles, projects must comply with national environmental and social laws, regulations, and permitting processes of the host country. The safeguard framework is explicitly aligned with country-driven processes and national priorities, while also requiring alignment with IFC Performance Standards when national standards are insufficient, ensuring consistency without overriding domestic frameworks.
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	Partially / Indirectly. The Equator Principles do not explicitly reference the Convention on Biological Diversity, UNFCCC, CEDAW, or other international human rights treaties by name. However, they indirectly incorporate these instruments through mandatory alignment with the IFC Performance Standards, which are grounded in international human rights norms, environmental agreements, gender considerations, and climate-related risk management.

CBD Checklist	Equator Principles (Framework)
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Yes. The Equator Principles establish an institutional framework that requires Equator Principles Financial Institutions (EPFIs) to integrate environmental and social risk management into their internal policies, procedures, and governance systems. This includes due diligence, project categorization, implementation of action plans, and ongoing monitoring to ensure safeguards are applied throughout the project lifecycle.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	Yes, to a significant extent. The Equator Principles include evaluation and monitoring mechanisms such as ongoing project supervision, independent environmental and social monitoring (where required), and regular reporting by clients to Equator Principles Financial Institutions. While enforcement relies primarily on contractual obligations and lender oversight rather than external sanctions, non-compliance can lead to corrective action requirements or withdrawal of financing.
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes. The Equator Principles include transparency and accountability requirements, such as public reporting by Equator Principles Financial Institutions on their implementation of the Principles, disclosure of environmental and social impact assessments where appropriate, and clear documentation of roles, responsibilities, and mitigation measures. Accountability is reinforced through lender oversight, client reporting obligations, and grievance mechanisms aligned with the IFC Performance Standards.
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	Partially / Generally yes. Under the Equator Principles, compliance with relevant safeguards is required contractually from project sponsors and monitored by Equator Principles Financial Institutions (EPFIs) throughout the project lifecycle. Borrowers must implement Environmental and Social Management Systems (ESMS) and comply with applicable IFC Performance Standards and national legislation. However, ultimate compliance depends on effective monitoring and enforcement by individual EPFIs, and practices may vary across institutions and projects.
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Partially. The Equator Principles promote equity indirectly through requirements aligned with the IFC Performance Standards, particularly those related to stakeholder engagement, social impact assessment, Indigenous Peoples, land acquisition, and livelihood restoration.

CBD Checklist	Equator Principles (Framework)
	These provisions aim to avoid disproportionate negative impacts and to ensure fair treatment and compensation where impacts occur. However, the Equator Principles do not include explicit, standalone requirements on benefit-sharing mechanisms; equity outcomes depend largely on project design and the application of IFC standards by borrowers and lenders.
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	Yes, indirectly. Under the Equator Principles, cultural impact assessment procedures are addressed through alignment with the IFC Performance Standards, particularly Performance Standard 7 (Indigenous Peoples) and Performance Standard 8 (Cultural Heritage). These standards require the identification, assessment, and protection of cultural heritage, including sacred sites and spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities. While the Equator Principles themselves do not detail cultural assessments, they mandate their application through the borrower's compliance with IFC standards as a condition of project financing.
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Yes. The Equator Principles, through their mandatory application of the IFC Performance Standards, require consideration of customary land and resource use when identifying and avoiding risks. In particular, IFC Performance Standard 7 recognizes customary rights and traditional use of lands and natural resources by indigenous peoples, even where such rights are not formally recognized under national law. Projects must assess impacts on customary use and adopt avoidance or mitigation measures accordingly.
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Yes. Under the Equator Principles, safeguards related to traditional knowledge are addressed indirectly through the mandatory application of the IFC Performance Standards, particularly Performance Standard 7. This standard requires respect for indigenous peoples' traditional knowledge and cultural heritage and seeks to prevent its inappropriate use or disclosure. Projects must assess risks to traditional knowledge, ensure culturally appropriate engagement, and apply mitigation measures where impacts cannot be avoided, consistent with national legislation and relevant international standards.

CBD Guidance	UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (Framework)
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	Partially / Indirectly. The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights do not establish a financing mechanism or a project-level safeguard system. However, they provide an internationally recognized normative framework that guides states and businesses to prevent, mitigate and remedy adverse human rights impacts, including impacts on indigenous peoples and local communities. The UNGPs emphasize human rights due diligence, stakeholder engagement, access to remedy, and respect for

CBD Guidance	UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (Framework)
	internationally recognized human rights standards, which can inform and strengthen safeguard systems used by financing mechanisms.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights do not explicitly address biodiversity or ecosystem functions. However, they recognize that environmental degradation can lead to adverse human rights impacts, particularly affecting the livelihoods, health, food security and resilience of indigenous peoples and local communities. Through the requirement for human rights due diligence, the UNGPs implicitly support consideration of ecosystem-related impacts where these are linked to human rights risks.
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	No, not explicitly. The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights do not recognize biodiversity's intrinsic values as such. Their focus is on preventing and addressing adverse impacts on internationally recognized human rights. Biodiversity is only considered indirectly, insofar as its degradation affects human rights, such as the rights to health, food, water, culture and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights clearly define the respective roles and responsibilities of States and business enterprises. States have the duty to protect human rights, while businesses have the responsibility to respect human rights and to address adverse impacts linked to their activities. However, the Principles do not provide detailed or operational definitions of rights and responsibilities for specific stakeholder groups within biodiversity financing mechanisms, leaving implementation to national legislation and institutional frameworks.

CBD Guidance	UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (Framework)
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights emphasize stakeholder engagement and meaningful consultation, particularly with affected stakeholders, as part of human rights due diligence. They encourage dialogue, transparency, and participation throughout project and policy processes. However, the Principles themselves do not establish formal participatory mechanisms nor guarantee effective participation in defining roles and responsibilities; this is expected to be operationalized through national laws, policies, and implementing institutions.
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Partially. The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights recognize the importance of respecting the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities and refer to international human rights standards, including those related to consultation and participation. However, the Principles do not explicitly establish Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) as a mandatory requirement. FPIC is expected to be addressed through applicable international instruments (such as UNDRIP) and national legislation rather than directly operationalized within the UN Guiding Principles themselves.
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights do not explicitly reference the Convention on Biological Diversity or its specific decisions and guidance. However, they are grounded in international human rights law and are consistent with the principles of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, particularly regarding respect for human rights, non-discrimination, participation, and access to remedy. Consideration of CBD-related principles is therefore implicit rather than explicit and depends on how the Principles are applied alongside other international environmental and biodiversity frameworks.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights emphasize context-specific human rights due diligence, requiring businesses and financial actors to identify, prevent, mitigate, and account for adverse impacts based on local conditions. While they do not provide biodiversity-specific or country-level safeguard requirements, they require consideration of national laws, local human rights risks, and the specific social and

CBD Guidance	UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (Framework)
	cultural context in which activities take place. Grounding in local circumstances therefore depends on implementation by the financing mechanism or actor applying the Principles.
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes, in principle. The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights require that business enterprises comply with applicable national laws and respect internationally recognized human rights wherever they operate. They emphasize alignment with national legal frameworks and country-specific processes, while also clarifying that where national legislation falls short of international human rights standards, businesses should seek to honour the higher standard. Consistency with country-driven processes therefore depends on how the Principles are operationalized by implementing institutions.
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	Yes, broadly. The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights are explicitly grounded in international human rights law and are aligned with core international human rights treaties, including instruments related to non-discrimination (such as CEDAW) and the rights of Indigenous Peoples as reflected in UNDRIP. While the Principles are not biodiversity- or climate-specific and do not directly reference the CBD or UNFCCC, they provide an overarching human rights framework that is intended to be applied alongside other international environmental and social agreements, as relevant to the context of implementation.
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights establish a global normative framework that clarifies the respective duties of States and responsibilities of businesses to protect, respect, and remedy human rights impacts. However, they do not create a dedicated institutional safeguard system or enforcement body. Their application depends on integration into national legislation, policies, and institutional frameworks, as well as voluntary adoption by businesses and financial institutions.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	No, not directly. The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights do not include binding enforcement or formal evaluation mechanisms. They rely on voluntary implementation by States and businesses. Enforcement and monitoring occur indirectly through national laws, judicial systems, regulatory frameworks, reporting requirements, and grievance mechanisms that States or institutions may establish when

CBD Guidance	UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (Framework)
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes, in principle. The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights emphasize transparency and accountability through requirements for human rights due diligence, public reporting, stakeholder engagement, and access to grievance mechanisms. While they are not legally binding, they encourage States and businesses to disclose impacts, decision-making processes, and remedial actions, promoting accountability through oversight, reporting frameworks, and judicial or non-judicial remedies at the national and institutional levels.
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	Partially / depends on implementation. The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights establish clear expectations for States and businesses to respect human rights and comply
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Yes, indirectly. The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights promote equity by requiring businesses to avoid causing or contributing to human rights harms and to address adverse impacts when they occur. While they do not explicitly regulate benefit-sharing mechanisms, they emphasize non-discrimination, equality, and fair treatment, which can help reduce risks of inequity when applied in biodiversity-related or development contexts.
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	No, not explicitly. The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights do not require specific cultural impact assessment procedures. However, they call for human rights due diligence that should identify, prevent, mitigate, and account for adverse human rights impacts, which can include cultural and spiritual values of Indigenous Peoples and local communities when these are affected.
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Indirectly / partially. The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights do not explicitly address customary use of land or natural resources. However, customary use may be considered indirectly through human rights due diligence processes, particularly where customary practices are linked to the rights, livelihoods, or cultural identity of Indigenous Peoples and local communities.
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Indirectly / partially. The UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights do not contain specific safeguards focused on the protection of traditional knowledge. However, traditional knowledge may be indirectly addressed through broader human rights protections, particularly rights related to culture, identity, and non-discrimination, when such knowledge is integral to the rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

CBD Guidance	BNP Paribas Group
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	BNP Paribas Group has a comprehensive Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) and safeguard framework designed to identify, avoid, mitigate, and manage environmental and social risks, including impacts on biodiversity, human rights, and local communities. Its policies aim to align financing activities with international standards and to support sustainable development outcomes, including respect for Indigenous Peoples' rights and livelihoods.
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	Yes. BNP Paribas has a safeguard system embedded in its Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) framework that aims to identify, avoid, and mitigate adverse impacts on the rights and livelihoods of Indigenous Peoples and local communities. The bank applies sector-specific policies, human rights due diligence, and client engagement processes aligned with national legislation and international standards (such as the IFC Performance Standards and UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights). These measures are designed both to manage risks and to encourage positive social and environmental outcomes through sustainable finance activities.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	Yes. BNP Paribas recognizes the role of biodiversity and ecosystem services for local livelihoods and resilience through its biodiversity roadmap, sector policies (e.g. agriculture, forestry, extractives), and environmental risk assessments. These considerations are integrated into project screening, due diligence, and financing decisions, with particular attention to ecosystem impacts that may affect communities' livelihoods.
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	Yes. BNP Paribas acknowledges the intrinsic value of biodiversity through its biodiversity strategy and commitments aligned with international frameworks (e.g. no net loss/avoidance of significant harm). The Group recognizes biodiversity not only for its economic and ecosystem services value, but also as a fundamental component of natural capital that must be protected in its own right, reflected in exclusion policies and risk management practices.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of	

CBD Guidance	BNP Paribas Group
indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	BNP Paribas defines rights and responsibilities of clients, project sponsors, and other stakeholders through its Environmental and Social Risk Management (ESRM) framework. This includes clear requirements for clients' compliance with national legislation and international standards (such as the Equator Principles and IFC Performance Standards), as well as defined roles for due diligence, monitoring, and accountability within the bank's governance structure.
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	BNP Paribas requires stakeholder engagement as part of its environmental and social due diligence processes, particularly for projects with significant impacts. This includes expectations for clients to conduct meaningful consultation with affected communities, including Indigenous Peoples where relevant, in line with national legislation and international standards. Engagement processes are monitored through ongoing risk management and client reporting.
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	BNP Paribas requires its clients to respect Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) for Indigenous Peoples in high-risk projects, in alignment with the IFC Performance Standards and the Equator Principles. FPIC is expected where projects may have significant impacts on Indigenous Peoples' lands, resources, or rights, and is assessed through the bank's environmental and social due diligence processes.
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	BNP Paribas requires clients to establish grievance and redress mechanisms for affected communities as part of its environmental and social risk management requirements. In addition, the Group has internal escalation and compliance mechanisms to address environmental and social risks, enabling monitoring, corrective actions, and, where necessary, disengagement from non-compliant projects.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	

CBD Guidance	BNP Paribas Group
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	BNP Paribas' safeguard system is designed to be applied in accordance with national legislation and local contexts. Its environmental and social due diligence processes require assessment of country-specific risks, legal frameworks, and socio-cultural conditions, ensuring that safeguards are adapted to local circumstances while remaining aligned with international standards.
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes. BNP Paribas' safeguards are applied in a risk-based and proportionate manner, allowing them to be adapted to different project contexts, sectors, and scales. The Environmental and Social Risk Management framework differentiates requirements according to the level of environmental and social risk, ensuring flexibility while maintaining consistency with international standards.
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	Yes. BNP Paribas regularly monitors and reviews the implementation of its environmental and social safeguards through internal controls, client reporting, and ongoing risk assessments. The Group updates its policies and procedures periodically to reflect evolving regulatory requirements, international standards, and emerging environmental and social risks, ensuring continuous improvement of its safeguard system.
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Yes. BNP Paribas aligns its safeguard framework with national legislation and relevant public policies in the countries where it operates. Its due diligence processes take into account regulatory requirements and coordination with public authorities where applicable, while also aligning financing activities with international policy frameworks related to environmental protection, human rights, and sustainable development.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	Yes. BNP Paribas ensures coherence of its safeguards with relevant international agreements and standards, including the Equator Principles, IFC Performance Standards, the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, and international biodiversity and climate frameworks. This alignment supports consistent application of safeguards across jurisdictions and financing activities.
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes. BNP Paribas clearly assigns roles and responsibilities for the implementation of safeguards within its governance and Environmental and Social Risk Management structure. Dedicated ESG, compliance, and risk teams are responsible for due diligence, monitoring, decision-making, and escalation, while clients are accountable for implementing safeguards at the project level in line with contractual requirements.

CBD Guidance	BNP Paribas Group
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	Yes. BNP Paribas allocates dedicated financial, technical, and human resources to the implementation of its safeguard system. This includes specialized ESG and environmental and social risk teams, internal training programs, and monitoring tools that support effective due diligence, oversight, and continuous improvement of safeguard implementation across its financing activities.
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Yes. BNP Paribas publicly discloses its environmental and social policies, safeguard frameworks, and sustainability commitments through its website, sustainability reports, and policy statements. The Group promotes accountability through transparency, reporting on progress, and engagement with stakeholders regarding the implementation and effectiveness of its safeguards.
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	Yes. BNP Paribas has grievance and accountability mechanisms that allow stakeholders, including affected communities, to raise concerns related to environmental and social impacts. These mechanisms are supported by internal compliance, ethics, and whistleblowing channels, and clients are also required to establish project-level grievance mechanisms. Together, these systems support access to remedy and corrective action where adverse impacts are identified.
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Yes. BNP Paribas demonstrates learning and continuous improvement through regular reviews of its environmental and social risk management framework, updates to policies and sector standards, and incorporation of lessons learned from project monitoring, audits, and stakeholder engagement. The Group adapts its safeguards in response to emerging risks, regulatory changes, and evolving international best practices.
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Partially / Yes, depending on implementation. BNP Paribas' safeguard system is designed primarily to prevent and mitigate adverse environmental and social impacts, while also creating opportunities to support positive outcomes for Indigenous Peoples, local communities, and biodiversity. Positive impacts depend on the quality of project design, client commitment, and effective implementation and monitoring at the project level.

CBD Guidance	Aviva
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	

CBD Guidance	Aviva
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	Yes. Aviva has an explicit system of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) safeguards embedded in its Responsible Investment Policy and Sustainability Ambition. These safeguards guide investment decisions, risk management, and stewardship activities, including the assessment and management of environmental and social impacts.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	Yes. Aviva's safeguards include explicit commitments to avoid, mitigate, and manage negative environmental and social impacts through its Responsible Investment Policy, human rights commitments, and climate and biodiversity strategies. These commitments are integrated into investment decision-making, risk assessment, and ongoing stewardship activities.
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	Yes. Aviva's safeguards are clearly defined and publicly documented through its Responsible Investment Policy, Human Rights Policy, Climate Transition Plan, and biodiversity commitments. These documents outline expectations, standards, and processes for managing environmental and social risks across its investment activities.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	Yes. Aviva aligns its safeguards with relevant international standards and best practices, including the UN Principles for Responsible Investment (UN PRI), the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, the OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, and international climate and biodiversity frameworks.
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Partially. Aviva's safeguards address human rights, social impacts, and community-related risks primarily through its Human Rights Policy and stewardship approach. While these frameworks encompass respect for Indigenous Peoples and local communities, protections are generally addressed at a high, principles-based level rather than through detailed, project-level requirements.

CBD Guidance	Aviva
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. Aviva's safeguard framework explicitly covers environmental risks, including climate change, biodiversity loss, and nature-related impacts. These issues are addressed through Aviva's Climate Transition Plan, biodiversity commitments, and integration of environmental risk assessment into its investment decision-making and stewardship activities.
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	Partially. Aviva applies its safeguards consistently across its core investment activities; however, the depth and application of safeguards may vary depending on asset class, investment structure, and the level of influence Aviva has over investee companies or funds.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	Partially. Aviva's safeguards are primarily principles-based and designed for global application. While they encourage consideration of local legal, social, and environmental contexts through due diligence and stewardship, they do not systematically require tailored, location-specific safeguards for all investments.
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes, in principle. Aviva's safeguards emphasize stakeholder engagement and responsible stewardship, encouraging investee companies to engage meaningfully with affected stakeholders, including workers and local communities. However, these requirements are generally indirect and depend on Aviva's influence over investee entities rather than mandatory, project-level consultation processes.
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	Yes. Aviva explicitly considers and aligns its safeguards with key international instruments, including the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), international human rights treaties, and gender equality principles such as those reflected in the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). This alignment is reflected through Aviva's commitments to the UN Principles for Responsible Investment, climate transition planning, and human rights-based investment and stewardship practices.

CBD Guidance	Aviva
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Yes. Aviva has established institutional frameworks to support the application of its safeguards, including dedicated responsible investment governance structures, ESG integration processes, internal oversight mechanisms, and stewardship teams responsible for engagement and escalation. These frameworks help ensure that safeguard policies are applied across its financing and investment activities.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	Partially. Aviva's safeguard system includes evaluation mechanisms such as ongoing ESG monitoring, performance reviews, engagement tracking, and reporting. Enforcement mechanisms exist mainly through stewardship tools—engagement, voting, escalation, and potential divestment—but they are indirect and depend on Aviva's leverage over investee companies rather than on binding, project-level sanctions.
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes. Aviva includes transparency and accountability requirements through public ESG policies, regular sustainability and climate disclosures, reporting aligned with international standards, and disclosure of stewardship activities, voting records, and progress against responsible investment commitments.
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	Partially. While Aviva requires relevant safeguards to be applied across its investment and financing activities and promotes compliance through ESG expectations, due diligence, and engagement, full compliance by all stakeholders cannot be guaranteed. Compliance largely depends on the commitment and performance of investee companies, partners, and third parties, with Aviva using stewardship, monitoring, and escalation mechanisms to address identified gaps.
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Partially. Aviva promotes equity and seeks to reduce risks of inequity through its responsible investment policies, commitments to social inclusion, human rights, just transition, and stakeholder engagement. However, benefit-sharing provisions are generally indirect and implemented through ESG expectations and stewardship of investee companies, rather than through explicit, project-level mechanisms guaranteeing equitable distribution of benefits to affected communities.

CBD Guidance	Aviva
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	Partially. Aviva's safeguard instruments address cultural considerations indirectly through its human rights policy, responsible investment framework, and expectations that investee companies respect indigenous peoples' rights, including cultural heritage and traditional livelihoods. However, Aviva does not require stand-alone cultural or spiritual impact assessments at the project level, nor does it explicitly mandate assessment of spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities within its own safeguard system.
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Partially. Aviva considers customary use indirectly through its recognition of indigenous peoples' rights, land tenure issues, and human rights standards within its responsible investment and ESG frameworks. These considerations are generally applied via due diligence and engagement with investee companies, rather than through explicit, enforceable requirements to identify and protect customary land and resource use in all financed activities.
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Partially. Aviva's safeguard framework acknowledges indigenous peoples' rights and broader human rights standards, which implicitly include respect for traditional knowledge. However, it does not contain explicit, standalone safeguards or requirements specifically designed to protect traditional knowledge or intellectual and cultural knowledge rights of indigenous peoples and local communities, relying instead on general ESG expectations and international norms applied through investee companies.

CBD Guidance	Ford Foundation
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	Yes. The Ford Foundation has a robust safeguard approach grounded in human rights, social justice, and equity. Its grant making framework explicitly prioritizes the protection and advancement of the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities. Rather than focusing only on risk mitigation, the Foundation actively seeks to support, empower, and strengthen these communities, aligning its programs with national legislation, international human rights standards, and locally grounded approaches. Its safeguards are embedded in due diligence, partner selection, monitoring processes, and long-term support strategies aimed at reducing harm and maximizing positive social impact.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	

CBD Guidance	Ford Foundation
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	Yes. The Ford Foundation recognizes the importance of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and community resilience, particularly through its work on climate justice, land rights, food systems, and sustainable development. In the selection, design, and implementation of its funding mechanisms, the Foundation supports initiatives that link environmental protection with social and economic well-being, especially for indigenous peoples, rural populations, and communities that depend directly on natural resources. This recognition is integrated into program strategies, grant making priorities, and partnerships that emphasize locally grounded, rights-based, and ecosystem-aware approaches.
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	Partially yes. The Ford Foundation primarily approaches biodiversity through a human rights, social justice, and livelihoods lens, rather than explicitly framing biodiversity as having intrinsic value independent of human use. While its programs acknowledge the importance of nature for cultural identity, community resilience, and sustainable futures, biodiversity is generally valued for its role in supporting human well-being, equity, and rights. Explicit recognition of biodiversity's intrinsic value as an end in itself is not a central or consistently articulated principle across the Foundation's safeguard or funding frameworks, but it is indirectly supported through grants that promote environmental stewardship, conservation, and respect for indigenous worldviews.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	Yes, in a strong and explicit way. The Ford Foundation clearly defines the rights and responsibilities of actors and stakeholders through its human rights-based approach, grant agreements, and ethical guidelines. It emphasizes equity, inclusion, and accountability, particularly for grantee partners, implementing organizations, and affected communities. Roles and responsibilities are articulated to ensure respect for local autonomy, shared decision-making, and non-discrimination, with special attention to marginalized groups, including indigenous peoples and local communities. While operational details are often delegated to grantees, the Foundation sets clear expectations regarding ethical conduct, social responsibility, and alignment with its core values of justice and fairness.

CBD Guidance	Ford Foundation
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes, generally, with a participatory and inclusive approach. The Ford Foundation promotes the effective participation of relevant actors—particularly civil society organizations, grassroots movements, and representatives of affected communities—in shaping roles and responsibilities within funded initiatives. Through consultative grant-making processes, long-term partnerships, and support for locally led organizations, the Foundation encourages dialogue and co-creation rather than top-down decision-making. While the Foundation itself does not implement projects directly, it requires and supports participatory approaches by grantees, especially when working with indigenous peoples and local communities, fostering shared ownership, legitimacy, and contextual relevance in the definition of roles and responsibilities.
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes, in principle, though applied through grantee responsibility rather than as a standalone procedural requirement. The Ford Foundation recognizes the importance of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) and the meaningful involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in initiatives that affect them. While the Foundation does not operate a single, formalized FPIC procedure across all grants, it expects and supports its grantees to obtain consent or approval in accordance with international human rights standards and relevant national legislation. Through its emphasis on human rights, social justice, and community-led approaches, the Foundation promotes approval, involvement, and self-determination of indigenous peoples and local communities in defining roles and responsibilities within funded programs, particularly in contexts involving land, resources, culture, or livelihoods.
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	Yes, in a normative and principles-based manner. The Ford Foundation aligns its grant making with internationally recognized frameworks, including the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and broader international human rights standards that are consistent with the principles of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), particularly regarding respect for indigenous peoples' rights, participation, equity, and sustainable use of natural resources. Although the Foundation is not a biodiversity-specific financing mechanism and does not explicitly reference CBD decisions in all its programs, its policies and funding priorities reflect key CBD principles—such as respect for traditional knowledge, community stewardship of ecosystems, and rights-based approaches—especially in programs related to environmental justice, land rights, and indigenous peoples' self-determination.
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological	

CBD Guidance	Ford Foundation
Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	Yes. The Ford Foundation's safeguard approach is grounded in local circumstances and contexts through its place-based, context-sensitive grant making model. The Foundation works closely with local partners, indigenous organizations, and community-based actors, relying on their knowledge to shape program design and implementation. Rather than applying rigid, one-size-fits-all safeguards, Ford emphasizes locally informed risk assessment, cultural relevance, and adaptability to national legal frameworks and social realities. This approach allows safeguards to reflect local priorities, power dynamics, and lived experiences, thereby increasing their effectiveness in protecting rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities.
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes. The Ford Foundation's safeguards are designed to be consistent with country-driven processes, national legislation, and local development priorities. The Foundation requires its grantees to comply with applicable national laws and regulations and aligns its funding with locally defined strategies and policy frameworks. Through collaboration with in-country partners and regional offices, Ford ensures that safeguard implementation respects national sovereignty, legal systems, and institutional contexts, while also reinforcing locally articulated social justice, human rights, and development priorities.
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	Yes. The Ford Foundation explicitly grounds its safeguard approach in international human rights and environmental instruments. Its policies and grant making frameworks recognize and are informed by the Convention on Biological Diversity, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, CEDAW, and a broad range of international human rights treaties. These instruments guide the Foundation's commitment to gender equality, climate justice, biodiversity protection, and the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities, ensuring that funded activities are aligned with internationally recognized norms and principles.
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	

CBD Guidance	Ford Foundation
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Yes. The Ford Foundation has robust institutional frameworks in place to ensure the application of its safeguards. These include clearly defined grantmaking policies, due diligence and risk assessment procedures, and internal accountability mechanisms that guide program design, approval, monitoring, and evaluation. Safeguards related to human rights, environmental sustainability, gender equity, and the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities are embedded across its thematic programs and operational guidelines. In addition, the Foundation relies on ongoing monitoring, learning, and compliance processes, as well as partnerships with local and international organizations, to ensure that safeguards are consistently applied and adapted throughout the lifecycle of funded initiatives.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	Yes. The Ford Foundation's safeguard system includes enforcement and evaluation mechanisms integrated into its grant management and oversight processes. These mechanisms involve due diligence prior to grant approval, contractual grant conditions, and regular monitoring and reporting requirements for grantees. The Foundation conducts periodic evaluations, learning reviews, and audits to assess compliance with safeguard commitments and to identify unintended impacts. Where risks or non-compliance are identified, the Foundation can require corrective actions, adaptive management measures, or, if necessary, suspension or termination of funding, ensuring that safeguards are meaningfully enforced and continuously improved.
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes. The Ford Foundation's safeguard framework includes clear requirements for transparency and accountability. These are reflected in its publicly available policies, funding strategies, and reporting on grants and outcomes, as well as in grant agreements that require financial and programmatic reporting from grantees. Accountability is further reinforced through internal governance structures, ethical standards, and oversight mechanisms, including monitoring, evaluation, and learning processes. Together, these measures promote responsible use of funds, openness in decision-making, and accountability to affected stakeholders and the public.
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	Largely yes, with ongoing oversight. The Ford Foundation requires that all stakeholders involved in its financed activities—including grantees, partners, and implementing organizations—comply with relevant safeguards related to human rights, non-discrimination, environmental responsibility, and ethical conduct. Compliance is embedded in grant agreements, codes of conduct, and due-diligence processes, and is supported through monitoring, reporting, and periodic evaluations. While full compliance depends on the context and capacity of each partner, the Foundation maintains mechanisms for follow-up, corrective action, and learning, which help address gaps and ensure alignment with safeguard standards over time.

CBD Guidance	Ford Foundation
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Yes. The Ford Foundation explicitly promotes equity and the reduction of structural inequalities as a core objective of its financing and grant-making. Its programs are designed to ensure fair access to benefits, particularly for indigenous peoples, local communities, women, and other historically marginalized groups. Provisions to promote equitable benefit-sharing include targeted funding to grassroots and community-based organizations, support for inclusive decision-making, gender and intersectional approaches, and requirements that grantees demonstrate how benefits will reach affected communities. These measures help minimize risks of inequity and strengthen just and inclusive outcomes.
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	Partially / Indirectly. The Ford Foundation does not apply a formal, standardized cultural impact assessment procedure comparable to those used by multilateral development banks. However, its safeguard approach does incorporate cultural considerations through rights-based, community-centred, and participatory frameworks. Respect for the cultural and spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities is promoted through: Support for indigenous self-determination and cultural rights, aligned with international human rights standards such as UNDRIP. Grant-making practices that emphasize local knowledge, cultural context, and community leadership in project design and implementation. Expectations that grantees engage respectfully with cultural and spiritual practices relevant to the communities involved. While these elements provide meaningful protection, they are embedded within broader human rights and equity frameworks rather than formalized as standalone cultural impact assessment instruments.

CBD Guidance	Ford Foundation
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Partially / Indirectly. The Ford Foundation does not apply a formal, standardized cultural impact assessment procedure comparable to those used by multilateral development banks. However, its safeguard approach does incorporate cultural considerations through rights-based, community-centred, and participatory frameworks. Respect for the cultural and spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities is promoted through: - Support for indigenous self-determination and cultural rights, aligned with international human rights standards such as UNDRIP. - Grant-making practices that emphasize local knowledge, cultural context, and community leadership in project design and implementation. - Expectations that grantees engage respectfully with cultural and spiritual practices relevant to the communities involved. While these elements provide meaningful protection, they are embedded within broader human rights and equity frameworks rather than formalized as standalone cultural impact assessment instruments.
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Yes, in principle, though primarily through rights-based safeguards rather than technical instruments. The Ford Foundation recognizes the importance of traditional knowledge and the knowledge rights of indigenous peoples and local communities as part of its broader commitment to human rights, cultural integrity, and social justice. Safeguards in this area include: - Support for indigenous knowledge systems and community-led research, advocacy, and cultural preservation initiatives. - Alignment with international norms such as UNDRIP and relevant human rights frameworks that affirm collective intellectual and cultural rights. - Grant-making practices that emphasize consent, ethical engagement, and community control over how knowledge is generated, used, and shared. However, these protections are not framed as formal intellectual property or access-and-benefit-sharing mechanisms. Instead, they are embedded within participatory, ethical, and rights-based approaches that aim to prevent misappropriation and ensure respect for community ownership of traditional knowledge.

CBD Guidance	International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)
Overall question on the purpose of the Convention's voluntary guidelines on safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms	
Does the financing mechanism have a safeguard system designed to effectively avoid or mitigate its unintended impacts on the rights and livelihoods of indigenous peoples and local communities in accordance with national legislation, and to maximize its opportunities to support them?	Yes — ESMS provides principles, standards (incl. Indigenous Peoples), FPIC, grievance, monitoring and requires compliance with host-country law and the most stringent standards.
Guideline A: The role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience, as well as biodiversity's intrinsic values, should be recognized in the selection, design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms.	
A.1 Is the role of biodiversity and ecosystem functions for local livelihoods and resilience recognized in the selection, design and implementation of the mechanism?	Yes — Biodiversity standard covers impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem functions and services , linking to community livelihoods
A.2 Are biodiversity's intrinsic values recognized?	Yes — IUCN mission emphasizes conserving the integrity/diversity of nature; Biodiversity standard protects biodiversity at all scales.
Guideline B: Rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be carefully defined, at the national level, in a fair and equitable manner, with the effective participation of all actors concerned, including the free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account, the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.	
B.1 Are the rights and responsibilities of actors and/or stakeholders carefully and equitably defined?	Yes.
B.2 Has there been effective participation of all actors concerned in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. The manual sets internal roles/responsibilities and requires stakeholder engagement for ESIA/mitigation
B.3 Has there been free prior informed consent, prior informed consent or approval and involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities in the definition of such roles and responsibilities?	Yes. FPIC is required for activities affecting rights/territories/TK

CBD Guidance	International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)
B.4 Has the mechanism considered the Convention on Biological Diversity and its relevant decisions, guidance and principles and, as appropriate, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples?	Yes — ESMS consolidates objectives of the CBD and endorses UNDRIP .
Guideline C: Safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms should be grounded in local circumstances, should be developed in consistency with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities, and take into account relevant international agreements, declarations and guidance developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, international human rights treaties and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.	
C.1 Are the financing mechanism's safeguards grounded in local circumstances?	Yes — Safeguards require scoping, stakeholder analysis, culturally appropriate consultation/disclosure, local grievance access (e.g., ombudsperson), and tailoring to context.
C.2 Are safeguards consistent with relevant country-driven/specific processes as well as national legislation and priorities?	Yes — ESMS applies national legislation and where more stringent, ESMS standards prevail; compliance with host-country laws is required.
C.3 Do they consider the instruments mentioned in point B.4 and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, international human rights treaties, and others, as appropriate?	Partially — ESMS explicitly references CBD, UNDRIP, Universal Declaration of Human Rights and IFC/GEF/GCF policies; it discusses gender and climate commitments but does not explicitly cite UNFCCC or CEDAW in the manual text.
Guideline D: Appropriate and effective institutional frameworks are of utmost importance for safeguards to be operational and should be put in place, including enforcement and evaluation mechanisms that will ensure transparency and accountability, as well as compliance with relevant safeguards.	
D.1 Are appropriate and effective institutional frameworks in place to ensure application of the safeguards?	Yes — Clear roles (ESMS Coordinator, Expert Team, Director PPG as Compliance Officer), records, contracts, and oversight are defined.
D.2 Does the safeguard system include enforcement and evaluation mechanisms?	Yes — Accountability includes non-compliance management, grievance (PCMS), monitoring of ESMP, and end-of-project evaluation.

CBD Guidance	International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)
D.3 Are requirements of transparency and accountability included?	Yes — Public disclosure requirements (screening, ESIA, ESMP, monitoring/evaluation) and a transparent grievance mechanism are mandated.
D.4 Are all stakeholders involved complying with relevant safeguards?	Yes — ESMS sets compliance expectations and corrective actions
Additional questions elaborated from the relevant decisions, guidance and principles under the Convention on Biological Diversity would include the following:	
E. Are there provisions to promote equity, or reduce risks of inequity, in benefit-sharing?	Yes. Equity for vulnerable groups and gender measures are required, even though benefit-sharing provisions are not explicitly defined.
F. Are cultural impact assessment procedures included in safeguard instruments? Do they specifically include respect for the spiritual values of indigenous peoples and local communities?	Yes — Cultural Heritage standard addresses impacts on cultural resources and spiritual/symbolic value ; includes chance-find procedures.
G. Is customary use considered in avoidance of risks?	Yes — FPIC covers customary rights/law , and stakeholder engagement recognizes customary institutions.
H. Are there safeguards in relation to the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, especially regarding the protection of their knowledge rights?	Yes — FPIC is required for activities involving traditional knowledge , protecting community knowledge rights.