

**CONVENTION ON  
BIOLOGICAL  
DIVERSITY**

Distr.  
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/2/INF/8  
16 April 2007

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

---

AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP ON  
REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE  
CONVENTION

Second meeting  
UNESCO, Paris, 9-13 July 2007

**REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF ARTICLES 20 AND 21: COMPILATION OF  
SUBMISSIONS**

*Note by the Executive Secretary*

In carrying out relevant provisions of decisions VIII/13 and VIII/18, the Executive Secretary circulated three notifications to solicit information on options and a draft strategy for resource mobilization, national and regional environmental funds, and guidance to the financial mechanism. Submissions have been received from Argentina, Australia, Canada, Germany and the European Commission on behalf of the European Community and its member States, Honduras, Mexico, Myanmar, Switzerland, as well as Greenpeace International and RSPB (the BirdLife Partner in the UK). All these submissions are summarized in the working document UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/2/4 and compiled in this information note.

/...

## ARGENTINA

Cabe observar que en el actual contexto de asignación financiera, los países donantes han implantado un nuevo Marco de Asignación de Recursos (MAR), que establece una cuota por país definiendo el nivel disponible para los programas de biodiversidad y cambio climático.

Dicha asignación estará disponible por un período de reposición de cuatro años e indica el máximo nivel de recursos que un país puede disponer para financiar proyectos que sean sólidos técnicamente y congruentes con las prioridades estratégicas del FMAM. Sin embargo, es importante afirmar y remarcar que los países deberían decidir sus propias prioridades de asignación de fondos basadas en el Plan Estratégico y las estrategias y acciones nacionales en materia de biodiversidad.

Por su parte, la CBD en su decisión VIII/13 párrafo 3 decidió llevar a cabo una revisión a fondo de la disponibilidad de recursos financieros, incluso a través del mecanismo financiero, en su novena reunión, es decir, en la mitad del período de la cuarta reposición. En la misma, las Partes decidieron examinar, entre otros puntos, de qué manera el MAR adoptado por el FMAM afectaría a la disponibilidad de recursos dadas las asignaciones individuales y para grupos de países, como así también examinar la eficacia del índice de beneficios de la diversidad biológica, utilizado para determinar el potencial de cada país para generar los beneficios de la biodiversidad para las finalidades del convenio.

En base a esto la Argentina manifiesta su preocupación en cuanto a la evolución y afectiva recepción de los fondos ya que se plantea, por un lado, una nueva modalidad de asignación y por el otro lado una revisión a fondo en la mitad del periodo que pudiera llevar a desincronizaciones de los procesos, estancamientos y cambios en las asignaciones acordadas en el marco de la CBD, afectando el Plan Estratégico y las estrategias y acciones nacionales realizadas en esta materia.

Asimismo, es oportuno mencionar a esa Secretaría Ejecutiva, que el proceso de la asignación de recursos -antes mencionado- no se ha servido de una metodología transparente para la distribución de fondos, que responda a indicadores efectivamente mensurables para los gobiernos, lo cual genera grandes inquietudes en cuanto a la metodología utilizada. En concordancia con esto, es que en la octava Conferencia de las Partes en la decisión VIII/13 párrafo 3 inciso e), se propone examinar el índice de beneficios, uno de los pilares de la metodología aplicada para la determinación del potencial de cada país.

Por su parte, debe considerarse la reserva presentada durante la aprobación del MAR (anexo 1), por al miembro del Consejo en representación de Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Paraguay, Perú y Uruguay (anexo IV) donde se establece que las objeciones al nuevo mecanismo de asignación están planteadas principalmente a los indicadores que no son estrictamente ambientales (el otro pilar del MAR denominado Índice de Desempeño que mide la capacidad, políticas y prácticas de cada país que pueden contribuir a la ejecución eficaz de los programas y proyectos).

Es por este motivo que nuevamente queremos llevar nuestra preocupación debido a que ambos pilares en el que está basado el MAR podría llevar a la toma de decisiones sin una evidencia real.

Del mismo modo, es importante poner en su conocimiento la falta de participación y de consulta por parte del Secretariado GEF acerca de las tablas de información de indicadores.

## AUSTRALIA

Australia's response to CBD Notification 2006-105 - Decision VIII/13 on Review of Implementation of Article 20 (Financial resources) and Article 21 (Financial mechanism), Paragraph 7, which invites Parties and others to make submissions in response to COP 8 decision VIII/13 calling for information on national and regional environmental funds, as well as related knowledge transfer and exchange.

We have broadly interpreted knowledge transfer and exchange to relate to the encouragement of creation and/or strengthening of national and international learning networks or communities. For example, in Australia these can be identified through such initiative as community awareness and engagement, implementation of communication strategies, Indigenous landcare facilitators, grants involving knowledge transfer and exchange through mechanisms such as museums, tertiary education institutions and universities.

MAJOR NATIONAL FUNDS AND FUNDING INITIATIVES				
Name of fund	Date of inauguration	Purpose	Value (AUD)	Knowledge transfer & exchange
Australian Government Water Fund	2004-05	The Australian Government Water Fund is a \$2 billion programme to invest in water infrastructure, improved water management, and better practices in the stewardship of Australia's scarce water resources. The Fund supports practical on-ground water projects that improve Australia's water efficiency and environmental outcomes.	AUD 2 Billion	The Fund comprises three programmes: The Water Smart Australia Programme was established to accelerate the development and uptake of smart technologies and practices in water use across Australia. The Raising National Water Standards Programme aims to assist the development of the necessary tools for good water management in Australia. It is managed by the National Water Commission and will direct targeted investment to improve Australia's national capacity to measure, monitor and manage its water resources. The Community Water Grants Programme will promote wise water use through community engagement, education and awareness and investment in saving and conserving water.
National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality	2001	The National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality (NAP) addresses the two major natural resource management issues facing Australia's environment, rural industries and regional.	AUD 1.4 Billion (50% Australian Government, 50% States)	Australian and State and Territory Governments work with people in communities to find solutions for salinity and water quality problems. Regional planning and investment at a regional level is the principal delivery mechanism for the NAP. At this level the NAP is jointly delivered with the Natural Heritage Trust.

MAJOR NATIONAL FUNDS AND FUNDING INITIATIVES				
Name of fund	Date of inauguration	Purpose	Value (AUD)	Knowledge transfer & exchange
Maintaining Australia's Biodiversity Hotspots	2004	The three-year hotspots programme, commencing in 2004-05, will protect and conserve Australia's biodiversity hotspots - areas which are rich in animal and plant species but where their habitats are under some degree of threat. The programme brings a proactive approach to managing threats in areas that are still relatively intact, and maintaining their biodiversity values.	AUD 36 Million	The Hotspots programme aims to improve the conservation of biodiversity hotspots on private and leasehold land by enhancing active conservation management and protection of existing terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems as habitat for native plants and animals. The programme uses a market-based approach to identifying investment targets, through the delivery of a tender for biodiversity stewardship funding. The programme is being delivered by a panel of non-government conservation organisations, who work directly with land-holders to achieve the best value-for-money biodiversity outcomes.
The Living Murray Initiative.	2002	To recover up to 500 gigalitres of water to achieve environmental objectives at six Icon Sites of national environmental value.	AUD 1 Billion	A communication strategy has been developed for the initiative which is implemented through the Murray Darling Basin Commission and resourced through a dedicated community consultation project within the Commission.

MAJOR NATIONAL FUNDS AND FUNDING INITIATIVES				
Name of fund	Date of inauguration	Purpose	Value (AUD)	Knowledge transfer & exchange
Australian Antarctic Science		Understanding the unique ecosystems and wildlife of the Antarctic is crucial to its protection. The Australian Antarctic Science Grants Programme, administered by the Australian Antarctic Division of the Department of the Environment and Water Resources, assists researchers to undertake studies of high scientific merit that contribute to Australia's Antarctic Science programme.	Individual grants of up to \$60 000 are available on an annual basis	Grants to the following Australian organisations: universities university-funded staff in Cooperative Research Centres (CRC) other tertiary education institutions, and State museums and State-funded institutions.
Australian Biological Resources Study	1975	The Australian Biological Resources Study (ABRS) Grants Programme supports the documentation of Australia's biological diversity, and improves and increases the national taxonomic (scientific classification) effort.	\$1.8 Million in 2007	The programme supports taxonomic and bioinformatics research to allow systematic studies and dissemination of these studies on the Australian fauna and flora including micro-organisms. A range of support programmes exist including research grants, PhD scholarships and travel bursaries for students.

MAJOR NATIONAL FUNDS AND FUNDING INITIATIVES				
Name of fund	Date of inauguration	Purpose	Value (AUD)	Knowledge transfer & exchange
Education for Sustainable Development Grants Programme		This programme aims to support sustainable development in Australia through improved approaches to education and learning for sustainable development.		The funding is provided for the activities that will act as a catalyst for systemic change in support of sustainable development and enhance the effectiveness and national coordination of existing education for sustainable development programmes, policies or institutions and to provide new and innovative approaches in areas of need in education for sustainable development at the national level.
Commonwealth Environment Research Facilities	Initiated in 2005	The Commonwealth Environment Research Facilities (CERF) programme aims to improve Australia's capacity to understand and respond to its priority environment concerns. The fund will significantly contribute to the development, delivery, understanding, adoption, evaluation or improvement of management and public policy relating to Australia's environmental assets.	AUD \$100 million	CERF represents a commitment to world-class public good research. Two broad streams of research will be funded over the next 5 years. The Nation-wide research component has been allocated \$60 million to develop collaborative work between Australia's best environmental researchers. The Marine and tropical science component is a \$40 million allocation for a Marine and Tropical Sciences Research Facility to support research relating to Great Barrier Reef and its catchments, the Wet Tropics and its catchments and the Torres Strait.

MAJOR NATIONAL FUNDS AND FUNDING INITIATIVES				
Name of fund	Date of inauguration	Purpose	Value (AUD)	Knowledge transfer & exchange
National Landcare Programme		The focus of the National Landcare Programme (NLP) is on developing alliances with sustainable primary industries and community groups wanting to be involved in the improvement and repair of their renewable natural resources.		<p>The NLP has two components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Support component - which is directed towards community and primary industry landcare activities including those on-farm that address offsite NRM issues.</li> <li>• National component - which funds projects that have a broad scale rather than regional or local outcomes. Investments are made through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Landcare Support – which administration and funds publications, newsletters, conferences and workshops.</li> <li>○ Natural Resource Innovation Grants - one-off grants to groups or individuals to develop innovative approaches to natural resource management in primary production or processing.</li> <li>○ Sustainable Industry Initiatives - investments in projects to help industry groups and organisations identify, address and assess the broad NRM issues facing them.</li> <li>○ Priority National Projects - funds projects in high priority areas identified by the Australian Government.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Grants to Voluntary Environment and Heritage Organisations		The Grants to Voluntary Environment and Heritage Organisations (GVEHO) programme helps eligible community based environment and heritage organisations to value, conserve and protect Australia's natural environment and historic heritage by	Grants of up to \$10,000 per annum	Over the last ten years, the Australian Government has provided over \$13 million to environment and heritage groups to assist with administration costs and employment of staff who liaise with the community on issues relating to the natural environment and historic heritage. The last two years of the programme has seen a total of 269 groups receiving assistance, of which 161 were new grant recipients.

MAJOR NATIONAL FUNDS AND FUNDING INITIATIVES				
Name of fund	Date of inauguration	Purpose	Value (AUD)	Knowledge transfer & exchange
		assisting with their administrative funding.		
Tasmanian Forest Conservation Fund		The Forest Conservation Fund (FCF) is an Australian Government initiative, developed as part of the 2005 Tasmanian Community Forest Agreement.		The FCF provides financial incentives to private landowners recognising their participation in helping to ensure that all forest types, especially old growth, are adequately protected for future generations under covenanting arrangements.
Global Environment Facility	1991	The Global Environment Facility (GEF) was established in 1991 and helps developing countries fund projects and programs that protect the global environment. GEF grants support projects related to biodiversity, climate change, international waters, land degradation, the ozone layer, and persistent organic pollutants.	\$59.8 Million (2006-2010) \$240 Million Overall	



MAJOR NATIONAL FUNDS AND FUNDING INITIATIVES				
Name of fund	Date of inauguration	Purpose	Value (AUD)	Knowledge transfer & exchange
Natural Heritage Trust overarching and sub-projects				
Natural Heritage Trust	Began in 1997.	The Natural Heritage Trust (NHT) funds the repair, conservation, and sustainable use of Australia's natural environment. The NHT provides funding for environmental activities at a community level (through the Australian Government Envirofund) the regional level and the National/State level More about the Natural Heritage Trust	AUD 3 Billion (overall NHT funding figure)	The Trust funds activities that tackle environmental and natural resource management problems at their source rather than treating the symptoms. With financial support from the Trust, regional and local communities are delivering protection for threatened species, cleaner beaches, healthier waterways, more productive agricultural land and cleaner air.
Australian Government Envirofund (Natural Heritage Trust)		Through the Australian Government Envirofund, community groups have access to small grants to provide the opportunity and means for groups and individuals to undertake short-term natural resource management projects tackling important local problems.	AUD 135 Million (Individual grants of up to \$50,000)	To date the Envirofund has funded 6900 projects for a total of \$110 million enabling thousands of community groups and landholders to protect native vegetation and undertake re-vegetation works, to improve water quality in rivers and estuaries, to protect wetlands and the marine environment.

MAJOR NATIONAL FUNDS AND FUNDING INITIATIVES				
Name of fund	Date of inauguration	Purpose	Value (AUD)	Knowledge transfer & exchange
Threatened Species Network Community Grants	Grants began 1998/99 financial year	The Threatened Species Network is a community-based programme of the Natural Heritage Trust and WWF Australia. It targets the needs of species and ecological communities recognised as threatened by the Australian Government.	Individual grants of up to \$50,000	To date, \$4.5 million of Natural Heritage Trust funding has been provided to 320 projects around Australia, enabling thousands of people to start conserving their local threatened species. Through its Community Grants Programme, communities are encouraged to take long-term responsibility for the health of our natural environment
Threatened Bird Network	1997	Birds Australia has been contracted under the Natural Heritage Trust since 1997 to deliver the Threatened Bird Network (TBN); a community based communication program designed to encourage and support community participation in conservation activities for Australia's threatened birds.	Funding provided to TBN = \$518,400	The TBN forms the communication hub for the gathering and dissemination of information on threatened bird species and recovery activities in Australia. Strong relationships and extensive communication networks have been developed and their maintenance and expansion remains an important feature of annual activities.
Marine Species Recovery and Protection		The Marine Species Recovery and Protection fund is a project under the Natural Heritage Trust which looks at supporting projects that contribute to the implementation of recovery plans for threatened marine species.		

MAJOR NATIONAL FUNDS AND FUNDING INITIATIVES				
Name of fund	Date of inauguration	Purpose	Value (AUD)	Knowledge transfer & exchange
National Reserve System Programme		The establishment of the National Reserve System (NRS) programme under the Natural Heritage Trust meets the requirement under the <i>National Strategy for the Conservation of Australia's Biological Diversity</i> to establish a comprehensive, adequate and representative system of terrestrial protected areas. There is a separate programme to establish marine protected areas.		The NRS programme works with all levels of government, industry and the community to establish and manage new ecologically significant terrestrial protected areas and develop and implement best practice standards for their management.
Indigenous Land Management Facilitator Network		A national network of 13 Indigenous Land Management Facilitators, which provide assistance to Indigenous people involved in land management		Among other things the Indigenous Land Management Facilitators foster the involvement of Indigenous people in national, regional and local activities for achieving ecologically sustainable development

REGIONAL FUNDS				
Name of fund	Date of inauguration	Purpose	Value (AUD)	Knowledge transfer & exchange
Regional Natural Heritage Programme	2004	The Regional Natural Heritage Programme (RNHP) provides grants to non-government organisations (NGO's) and other relevant agencies to protect outstanding biodiversity in hotpot areas of South-East Asia and the Pacific.	\$10 million over 4 years 03-07	The RNHP works by using partnerships with NGO's, community-based organisation, private sector, regional governments and other regional organisation through existing and new programmes for sustainable biodiversity conservation.

## CANADA

### Financial Mechanisms For Canadian Biodiversity

Response to Article 20 and 21 of the CBD

#### 1.0 Government Funded Biodiversity Education

- The *Ashkui* Project: <http://www.stmarys.ca/administration/gorsebrook/ashkui.htm>

Over the past two years, the Innu Nation, Environment Canada, the Gorsebrook Research Institute of Saint Mary's University and Natural Resources Canada have been exploring new ways to connect Innu knowledge and western science.

- The Canadian Museum of Nature: [http://www.nature.ca/pdf/ann04-05nature\\_e.pdf](http://www.nature.ca/pdf/ann04-05nature_e.pdf)

The Canadian Museum of Nature used \$27,188,000.00 of funds appropriated by the Government of Canada in 2005. The Museum educates the public about Canada's natural heritage and the need for its conservation.

- Centrale des syndicats du Québec:  
<http://www.education.csq.qc.net/index.cfm/2,0,1673,9596,2041,0,html>

The Centrale des syndicats du Québec has created a network of institutions where its teachers, hospital staff and day-care workers offer services to the public. That network, les Établissements verts Brundtland, was named after Gro Harlem Brundtland, former Prime Minister of Norway, who led the World Commission on Environment and Development in the mid-1980s. The "EVB" network bases its learning for sustainability on four pillars or themes: ecology, peace, solidarity and democracy. Over 600 institutions in Quebec participate in this program which has run for ten years. Environment Canada was listed among its partners.

- Conservation Corps - Newfoundland and Labrador:  
[http://www.conservationcorps.nf.ca/html/who\\_weare.htm](http://www.conservationcorps.nf.ca/html/who_weare.htm)

The Conservation Corps is a not-for-profit organization dedicated to providing youth with training and employment in environmental and cultural heritage conservation. The Conservation Corps receives funding from Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and from a wide network of community and corporate partners.

- Environment Canada's Biosphere: [http://biosphere.ec.gc.ca/Home-WS3C2E8507-1\\_En.htm](http://biosphere.ec.gc.ca/Home-WS3C2E8507-1_En.htm)

Environment Canada's Biosphère has been a showcase for environmental education. The Biosphère raises the awareness of young people and their families about major environmental issues, including those related to water and climate change, and the sustainable development of the Great Lakes – St Lawrence ecosystem.

- Government of Newfoundland and Labrador Funds University for Museum and Education Facility related to culture and natural heritage (2003):  
<http://www.releases.gov.nl.ca/releases/2003/exec/0213n02.htm>

The science division of the Department of Tourism, Culture and Recreation will provide funding for staffing, administrative and operational program costs for *The Institute for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Science*.

- Nature Watch Program: <http://www.naturewatch.ca/english/>

Successful volunteer monitoring programs demonstrate that volunteers can collect valuable data. NatureWatch is a suite of community based or "citizen science" monitoring programs that are administered through a partnership between the [EMAN CO](#), the [Nature Canada](#), and the [University of Guelph](#).

- PEI's Environmental Futures Program:

<http://www.gov.pe.ca/infopei/index.php3?number=18644>

It is a summer program that trains high school and university students to do environmental protection and enhancement work. Students are assigned to a team to do short-term environmental projects in their region. Organizations or government departments in PEI can apply to have the student work teams provide labour for their proposed environmental projects. Sponsored by: Prince Edward Island Department of Environment, Energy and Forestry.

- Professional Institutes for Teachers:

For years, professional learning institutes for teachers and other practitioners have been led during the school year or during the summer months by dedicated environmental educators through the following institutions and organizations: Simon Fraser University, the Key Foundation, the Fondation Riou-Delorme, FEESA in Alberta, Learning for a Sustainable Future, the UNESCO Chair at York University, Yukon College, St. Francis Xavier University, Université de Moncton and others in Canada. Many teachers have benefited from these experiences personally, and have transformed the way they teach.

- Salmonier Nature Park Education Centre: <http://www.env.gov.nl.ca/snp/AboutUs.htm>

Salmonier Nature Park is a provincial park in Newfoundland, established in 1978 not as a tourist destination but as an environmental education centre. Salmonier Nature Park, its environmental education and wildlife care/research programs are a section of the Inland Fish and Wildlife Division of the Department of Environment and

- Trent University receives grants and funding from government for environmental programs:

[http://www.innovation.ca/evaluation/2001/trent\\_01.pdf](http://www.innovation.ca/evaluation/2001/trent_01.pdf)

Conservation. Funding is nearly 100% provided by the provincial government.

## **1.1 Forest Management Education**

- Alberta's Woodlot Extension Program (WEP)

[http://www1.agric.gov.ab.ca/\\$department/deptdocs.nsf/all/apa3312](http://www1.agric.gov.ab.ca/$department/deptdocs.nsf/all/apa3312)

Alberta's Woodlot Extension Program's mission is to achieve sustainable woodlot management on private land by providing support to landowners, land managers and others who influence land use practices in Alberta.

WEP began in 2004, is a province wide, joint venture between government, industry, conservation agencies, such as Ducks Unlimited Canada, and the Woodlot Association of Alberta (WAA). The program brings awareness and information to woodlot owners interested in sustainable woodlot management and supports landowners, land managers and others who influence land use practices. The WEP helps fund woodlot development management plans.

- Bas-Saint-Laurent Model Forest [http://wwwforet.fmodbsl.qc.ca/reseau/index\\_reseau.html](http://wwwforet.fmodbsl.qc.ca/reseau/index_reseau.html)

The Forêt modèle du Bas-Saint-Laurent was founded by the Government of Canada. Over the years the Forêt modèle du Bas-Saint-Laurent and its partners have developed a wide range of tools to help woodlot owners succeed in sustainably managing their woodlots and in tackling landscape issues. They are now

experimenting with two formulas, one based on the group venture model and the other one based on a tenant model.

- Canada's Model Forest Program

[http://www.nrcan.gc.ca/cfs-scf/national/what-quoi/modelforest\\_e.html](http://www.nrcan.gc.ca/cfs-scf/national/what-quoi/modelforest_e.html)

Canada's Model Forest Program represents an initiative in building partnerships locally, nationally, and internationally to generate new ideas and on-the-ground solutions to sustainable forest management issues.

QUÉBEC - The Government of Canada will continue to support an innovative and successful forestry program that is based on partnerships. Herb Dhaliwal, Minister of Natural Resources Canada (NRCan), today announced renewed funding of \$8 million per year for five years for Canada's Model Forest Program.

## 2.0 Biodiversity Fundraising

### 2.1 Re-occurring Fundraising Events:

- Canada's Baillie Birdathon:

<http://www.bsc-eoc.org/organization/brdathonsummary.html>

Bird Studies Canada is recognized nation-wide as a leading and respected not-for-profit conservation organization. Canada's Baillie Birdathon is the oldest sponsored bird count in North America. It was established in 1976 as a national fundraiser to support the research and conservation of wild birds. Funds raised by participants benefit not only the work of Bird Studies Canada, but also designated bird observatories in the Canadian Migration Monitoring Network, the James L. Baillie Memorial Fund, which provides research grants to amateurs across Canada, and participating conservation and naturalist clubs. All contributions to Birdathon are tax-creditable (Canadian Registered Charity No. 119024313RR0001).

- Trout Unlimited Canada: [http://www.tucanada.org/3\\_0/3\\_fund.htm](http://www.tucanada.org/3_0/3_fund.htm)

The largest fundraising event is the National Conservation Dinner held every spring, where the proceeds of silent and live auctions assist in funding *Trout Unlimited's* many projects.

### 2.2 Established Biodiversity Funds:

- The Canadian Cold Water Conservation Fund: [http://www.tucanada.org/1\\_0/index.htm](http://www.tucanada.org/1_0/index.htm)

The Canadian Cold Water Conservation Fund will allow donors to invest in projects from the stream up that will have immediate and meaningful impact at local levels. Note: This fund may not be in existence at this time, however, the fund will be modeled after the American version. See site below: <http://www.tu.org/site/pp.asp?c=7dJEKTNuFmG&b=277852>

- EC's Environmental Damages Fund:

<http://www.ec.gc.ca/edf-fde/default.asp?lang=En&n=C5BAD261-1>

The Environmental Damages Fund gives courts a way to guarantee that the money from pollution penalties and settlements is directly invested to repair the actual harm done by the pollution.

- Environment Canada's Endangered Species Recovery Fund:

[http://www.cbsc.org/servlet/ContentServer?pagename=CBSC\\_AB%2Fdisplay&lang=en&cid=1081944217925&c=Finance](http://www.cbsc.org/servlet/ContentServer?pagename=CBSC_AB%2Fdisplay&lang=en&cid=1081944217925&c=Finance)

- Great Lakes Sustainability Fund:

[http://sustainabilityfund.gc.ca/Past\\_Projects-WS16602983-1\\_En.htm](http://sustainabilityfund.gc.ca/Past_Projects-WS16602983-1_En.htm)

The Great Lakes Sustainability Fund (GLSF) provided \$3.8 million to support 64 restoration projects in the Great Lakes Basin in 2004-2005. GLSF projects reflect diverse and dedicated partnerships with local and provincial governments, community groups, academia and industry, and focus on an extensive range of restoration activities. These include the development and implementation of innovative strategies for improving wastewater treatment, remediation of contaminated sites, restoration of fish and wildlife habitat, and public outreach activities.

- Habitat Conservation Trust Fund: <http://www.hctf.ca/>

The mission of the Habitat Conservation Trust Fund (HCTF) is to invest in projects that maintain and enhance the health and biological diversity of British Columbia's fish, wildlife, and habitats so that people can use, enjoy, and benefit from these resources.

- The Heritage Parkland Acquisition Fund- GVRD:

<http://www.gvrd.bc.ca/board/comagendas/Parks/April/4.2.pdf>

The Heritage Parkland Acquisition Fund was established by the GVRD Board in 1994. It's purpose is to acquire and protect parks to increase the GVRD's green-zone.

- Interdepartmental Recovery Fund – Canada:

[http://www.speciesatrisk.gc.ca/support/irf\\_fir/default\\_e.cfm](http://www.speciesatrisk.gc.ca/support/irf_fir/default_e.cfm)

The IRF provides funding to federal departments and departmental corporations for implementing recovery activities for species designated by the COSEWIC as nationally extirpated, endangered or threatened that are on federal lands or under federal jurisdiction.

- Living Legacy Trust Fund: [http://www.livinglegacytrust.org/info\\_01.html](http://www.livinglegacytrust.org/info_01.html)

This Trust had a five year time frame, and was completed in 2004. The Living Legacy Trust was an “arms-length”, \$30 million fund established by Premier Harris on March 29, 1999, as part of Ontario's Living Legacy. Ontario's Living Legacy was an innovative strategy that included the biggest expansion in history of Ontario's system of parks and protected areas, while also providing measures to improve the business climate for resource-based industries.

- Manitoba Fisheries Enhancement Initiative: <http://www.gov.mb.ca/conservation/fish/>

The Manitoba Fisheries Enhancement Initiative has contributed funding for the enhancement, restoration and creation of fish habitat in Manitoba. Under this program, revenue generated through a portion of sport and commercial licence sales is used to fund such projects including: Lake Aeration, Fish Passage, Rearing and Spawning Enhancement, Stream Rehabilitation, Population Management and Education, Information and Promotion Materials.

- The Murre Conservation Fund –NL: <http://www.whc.org/NLMurreConservationFund.htm>

- New Brunswick Environmental Trust Fund: <http://www.gnb.ca/0009/0373/0002/0001-e.asp>

The Fund provides assistance for action-oriented projects with tangible, measurable results, aimed at protecting, preserving and enhancing the Province's natural environment.

- Newfoundland and Labrador Legacy Nature Trust: <http://legacynaturetrust.ca/main.asp>

The Trust aims to reach new sources of funding, from outside and inside the province, in order generate new revenue for conservation of the natural environments of Newfoundland

and Labrador. The Trust works with other environmental organizations and project partners to reach its fundraising goals.

- Nova Scotia Habitat Conservation Fund: <http://www.gov.ns.ca/natr/wildlife/habfund/>

The Nova Scotia Habitat Conservation Fund is a funding program for the protection and enhancement of wildlife and wildlife habitats. The Fund is organized under four objectives: Enhancement, Acquisition, Research, and Education.

- NWT Natural Resources Conservation Trust:

[http://www.enr.gov.nt.ca/plc/wildtimes/fall1994/wild\\_times\\_fall\\_1994\\_page\\_12.htm](http://www.enr.gov.nt.ca/plc/wildtimes/fall1994/wild_times_fall_1994_page_12.htm)

The Natural Resources Conservation Trust Fund promotes, through education, research and demonstration, the: a) wise use of renewable resources, b) awareness, enhancement and protection of the environment, and c) use of the most efficient and most effective methods of trapping wildlife.

- Parkland Acquisition Fund:

<http://www.conservancy.bc.ca/content.asp?sectionack=thetislakemtnwork>

The Land Conservancy launched an exciting new parkland acquisition in partnership with the Capital Regional District Parks Department. Together they have purchased 172 acres (67.98 hectares) of forest and wetlands joining Thetis Lake and Mount Work Regional Parks.

- PEI's Watershed Management Fund: <http://www.gov.pe.ca/infopei/index.php3?number=18643>

The Watershed Management Fund is an initiative that provides support to community-based watershed organizations that are involved in the watershed management and planning process. The Watershed Management Fund (WMF) also supports the habitat enhancement projects that were formerly supported by the Wildlife Habitat Improvement Program.

- Quebec's Green Fund:

<http://www.mddep.gouv.qc.ca/developpement/2004-2007/plan-consultation-en.pdf>

(pg. 38 of 48)

A **Green Fund** will be established within the Ministère de l'Environnement. The fund will serve to finance measures carried out by the Minister to promote sustainable development, especially in its environmental aspects. This will allow the Minister to grant financial assistance in particular to municipalities and non-profit organizations working in the environmental field.

- WWF – Canada Endangered Species Recovery Fund:

<http://wwf.ca/NewsAndFacts/Projects/ESRF.asp>

- Wetland Habitat Fund (Ontario):

<http://www.whc.org/wetlandfund/en/home/whatsnew/whatsnew.html>

The Wetland Habitat Fund has been available in Peterborough County since 1997 and offers a financial incentive to those prepared to improve their property by enhancing wetlands.

- Yukon's Environmental Awareness Fund:

<http://www.environmentyukon.gov.yk.ca/epa/eafund.html>



Funding of \$30,000 is available in 2006-07 to assist registered non-government organizations with efforts to inform and educate the public by promoting environmental education or awareness, resource planning and sustainable development in the Yukon.

### 2.3 Object Purchasing:

#### 2.3.1 License Plates:

- New Brunswick Wildlife Trust Fund: <http://www.nbwtf.ca/how-to-contribute.asp>

- Nova Scotia Conservation license plates:

<http://www.gov.ns.ca/snsmr/rmv/registration/conservationplate.asp>

<http://www.gov.ns.ca/news/details.asp?id=20030407002>

#### 2.3.2 Stamps:

- British Columbia Salmon Conservation Stamp:

<http://www.greatcanadianrivers.com/salmon/conservation-home.html>

British Columbia anglers are required to purchase an artist-designed Salmon Conservation Stamp each year as part of their tidal water license. Produced by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada.

- City of Winnipeg Wildlife Conservation Stamps: [http://www.saskatoonstamp.com/sir\\_wpg.htm](http://www.saskatoonstamp.com/sir_wpg.htm)

The "Canada Goose" stamps were produced by the Winnipeg Game & Fish Association to raise funds to promote wildlife conservation.

- Ducks Unlimited Stamps: <http://www.nationalwildlife.com/DUNL.htm>

List of Federal Ducks Unlimited Stamps, unfortunately it appears that Canada hasn't produced any stamps since 1988.

- Murre Hunting Stamp – Newfoundland and Labrador:

<http://legacynaturetrust.ca/index.asp?cat=projects&page=32>

Revenues for the Murre Conservation Fund come from the purchase of conservation stamps by Murre hunters. Produced through a partnership between Environment Canada and Wildlife Habitat Canada, this stamp is required to validate the Migratory Game Bird Hunting Permit. In 2001, the Canadian Wildlife Habitat Conservation Stamp became a requirement for Murre hunting licenses issued in Newfoundland and Labrador.

- Pacific Salmon Foundation: <http://www.psf.ca/06events/06stamps.html>

- Wildlife Habitat Canada Donates Prints to Conservation Organizations to Raise Funds:

<http://www.stewardshipcanada.ca/stewardshipCanada/home/si.asp?s=scn&l=en&dc=4852>

Wildlife Habitat Canada, would like to donate a Conservation Edition Print valued at \$195.00 for auction, as a great way for you to raise funds for stewardship organizations. They ask that the organization purchase a Wildlife Habitat Canada Conservation Stamp for \$8.50, as well as framing the print with the stamp and cover shipping costs. The organization gets to keep all the funds raised by these prints by Canadian artists.

- Wildlife Habitat Conservation Stamps:  
<http://www.gov.ns.ca/natr/WILDLIFE/conserva/11-03-5.htm>  
[http://www.whc.org/conservation\\_stamps.htm](http://www.whc.org/conservation_stamps.htm)

### 2.3.3 Posters:

- Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters → Ontario Game Fish Posters:  
[http://www.ofah.org/store/index.cfm?Cat=2&A=Get\\_Prod&ItemID=7](http://www.ofah.org/store/index.cfm?Cat=2&A=Get_Prod&ItemID=7)

Proceeds go to fish and wildlife projects across the province.

- WWF Canada Posters and Products:  
<http://www.wwf.ca/HowYouCanHelp/PandaStore/PandaStore.asp?Category=17&IGNOREcart=>

Proceeds from every sale support WWF's conservation efforts to save endangered species and habitats

### 2.3.4 Other:

- Nature New Brunswick Pins: <http://www.naturenb.ca/English/merchandise.htm>

Funds the New Brunswick Federation of Naturalists whose mission is to celebrate, conserve and protect New Brunswick's natural heritage, through education, networking and collaboration.

- RJ Brewers beer in support of species at risk  
Rescousse, also known as The SOS Beer, aims to raise consciousness over species endangerment, as well as funds to ease their recovery. For each bottle sold, both the brewer and its representative - Premier Brands - will contribute money to preserve species at risk and their critical habitat.  
Ontario site: <http://www.rescousse.org/on/index.html>  
Quebec site: <http://www.rescousse.org/qc/>

## 3.0 Biodiversity Grants/Project Funding Programs:

- CFI- Canada Foundation for Innovation:  
<http://www.innovation.ca/about/index.cfm?websiteid=5>

CFI was created by the government of Canada and funded/continues to fund a great number University based research projects pertaining to a great number of disciplines. Evolution & Ecology, and Plant & Tree biology are areas of interest to the CBD.

- EC's Northern Ecosystems Initiative:  
<http://www.mb.ec.gc.ca/nature/ecosystems/nei-ien/index.en.html>

The Northern Ecosystem Initiative (NEI) is a partnership-based program of Environment Canada that supports action on shared priorities important to the conservation, protection and restoration of northern ecosystems and sustainability of northern communities. The NEI is unique in that it addresses ecosystem science and capacity building needs of significance to all parts of Canada's North including the Yukon, Northwest Territories, Nunavut, lowlands in northern Manitoba and Ontario, Northern Quebec and Labrador.

- Invasive Alien Species Partnership Program:  
[http://www.scics.gc.ca/cinfo05/830859006\\_e.html](http://www.scics.gc.ca/cinfo05/830859006_e.html)

Ministers announced the establishment of the Invasive Alien Species Partnership Program, an initiative sponsored by the Government of Canada. Beginning in late 2005, this five-year Program will provide funding of \$1 million annually to enable Canadians to become actively involved in projects that prevent, detect, and manage invasive alien species and their pathways of invasion.

- The Standard Grants Program:

<http://www.fws.gov/birdhabitat/Grants/NAWCA/Standard/index.shtm>

The Standard Grants Program is a competitive, matching grants program that supports public-private partnerships carrying out projects in Canada, the United States, and Mexico. These projects must involve long-term protection, restoration, and/or enhancement of wetlands and associated uplands habitats.

- The Sustainable Development Innovations Fund:

<http://www.gov.mb.ca/conservation/pollutionprevention/sdif/index.html>

The SDIF provides grants through several priority program areas. Proposed projects must address one or more priority area and achieve or demonstrate measurable progress toward achieving the fund's objectives. They must also be environmentally and ecologically sound, promote a sustainable approach, have clear environmental benefits and take into account benefits to the community and the economy.

- Specific to Canada:

<http://www.fws.gov/birdhabitat/Grants/NAWCA/Standard/Canada/index.shtm>

- Alberta Ecotrust Environmental Grants Program:

[http://www.albertaecotrust.com/grants/grants\\_envpriorities.html](http://www.albertaecotrust.com/grants/grants_envpriorities.html)

Alberta Ecotrust will fund projects related to air, water and wilderness. With regards to wilderness: will favour initiatives that identify and protect remaining natural areas, improve the management of critical wildlife habitats, provide ecological connections among "core" wildlife areas, and demonstrate compatibility of human activities with wildlife conservation in areas where those activities already occur, including sustainable urban and suburban planning.

- BC Hydro Bridge Coastal Fish and Wildlife Restoration Program (BCRP):

<http://www.bchydro.com/bcrp/about/index.html>

A competitive [grant-awarding process](#) with approximately \$1.7 million available annually for [eligible projects](#) that restore fish and wildlife resources that have been adversely affected by the development of hydroelectric facilities in the [Bridge Coastal Generation Area](#). The BCRP operates on a shared governance model, as outlined in this Manual. Three groups are involved in program governance - First Nations, the public and Government (BC Hydro, DFO, Ministry of Water, Land, and Air Protection).

- BIOCAP Canada

<http://www.biocap.ca/index.cfm?meds=category&category=25>

BIOCAP Canada is Capturing Canada's Green Advantage by building research partnerships to encourage productive, competitive and sustainable methods for using our country's biological capital to create clean, sustainable forms of energy, fight climate change and encourage rural economic development.

BIOCAP is supported by three federal departments: Environment Canada, Natural Resources Canada and Agriculture and Agri-food Canada. The Foundation is currently in the final phase of a five-year, \$10 million federal commitment. During this five year period, BIOCAP has invested \$6.8 million dollars in research by providing seed funding to initiate suitable research projects. BIOCAP has leveraged this investment to attract an additional \$31.7 million in research by partnering with national scientific and research councils and industry, to co-fund emerging research programs. Primary funding partners have

included the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC). With its partners, BIOCAP has helped support over 300 researchers in academia, government, industry and 225 graduate students since 2002.

- CEC's Grants for Environmental Cooperation:

<http://www.cec.org/grants/projects/details/index.cfm?varlan=english&ID=114>

Grant for Community-based Salt Marsh Restoration in the Canadian Gulf of Maine.

- EcoAction: [http://www.ec.gc.ca/ecoaction/index\\_e.html](http://www.ec.gc.ca/ecoaction/index_e.html)

*EcoAction* is an Environment Canada program, providing financial support to community groups for action-oriented projects that have measurable, positive impacts on the environment. Non-profit groups are welcome to apply for projects that address Environment Canada's priority issues: Clean Air and Climate Change, Clean Water and Nature.

- Heritage Project Funding Programs:

[http://www.rougepark.com/programmes/heritage/project\\_funding.php](http://www.rougepark.com/programmes/heritage/project_funding.php)

Each year, the [Rouge Park Alliance](#) funds projects to restore and enhance [Rouge Park](#) and the [Rouge River watershed](#).

- Innovation Alberta: [http://www.innovationalberta.com/theme\\_sfm.php](http://www.innovationalberta.com/theme_sfm.php)

The Sustainable Forest Management Network operates with a \$7 million dollar budget. Fifty-five percent comes from the Network of Centres of Excellence program/Government of Canada. The Sustainable Forest Management Network is also in partnership with National Research Council Canada.

The Sustainable Forest Management Network promotes cross-discipline research to help develop a better understanding of our forests and the interconnectedness of ecological, social and economic perspectives. Funds a variety of research projects in the fields of ecology, biology, economics, policy, anthropology, and engineering. Key sector partners include Aboriginal people, government and industry.

- The *Nature Canada Parks and People program* –funded by Parks Canada and Nature Canada:

[http://www.cnf.ca/cwn\\_parkspeople.asp](http://www.cnf.ca/cwn_parkspeople.asp)

<http://www.stewardshipcanada.ca/funders/index.asp?sid=1&id=4142&type=single>

The program helps local naturalist groups, schools and conservation associations to bring Canadians into intimate contact with nature, guided by passionate and experienced volunteer nature experts. Twenty-eight local projects have been funded since the program began.

- Tree Canada Foundation – Green Streets Canada Program

<http://www.treecanada.ca/programs/greenstreets/>

Natural Resources Canada (NRCan) is the major sponsor of the Tree Canada Foundation, including the Green Streets Canada program. In 2005, NRCan proceeded with plans to renew its funding agreement with the Tree Canada Foundation for an additional two years. The Green Streets Canada program is being revamped to fund projects that encourage adopting innovative best management practices and policies in municipal forest management.

To help raise public awareness around trees and urban forests, funding was also provided to update the Foundation's public service announcements to make them ready to be broadcast. Every school board in Canada received copies of an educational poster and a pamphlet on the benefits of greening Canada's schoolyards, both of which were funded by NRCan.

- Wetland Conservation Projects Funded in Canada:

<http://www.wetlandscanada.org/september%202005%20projects.html>

Funded by a range of Canadian Foundations (e.g. Ducks Unlimited and Nature Conservancy of Canada are the major ones)

- Wildlife Habitat Canada Grants: [http://www.whc.org/canadian\\_conservation.htm](http://www.whc.org/canadian_conservation.htm)

In partnership with the Canadian Wildlife Service of Environment Canada, a portion of the revenues associated with the sale of the Canadian Wildlife Habitat Conservation Stamp are forwarded to Wildlife Habitat Canada (WHC) which in turn allocates funds toward wildlife habitat conservation programs across Canada.

- The Western Newfoundland Model Forest: <http://www.wnmf.com/main/index.html>

The Western Newfoundland Model Forest is in partnership with industry, government, academia, recreational, environmental and economic development groups. The Western Newfoundland Model Forest and its partners have funded pine marten research, worked with government, industry, hunters and the scientific community to promote public awareness about the pine marten, and helped create a pine marten reserve system.

#### **4.0 Land Trusts and Stewardship Programs:**

- Agriculture Environmental Initiatives (i.e. AEPI & AESI):

[http://www.bcac.bc.ca/agriculture\\_enviro\\_programs.htm](http://www.bcac.bc.ca/agriculture_enviro_programs.htm)

The Agriculture Environment Initiatives include the Agriculture Environment Partnership Initiative (AEPI) and the Agriculture Environment Sustainability Initiative (AESI). The AEPI and AESI funds provide assistance in resolving environmental and wildlife issues with agriculture. They are intended to further the environmental sustainability of the agri-food sector in British Columbia while enhancing the viability of the industry.

- BC's Environmental Farm Plan Program: [http://www.bcac.bc.ca/efp\\_programs.htm](http://www.bcac.bc.ca/efp_programs.htm)

British Columbia EFP Program will complement and enhance the current environmental stewardship practices of British Columbian producers. AESI (Agriculture Environment Sustainability Initiative) funds delivered through the Investment Agriculture Foundation of BC from AAFC (Agriculture and Agri-food Canada) have been made available for program initiation. The BCMAL (BC Ministry of Agriculture and Lands) supplies additional resources, such as personnel and facilities.

- Greencover Canada: [http://www.agr.gc.ca/env/greencover-verdir/index\\_e.phtml](http://www.agr.gc.ca/env/greencover-verdir/index_e.phtml)

The Greencover Canada program is a five-year, \$110-million Government of Canada initiative to help producers improve their grassland-management practices, protect water quality, reduce greenhouse-gas emissions, and enhance biodiversity and wildlife habitat.

- The Alberta Environmental Farm Plan Company:

<http://www.albertaefp.com/resources/assistance.html>

Farmers and ranchers with completed EFPs may be eligible for funding or other types of assistance to help implement the environmental farm plan. Various programs listed on this site offer assistance for environmentally sustainable agriculture projects in Alberta.

- Canada-Alberta Farm Stewardship Program: [http://www.agr.gc.ca/env/efp-pfa/index\\_e.php?section=nfsp-pnga&page=ab-nfsp-pnga](http://www.agr.gc.ca/env/efp-pfa/index_e.php?section=nfsp-pnga&page=ab-nfsp-pnga)

Brochure: [http://www.agr.gc.ca/env/efp-pfa/pdf/ab/ab\\_CAFSP\\_info\\_e.pdf](http://www.agr.gc.ca/env/efp-pfa/pdf/ab/ab_CAFSP_info_e.pdf)

CAFSP will provide financial and technical assistance for Alberta producers to develop and implement viable and environmentally sustainable agriculture practices. Flyer includes a table that lists categories for Environmental Improvement, lists % of Cost sharing by CAFSP, and up to how much they will contribute.

Categories of Particular Interest:

- Enhancing wildlife habitat and biodiversity
- Species at Risk
- Biodiversity Enhancement Planning
- The Habitat Stewardship Program in Nova Scotia (2003-2004):  
[http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/media/backgrou/2003/hq-ac54a\\_e.htm](http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/media/backgrou/2003/hq-ac54a_e.htm)

The Habitat Stewardship Program (HSP) for Species at Risk is a partnership-based conservation initiative sponsored by the Government of Canada. It provides funding for projects which, with matching contributions (in-kind or financial), aim to protect and recover priority species at risk listed by the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC).

- Islands Trust Fund – BC:  
<http://www.islandstrustfund.bc.ca/general/aboutus.htm>

The Islands Trust Fund is a conservation land trust established in 1990 to preserve and protect unique ecological or cultural properties in the Islands Trust Area.

- Canadian Ecological Gifts Program:  
<http://www.cws-scf.ec.gc.ca/egp-pde/default.asp?lang=En&n=522AB5A3-1>
- Habitat Acquisition Trust: <http://www.hat.bc.ca/>

Conserves natural environments on southern Vancouver Island and the southern Gulf Islands

- EC's Habitat Stewardship Program:  
<http://www.cws-scf.ec.gc.ca/hsp-pih/default.asp?lang=En&n=59BF488F-1>

The Habitat Stewardship Program became operational in 2000-2001 and allocates up to \$10 million per year to projects that conserve and protect species at risk and their habitats.

- Ontario Stewardship Program – Funded by MNR:  
<http://www.ontariostewardship.org/ontarioStewardship/home/osIndex.asp>

## 5.0 Conservation Easements and Tax Incentives:

### 5.1 Easements:

- BC grasslands Conservation Easements:  
<http://www.bcgrasslands.org/conservation/preserving/easement.htm>

- Ducks Unlimited Canada Conservation Easements: <http://www.ducks.ca/resource/landowner/easement.html>
- The Nature Conservancy of Canada: <http://www.nature.org/aboutus/howwework/conservationmethods/privatelands/conservationeasements/about/tncandeasements.html>

## 5.2 Tax Incentives:

- Ducks Unlimited: <http://www.ducks.ca/resource/landowner/easement.html>
- The Farm Tax Rebate Program: <http://www.mnr.gov.on.ca/MNR/cltip/other.html>

Starting January 1998, the Farm Tax Rebate Program was replaced by a new Farmland Taxation Policy for farm properties administered by the Ministry of Agriculture and Food. Under the new tax policy, farm properties satisfying the eligibility requirements will be identified in the Farmlands Property Class and will be taxed at 25% of the municipal residential/farm tax rate. The farm residence and one acre of land, surrounding it, will continue to be taxed as part of the residential class.

- The Managed Forest Tax Incentive Program: <http://ontariosforests.mnr.gov.on.ca/mftip.cfm>

The Managed Forest Tax Incentive Program (MFTIP) is a voluntary program administered by the Ministry of Natural Resources that provides lower property taxes to participating landowners that agree to conserve and actively manage their forests.

- MNR Tax Incentive Program: <http://www.mnr.gov.on.ca/MNR/cltip/>

The Conservation Land Tax Incentive Program (CLTIP) was established in 1998. It is designed to recognize, encourage and support the long-term private stewardship of Ontario's provincially significant conservation lands. It provides property tax relief to those landowners who agree to protect the natural heritage values of their property. The current tax relief offered is a 100 per cent tax exemption on the eligible portion of a property.

## 6.0 Interesting Financial Mechanisms (Non-Canadian):

- Emergency Wetlands Loan Act <http://www.ducks.org/news/926/DucksUnlimitedSupport.html>

Ducks Unlimited (DU) is asking Congress to support renewal of the proposed Emergency Wetlands Loan Act. DU Public Policy Director for the Great Plains Region, Joe Satrom, testified Wednesday before the House Resources Committee in favor of the proposed legislation. The legislation could bolster public-private efforts that help private landowners conserve habitat that benefits waterfowl and other wildlife, particularly in the “duck factory” of the Prairie Pothole Region (PPR) of the United States.

- Federal Duck Stamp Revenues and Land and Water Conservation Funds for National Wildlife Refuges: <http://www.fws.gov/duckstamps/>

Money raised by the sale of Federal Duck Stamps pays for wetland acquisitions for the National Wildlife Refuge System. Since the first Duck Stamp sale in 1934, more than \$700 million has been raised to help purchase in excess of five million acres of wetlands for the refuge system. Today, the Commission approved nearly a million dollars in Federal Duck Stamp funds to acquire land for the National Wildlife Refuge System. All acquisitions were previously approved by the affected states.

- The Nature Conservancy in the U.S. provides conservation easements: <http://www.nature.org/aboutus/howwework/conservationmethods/privatelands/conservationeasements/about/tncandeasements.html>
- The Nature Conservancy of Canada [http://www.natureconservancy.ca/site/PageServer?pagename=ncc\\_about\\_index](http://www.natureconservancy.ca/site/PageServer?pagename=ncc_about_index)
- National Stewardship Initiatives: Conservation Strategies for U.S. Land Owners: <http://www.defenders.org/pubs/nsi01.html>  
<http://www.defenders.org/pubs/nsi15.html>

It provides a range of incentive options that currently exist or that could be implemented to encourage improved stewardship on managed lands across the nation. It describes specific strategies to enhance biodiversity on lands managed primarily for human uses and defines a positive role in biodiversity conservation for private landowners, highlighting contributions they often already make. The primary audience is private landowners, resource managers, policy makers, and others interested in conserving wildlife, habitat, and other elements of biodiversity on the managed landscape.

Note: The various existing and possible financial incentives are listed in the second url.

- Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation: <http://www.birdlife.org/news/news/2001/08/296.html>

The US Government has approved in full funding for the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act (see *World Birdwatch* 22(4): p. 5). US \$5 million per year will be available for five years to support partnership programmes to enhance habitat in the Caribbean and Latin America for migratory birds.

- U.S. Scholarships and Fellowships Ecology Related – National Wildlife Federation: <http://www.nwf.org/campusEcology/dspFellowshipsFunding.cfm>

#### **7.0 Suggestions for Innovative Mechanisms:**

- Suggestion by Benoit Limoges: Charge a fee for using plastic bags (grocery store, retail etc.) as they directly affect biodiversity. There is an incentive mechanism of this sort in place in Sainte-Foy, Québec. The grocery store takes 5 cents off the bill every time someone uses their own enviro-bag.
- There are a number of suggestions listed on the following American site: <http://www.defenders.org/pubs/nsi15.html>

#### **8.0 International Financial Mechanisms:**

- Biotic Exploration Fund: [http://www.iocd.org/working\\_groups/bioticEF.html](http://www.iocd.org/working_groups/bioticEF.html)

IOCD works through the Biotic Exploration Fund to assist developing countries to establish programs of scientific exploration and conservation of their biodiversity resources known as bioprospecting.

- Canada Iraq Marshlands Initiative: <http://www.cimiwetlands.net/>

Led by University of Waterloo in partnership with a couple dozen partners- EC's Wildlife Service was listed among them.

Project Goals:



- (a) contribute to the restoration of the ecological, socio-economic and cultural values of the southern Mesopotamian Marshlands; and
- (b) The project will assist in strengthening elements of the Iraqi environmental governance system for wetlands. This will assist on-going and planned restoration efforts and sustainable management, with a focus on the southern Iraqi marshlands. The underlying premise of the project is that the actions or institutional changes that CIMI supports should be sustainable beyond the life of the project. CIMI will stress Iraqi ownership of the project and work in partnership with local and international partners.

- Costa Rica project on Payment for Environmental Services (PSA)

This incentive system for forest activities took a significant turn in 1996 with the promulgation of the Costa Rica Forestry Law. The PSA establishes payments to owners of forests and forest plantations in recognition of the service that conserving or appropriately managing the forest offers to society as a whole. According to this law, the services recognized are the mitigation of greenhouse effect gases, the protection of water resources and protection of the biodiversity and scenic beauty. The Costa Rica Ministry of the Environment and Energy (MINAE) administers the PSA system through the National Forestry Financing Fund (FONAFIFO). Funding for the system essentially comes from the transfer of a third of the selective sales tax on fuels and hydrocarbons. Other financing sources are the contracts between FONAFIFO and some private companies interested in conservation plus the funds obtained from carbon sequestration, through the Joint Implementation Mechanism.

- Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund: <http://www.cepf.net/xp/cepf/>

The Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) provides financial and technical assistance to nongovernmental organizations, community groups, and other civil society partners to help safeguard Earth's biodiversity hotspots.

- The Nature Conservancy's Debt-for-Nature Swap:

<http://www.nature.org/aboutus/howwework/conservationmethods/conservationfunding/>

Debt-for-nature swaps create a link between a country's external debt and financing for biodiversity conservation. These are voluntary transactions through which an amount of hard-currency debt owed by a developing country government (debtor) is exchanged by the creditor for financial commitments to conservation by the debtor, usually in local currency. The proceeds generated by debt-for-nature swaps are often administered by local conservation or environmental trust funds, which disburse grants to specific projects and ensure accountable, transparent and decentralized management.

### **GERMANY AND THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION, (ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY AND ITS MEMBER STATES)**

EU-Submission to Notification 2006-093  
(as of 14.02.2007)

Decision VIII/18 on Guidance to the Financial Mechanism: Consultation with the Parties on opportunities for streamlining the guidance

Views / Comments of the European Union

1. Notification 2006-093 calls for views of governments on decision VIII/18, paragraph 6, in which COP requests "the Executive Secretary to explore opportunities for streamlining the guidance provided to

/...

the Global Environment Facility taking into account the framework for goals and targets in decision VII/30 as well as indicators for assessing progress toward the achievement of the 2010 target.

2. In past COP decisions a number of parameters have been established to more effectively formulate the guidance to the financial mechanism. In decision V/20, paragraph 8, COP decided that guidance to the GEF should be incorporated into a single decision, including the identification of priority issues. The EU regards this practise as important and useful, but believes that further work needs to be done on the way in which priorities are set.

3. The EU does not consider necessary the establishment of a special joint working group comprised of staff from the SCBD and the GEF-Secretariat to review the formulation of the guidance, as proposed by the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation. An additional working group would bear additional costs. There is sufficient and helpful dialogue between COP and the GEF as proven by the review of earlier COP decisions related to the financial mechanism and the retiring of COP decisions, a practise that the EU believes should continue.

4. The EU recognizes the concerns expressed by developing countries about the implications of the GEF's new Resource Allocation Framework in changing the process for the allocation of resources to them in support of the implementation of the Convention. The EU realizes that COP did not provide guidance on the development of the RAF. The EU would welcome guidance from the COP to the GEF, including on the application of on the Global Benefits Index (Biodiversity), to improve the RAF, as an input to the mid-term review of the RAF in 2008. The experience of developing countries should be taken into account.

EU-Submission to Notification 2006-096

Decision VIII/13 on Review of Implementation of Article 20 (Financial Resources) and Article 21 (Financial Mechanism)

Views /Comments of the European Union

1. Notification 2006-096 calls for views and comments of governments in response to COP decision VIII/13, paragraph 4, which requests “the Executive Secretary, in consultation with Parties, Governments and relevant partners, to explore all options for resource mobilisation including innovative financial mechanisms and to develop a draft strategy for resource mobilisation in support of the achievement of the objectives of the Convention [...]”.

2. The EU recognises the importance of official development assistance in ongoing activities to implement the Convention. In this regard the EU wishes to stress the need for understanding and taking into account the considerations and mechanisms guiding the international development cooperation agenda, as expressed in e.g. the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and including the emphasis on recipient country ownership, harmonization and alignment.

3. Individual recipient countries set the agenda and define their priorities. This means that in order to assist in the mobilisation of ODA in support of the achievement of the objectives of the Convention, biodiversity needs to be mainstreamed and prioritised accordingly in the recipient countries' national plans and programmes, such as Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and sector development plans. The adoption of a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) is a good tool to be used in the mainstreaming process, as stated in the Paris Declaration.

4. Moreover, the strong focus of most countries' development cooperation on poverty alleviation and eradication of hunger as the main objectives means that a high percentage of biodiversity-related

funding is devoted to sustainable use and addresses biodiversity-related livelihoods and food-security concerns within economic and other sector projects and programmes, particularly those related to natural resource management. The relevance of this funding to the CBD and the 2010 target must also be recognised.

5. However, ODA including contributions to the Global Environment Facility is only one source of funding. The Convention's targets can only be met if funding draws on all available public and private sources, including public sources in developing country Parties as well as Parties with economies in transition. Adequate and sustained funding can only be mobilised, if biodiversity considerations are fully integrated into national, regional and international economies and budgets. We also refer to the Environmental Fiscal Reform approach approved by OECD/DAC. The value of Environmental Fiscal Reform lies in its potential to both provide for a way for governments to raise revenue and to contribute positively to sustainable biodiversity management and other policy objectives, such as revenue generation, poverty reduction, good governance and growth.

6. Moreover, funds need to be generated from the provision of ecological services and from marketing the benefits of sustainable management. It is also important to acknowledge the value and foster the contribution of sustainable community-based management systems. Sustainable use and benefit sharing from the utilisation of genetic resources provide opportunities for reinvesting returns in the long term sustainable management of biodiversity.

7. Private sector awareness of the importance of biodiversity for sustainable development is growing and the EU considers it important to work with the private sector to promote greater understanding of biodiversity and mobilizing support for the achievement of the Convention's objectives.

8. The EU would also like to highlight the necessity to enhance cooperation and use synergies between the three Rio conventions to increase the effectiveness of the use of financial resources. The EU therefore welcomes the recommendation of the UN High Level Panel's report on system-wide coherence of further coordination among the relevant UN agencies in the field of environment.

9. Because of limited financial resources, NBSAPs should indicate priorities for funding.

10. Finally, the EU welcomes the message from Paris "Integrating biodiversity into European development cooperation" of 19-21 September 2006 which emphasises the important link between biodiversity and achieving poverty reduction as well as other MDGs and underlines that conservation, sustainable use of and equitable sharing of benefits from biodiversity as well as sustaining ecosystem services are core development issues.

EU-Submission to Notification 2006-105

Decision VIII/13 on Review of Implementation of Article 20 (Financial Resources) and Article 21 (Financial Mechanism), Paragraph 7

Views / Comments of the European Union

1. Notification 2006-105 calls for views and comments of Contracting Parties on decision VIII/13, paragraph 7, which "recommends to Parties, Governments and funding institutions, as appropriate, the promotion, and fostering of new national and regional environmental funds and strengthening/expanding such existing funds, and further to encourage knowledge transfer and exchange about these mechanisms, through the creation and/or strengthening of national and international learning networks or communities [...]".

2. The EU recognises that environmental funds can provide substantial and secure amounts of funding in support of the objectives of the Convention. Therefore EU Member States have established and supported funds for this purpose, e.g. The Darwin Initiative (UK). Moreover they present a form of direct budgetary support for specific projects.

3. The EU sees the need for broadening the finance basis for biodiversity and ecosystem services and for making best possible use of available co-financing instruments, in accordance with the objectives of these instruments.

4. The EU recognises that e.g. the sustained funding of in situ conservation and its financial viability in the long term present a significant challenge and is essential if the Convention's targets are to be met. Therefore, EU Member States have established and supported the establishment of such funds, e.g. the Caucasus Protected Area Trust Fund (Germany, 2006), the Madagascar Biodiversity Conservation Trust Fund (Germany, 2005), Trinational Park Sangha (Germany, 2005).

5. From our experience with the establishment and management of environmental funds, they will only be sustainable if a number of preconditions are met. Apart from the necessary legal and financial regulations, there needs to be a clear commitment to conservation and sustainable use by the national and local governments and active government support for the fund as well as support from private sources. Good governance practises as well as adequate governance arrangements are necessary.

6. Also, the EU would like to point out that environmental funds only present one out of several financial sources that are relevant to meet the Convention's objectives. We refer to our submission to notification 2006-096 where we highlighted the importance to draw upon all available public and private sources.

## HONDURAS

### 1. Fondo de Manejo del Medio Ambiente Honduras-Canada (FEHC)

El Gobierno de Honduras y Canadá convino la creación de un Fondo del Medio Ambiente Honduras – Canadá FAHC para el financiamiento de proyectos vinculados al medio ambiente y otros de desarrollo sostenible, los que fueron identificados y seleccionados por medio de mecanismos mutuamente establecidos entre ambos países. La ejecución de estos proyectos a estado a cargo de entidades privadas y publicas, como se CARE, COHDEFOR, SETCO Y MARENA

En el marco de la ejecución de proyectos financiado por el Fondo se ha creado un Manual Operativo que establece los criterios, las normas y los procedimientos mediante los cuales opera, así mismo, contiene las instancias de concertación y coordinación operativa de la Comisión Binacional. Dentro del manual operativo se encuentra la guía donde se dan las indicaciones para la elaboración de proyectos, elaboración el marco lógico, el sistema de monitoreo y evaluación de proyectos, presentación de informes, evaluación de medio termino, evaluación interna y otros. Unos pocos proyectos han tenido Evaluación de Medio Término para otros, la Comisión Binacional optó por apoyarles en hacer Planificación Participativa de sus POAs pues la Evaluación ya era extemporánea.

### 2. Fondo Hondureño para Áreas Protegidas (FHAP)

Establecer y operativizar el FHAP

En la actualidad está en la etapa final el desarrollo de una Consultoría con el objetivo de formular los estatutos de la Fundación que será el Organismo que administrará el Fondo, los cuales están siendo revisados por el Comité Técnico del el CONAP y posteriormente serán aprobados por la asamblea constitutiva de la fundación, la SERNA es la responsable por la efectiva y eficiente coordinación para la

puesta en marcha de la Fundación, actualmente se cuenta con un fideicomiso de Lps. 60 millones en el Banco Nacional de Desarrollo Agrícola (BANADESA) como Capital Semilla del Fondo.

Este fondo será una ventanilla para apoyar el manejo efectivo del Sistema Nacional de Áreas Protegidas de Honduras (SINAPH) y fomentar proyectos de desarrollo sostenible.

## MEXICO

Al respecto esta Dependencia propone las siguientes acciones:

- Que el secretariado del CBD promueva el establecimiento de un instrumento y criterios de admisibilidad para precisar el listado de las Partes que pueden recibir financiamiento del Fondo para el Medio Ambiente Mundial (FMAM)
- Exigir al Secretariado del FMAM la simplificación y agilización de los procedimientos de aprobación y desembolso de los recursos.
- Exigir al Secretariado del FMAM que acepte los proyectos que son resultado de un proceso de priorización nacional y consulta interna de las Partes, y que cuentan con la aprobación de mecanismos interinstitucionales nacionales.
- Definir criterios claros para orientar al FMAM sobre el financiamiento de proyectos de alcance mundial o regional, así como del Programa de Pequeñas Donaciones y actividades intersectoriales de fortalecimiento de la capacidad.
- Acordar con el Secretariado del FMAM el fomento de actividades de habilitación, a fin de que las Partes autoevalúen sus capacidades y actualicen sus inventarios, estrategias, planes de acción e informes nacionales, en las que integren además los temas de seguridad biotecnológica, diversidad biológica de las islas, ecosistemas del milenio, taxonomía, especies exóticas invasoras, etc.
- Que se defina una representación del Secretariado del CBD para que participe activamente en el examen del marco de asignación de recursos, que está programado una vez transcurridos dos años de su aplicación (revisión programada por el FMAM para el 2008).
- Que el Grupo de Trabajo Especial Composición Abierta verifique que los indicadores que conforman el Índice de Beneficios del FMAM, sean congruentes con el marco de metas y objetivos y los indicadores para determinar el avance hacia el logro de la meta de 2010.
- Que se proponga al FMAM se lleven a cabo gestiones para una revisión de las aportaciones que se hacen a las Agencias Implementadoras, a fin de que se obtengan ahorros, para que éstos se destinen a cualquiera de los programas operacionales del FMAM.

## MYANMAR

With reference to your e-mail dated 26th September 2006 regarding the implementation of Article 20 (Financial resources) and Article 21 (Financial mechanism), Myanmar, as a contracting Party to the Convention on Biological Diversity, would like to suggest that a special request be made to encourage the developed countries which have the potential to provide financial contribution in order to

/...

strengthen the financial resources of the convention. As to funding programme, priority should be given to the least developed countries, which are rich in biological resources.

### *SWITZERLAND*

As set out in decision VIII/13, our contribution focuses on the options for resource mobilization including innovative financial mechanisms.

It includes two elements:

- (a) Generic conclusions from the experience regarding the implementation of Articles 20 and 21, and
- (b) Specific examples of on-going efforts that are associated with.

In this respect we have included examples related to our involvement as part of the European Biodiversity Resourcing Initiative- which is developed within the frame of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) and within the Paneuropean Strategy on biological and landscape diversity (PEBLD).

#### 1. Challenges for Supporting Biodiversity Investment at a European Scale EBRI)

1. Three challenges have been addressed so far by the European Biodiversity Resourcing Initiative (EBRI), (see note \*) and its Task Force, but only partially resolved:

Clarifying the scope of 'biodiversity' products, either as a sellable item or a process / by-product related to their production.

Demonstrating the nature of the need for non-commercial finance by biodiversity-relevant projects, which under normal conditions of profitability for an investment proposal would be satisfied by existing liquidities from local banking sources.

Defining the investment mechanisms that would avoid either moral hazard in the finance sector or unsustainable business plans in the commercial / service / industrial sectors.

2. In addition, the attention of the EBRI and its Task Force (see section 2) focused on the experience of IFC that the future for biodiversity-related investment in countries with transition economies requires accelerating market development rather than transforming markets.

3. Certain market segments are already known as being closely related to bio-diversity. These are:

- (a) organic agriculture
- (b) certified forestry

Entrepreneurial activity can be structured around production processes of raw materials, their transformation into consumer products, and their distribution.

- (c) eco-tourism

'Ecologically-friendly' recreation depends on limiting access and controlling the intensity and frequency of use, and therefore on a partial privatization of public goods.

---

\* European Biodiversity Resourcing Initiative – launched in Geneva, December 2001 – in which the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN) has played a leading role, notably through the European Task Force for Banking, Business and Biodiversity (part of the EBRI programme), meeting regularly at the London headquarters of the EBRD. EBRI is part of the implementation of the Pan-European Landscape and Biodiversity Strategy; the Secretariat of the European Task Force is assured by ECNC (European Centre for Nature Conservation).

4. Other human activities / land use can be more favorable for biodiversity if properly located and if accompanied by 'damage reduction' measures. This type of abatement approach depends on ecologically-based zoning and on pollution control technologies.
5. Finally, mitigation measures are possible, in the sense of compensation by substitution: planting x ha for y ha lost, etc.
6. Biodiversity investment can provide direct or indirect returns, direct if there is a marketable 'product' or 'by-product', or indirect if there is an influence on the market environment. Return on investment can be evaluated in both circumstances; the difference is the degree of confidence in the calculation.
7. There are two basic strategies for supporting biodiversity investment: to avoid risk of damage to biodiversity (in the present and the future); and to capture added value from properly managed biodiversity assets.
8. Avoiding risk is a strategy that is more certain in its results, but the potential for added value may lead to greater profitability in an investment.
9. With regard to structuring a European investment programme, the existence of financial intermediaries is the critical bottleneck.
10. Considering the two previous points, capacity building is essential: point 8 with regard to the entrepreneur; point 9 with regard to the intermediate banker. Both require awareness of potential risks and added value when dealing with biodiversity.
11. Launching a successful European investment programme related to biodiversity requires preparing the knowledge base for realistic investment proposals and for the due diligence to carry these through to completed deals. The availability of training and guidelines, both based on thoroughly researched best available technologies and best-practice case studies, are indispensable; they should be considered as part of the initial programme costs.

## 2. A focus on pro-biodiversity business investment (European Task Force)

The European Task Force on Banking, Business and Biodiversity has as a focus: the encouragement of pro-biodiversity business investments; the Task Force is favorable to the principal of targeted support for these investments from the major European financial institutions. This is in line with the Kyiv resolution on Financing Biodiversity, which calls for the establishment of Biodiversity Financing Facilities through which the major European banks work will with directly financial intermediaries in Europe, particularly in the EECCA region, to encourage the establishment of biodiversity-related business enterprises.

Biodiversity investment can provide direct or indirect returns, direct if there is a marketable 'product' or 'by-product', or indirect if there is an influence on the market environment. Return on investment can be evaluated in both circumstances; the difference is the degree of confidence in the calculation.

There are two basic strategies for supporting biodiversity investment: to avoid risk of damage to biodiversity (in the present and the future); and to capture added value from properly managed biodiversity assets. Avoiding risk is a strategy that is more certain in its results, but the potential for added value may lead to greater profitability in an investment. With regard to structuring a European investment programme, the existence of financial intermediaries is the critical bottleneck.

Considering the two previous points, capacity building is essential with regard to the entrepreneur and also the local banker. Both require awareness of potential risks and added value when dealing with biodiversity.

Launching a successful European investment programme related to biodiversity requires preparing the knowledge base for realistic investment proposals and for the due diligence to carry these through to completed deals. The availability of training and guidelines, both based on thoroughly researched best available technologies and best-practice case studies, are indispensable; they should be considered as part of the initial programme costs.

The European Task Force for Business, Banking and Biodiversity met in the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development Headquarters in London on 3 November 2005, to review on-going efforts. The meeting concluded that there is an investment market for biodiversity relevant project and programmes and that a number of leading banks are interested to promote biodiversity schemes.

The EBRD is working on the basis of a scoping study on biodiversity investments in Poland, which was implemented by Flora Fauna International with support of Stichting Doen. The EBRD presented a proposal for a Biodiversity Finance Facility, which should mobilise investments in biodiversity and assist in bringing together demand and supply.

The Hungarian government and the European Center for Nature and Conservation (ECNC) are carrying out a pilot project in Hungary on biodiversity investments that is currently being explored by the European Investment Bank, the Hungarian Development Bank, The Hungarian Ministry of Environment and Water, and ECNC-European Centre for Nature Conservation. EIB indicated its willingness to contribute via a global loan to a regional biodiversity fund, if there is need, provided that biodiversity investments could be mainstreamed with the bank's lending criteria and requirements and provided that enough investors could be attracted.

The Swiss Federal Office for Environment (FOEN) is supporting the work of ECNC for promoting biodiversity awareness in EECCA financial institutions through local seminars.

Finally, in response to the recommendation made by the European Task Force to the European Commission Directorate-General for the Environment, a pilot programme for a Biodiversity Technical Assistance Facility has been undertaken, in which at first three countries (Bulgaria, Hungary and Poland) will benefit from targeted intervention to promote pro-biodiversity business opportunities in selected natural areas of European importance, working with both entrepreneurs and the managers of financial establishments. The purpose is to encourage the development of bankable investment proposals having Net Ecological Benefit ([see note†](#)), and to overcome possible apprehension of risks associated with these investments. This is a first step in the preparation of an eventual Biodiversity Financing Facility that would operate on a pan-European level.

---

#### † Net Ecological Benefit

Net Ecological Benefit is the difference in ecological state of a geographically determined area from the present time projected forward to a specified future date, which can be considered as an improvement in ecological conditions and functions for habitats and/or species.

A proposal for a pro-biodiversity business investment should be able to demonstrate with independent expert verification that Net Ecological Benefit will take place, and that this improvement is directly attributable to the investment itself, and its operation over time.

Net Ecological Benefit infers the sustainable use of natural resources as an inherent feature of an investment proposal.



## GREENPEACE INTERNATIONAL

### “We cannot afford more biodiversity loss: the urgency of protected area financing” SUMMARY

#### *The need for additional sources of funding*

There is an urgent need for a global network of terrestrial protected areas (PAs), especially for ancient (or primary) forest ecosystems. Ancient forests are under multiple threats, predominantly commercial and illegal logging and agriculture.

The funding gap for a global network of PAs has an estimated shortfall of US\$ 20-25 billion per year for terrestrial ecosystems (Balmford et al., 2002). This amount, however, is negligible in comparison to the estimated financial returns of between US \$4 400-5 200 billion per year that a global network of PAs could provide in terms of ecosystem goods and services, such as clean water, food security, medicine, disaster prevention and climate stabilization.

Greenpeace commissioned a review of options to generate additional funds for a global network of terrestrial PAs. From these options, Greenpeace considers international environmental taxation options to be the most suitable mechanism to fill the funding gap for a global network of terrestrial PAs, in particular forests.

#### *International environmental taxation mechanisms*

Biodiversity is not evenly distributed around the world but generally concentrated in the tropics. However, a number of important goods and services produced by biodiversity via ecosystems are regional or global, e.g. carbon sequestration in forests. Therefore, the global community has an obligation to fund PAs. This is most easily performed by international fund-raising mechanisms. International mechanisms are especially relevant for poorer countries, which may be biodiversity rich, yet require financial assistance to develop an effective network of PAs.

There are many options for increased funding, but environmental taxation is Greenpeace's preferred mechanism to raise additional funds for PAs. International environmental taxation is attractive because it would capture taxes from transnational companies/corporations. Transnational companies are becoming increasingly insulated from national taxation systems, but can exploit natural resources on a large scale, with associated negative ecological and social impacts. Thus, an international environmental tax would help to internalize the costs of these negative impacts.

International environmental taxation would have the additional benefit of increasing the accountability of transnational companies at the international level.

The taxation subjects described here were selected on the basis of being applicable globally and able to be administered through international agencies. The following types of tax have the most potential to raise income for a global network of PAs.

- 1) Carbon tax
- 2) Timber tax
- 3) Currency Transaction Tax

#### *1) Carbon taxes*

Carbon tax would be applied to releases of carbon dioxide from fossil fuels into the atmosphere.

Carbon taxes could raise money for a variety of relevant projects, including the promotion of renewable energy, but could also raise money for protected areas. Biodiversity conservation is key to maintaining healthy ecosystems and contributing to mitigation and adaptation to climate change. In particular, the conservation of forest and peat ecosystems would prevent the loss of terrestrial sinks and stocks of carbon, which is a function man-made ecosystems cannot fulfil to the same extent.

**Aviation and shipping:** These sectors contribute significantly to air pollution and climate change, but their emissions are not covered by the Kyoto Protocol. The substantial greenhouse gas emissions from the growth of both sectors make these important areas for a potential carbon tax scheme. Taxes to offset carbon emissions from air travel and shipping could raise considerable revenues, of which a proportion could be for PAs, including forests and peat ecosystems.

Taxes related to aviation could be applied on consumed fuel, air tickets, or on the use of air corridors. The air corridor option has the advantage that the tax can be collected by air space administration bodies on top of the normal route fees. The aircraft's emissions could also be taken into account along with the amount of fuel consumed. Thus, the tax rate could be linked to the level of pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, which may lead to reductions of the emissions generated by the aviation sector by technological innovations. The aviation tax options each have the potential to yield US\$ 8-10 x 10<sup>9</sup> per year and would result in modest increases in the price of air tickets (Landau, 2004).

In the shipping sector, taxes could be applied to fuels, and on utilization of sea straits. The fuel tax would raise US \$1-20 x 10<sup>9</sup> per year, depending on the degree to which environmental costs are internalized in the fuel cost price (Landau, 2004). A fuel tax has the most direct relation with the negative environmental impacts caused by shipping and thus could lead to mitigation of pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.

Revenues from taxes on aviation and shipping would probably be divided between PAs and other initiatives such as developing cleaner transport systems or poverty alleviation. Nonetheless, aviation and shipping taxes would be a viable option to raise additional funds for protected areas.

The Landau Report (Landau, 2004) concludes that environmental taxes on aviation and shipping are technically feasible and that these would be able to raise significant, stable and sustainable sources of finance. The critical issue is that these require strong international consensus.

## *2) Timber tax*

The annual turnover of world trade in forest products exceeded US\$ 200 x 10<sup>9</sup> in 2003 (FAOSTAT, 2005). A tax of 1% on international trade in timber products (including paper) thus would generate revenue of US\$ 2 x 10<sup>9</sup>. Whilst a regulative system for international timber trade could raise only a part of the revenues required for a global network of protected areas, the advantage is that this could be channeled directly into forest PAs.

A suggested mechanism for channeling international payments linked to timber trade taxation is to make area-based payments to forest management units to compensate for the additional costs of sustainable natural forest management (Bach & Gram, 1996). However, this clearly could be considered a forestry subsidy. Only at very low extraction levels, or in the case of sustainable use of non-timber forest products, it can be justified that area-based payments would act as financial compensation for ecosystem services provided by natural forests. Financial compensation would then take the form of payment for environmental services.

A lower timber taxation rates could be applied to Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certified wood products, in order to provide financial incentives for the use of timber from sustainable forestry operations.

An international body such as UN GEF could be in charge of co-ordinating the distribution of revenues of a timber tax. Payment for environmental services and conservation trust funds are identified as important distribution mechanisms to spend the money on forest conservation.

### 3) Currency Transaction Tax

Funds could be raised via a tax levied on currency or exchange transactions. Both the Rapport Quadripartite (2004) and the Landau report (Landau, 2004) conclude that a tax on foreign exchange transactions is technically feasible. Although not an environmental tax, such a tax has considerable potential for raising funds for sustainable development, including biodiversity conservation in the form of PAs. A modified Tobin tax of 0.01% on foreign exchange transactions would yield about US \$47.5 x 10<sup>9</sup> per annum. A two-tier Currency Transaction Tax would generate US \$60-75 x 10<sup>9</sup> at global level, but could also be introduced at regional or unilateral level.

If applied at global or regional level, a tax on international financial transactions requires international co-ordination of the mechanism and a proper institutional framework. Who decides on the destination of the financial resources generated? However, if part of the revenues would be spent towards benefiting the environment, this money could be allocated to existing international agencies, in particular UN GEF.

### Summary

It is clear that international environmental taxes do have potential to fill the funding shortfall. Indeed, the Currency Transaction Tax has potential to close the gap completely although, in practice, the money raised would be unlikely to all be directed towards terrestrial protected areas. However, a combination of these taxes could be effective in providing the necessary funding, especially to developing countries where the funding shortfall for protected areas is most acute. Importantly, political will is required to set up new international taxation regimes.

### References

- Bach, C.F. & Gram, S. 1996. The tropical timber triangle. *Ambio* 25: 166-176.
- Balmford, A. et al., 2002. Economic reasons to conserve wild nature. *Science* 297: 950-953.
- FAOSTAT, 2005. *FAOSTAT data 2003*. Online: <http://faostat.fao.org/faostat> (December 2005).
- James, A., Gaston, K.J. & Balmford, A. 2001. Can we afford to conserve biodiversity?" *Bioscience* 51: 43-52.
- Landau, J.-P., ed., 2004. *Rapport à Monsieur Jacques Chirac, Président de la République*. Groupe de Travail sur les Nouvelles Contributions Financières Internationales, Paris, France, 131 pp.
- Rapport Quadripartite, 2004. *Report of the Technical Group on Innovative Financing Mechanisms, 2004*. Online: <http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/actual/pdf/Reportfieng.pdf>.

Available at: <http://www.greenpeace.org/protected-areas-financing-summary>

### RSPB (THE BIRDLIFE PARTNER IN THE UK)

The challenge of providing sustainable funding for implementation of the Convention in developing countries is enormous. Most of the current means of funding are either inadequate or time-limited, and often both. The lack of funding and its periodicity of supply not only ensures that finance is not available for management of biodiversity, but it also ensures funding is not available to pay for opportunities forgone, thus leaving irresolvable some of the issues with local communities and others, that may occur when taking some of the actions necessary to conserve biodiversity. The lack of continuity in funding is

also the major reason why many organizations working on implementation of the Convention in developing countries lose professional capacity and fail to make progress.

RSPB is proud to be the provider of long-term funding to many of our BirdLife Partners in other countries, funds that have allowed capacity to be built and considerable conservation achievements. A major focus of our work is on protected areas and we see environmental funds ('Trust Funds') as one of the most important mechanisms for ensuring sustainable financing of protected areas in developing countries. We believe that the establishment and funding of environmental funds should form a key part of the Convention's future strategy for resource mobilisation. Our reasons for this are set out below,

Solutions put forward in response to the funding challenge usually include increased domestic government funding, ecotourism, business activities related directly to protected areas (e.g. crafts, licensing) and private sector fundraising. All of these have a contribution to make, but in many cases, they have serious shortcomings that mean that they do not, in many situations, provide a viable solution.

In financially poorer nations, faced by the challenges of poverty reduction and the provision of education, health services, adequate housing etc for their citizens, it is unlikely that implementation of NBSAPs or the various work programmes of the Convention, such as protected areas, will be prioritized for government expenditure. Even for governments of middle-income or richer countries, practice over the past few years has shown that funding for biodiversity is very rarely prioritized to the extent required to meet the Convention's objectives. For many of the world's poorest countries, it is simply unrealistic and indeed unreasonable to suggest that national Government funds will be available in the quantities required to achieve the goal of conserving natural resources, including biodiversity.

Ecotourism has been successful in funding protected areas in some countries (e.g. South Africa, Kenya). However, it is far from a panacea. For ecotourism to be a significant earner for natural resource conservation, there needs to be a viewable attraction (e.g. large mammals or coral reefs), good infrastructure and facilities for visitors (who are usually coming from abroad or from national cities) enabling them to easily get to and stay close to the attraction and finally the assurance of safety to give visitors the confidence to make the trip. If any of these are lacking - which is the case in many places - then ecotourism will remain a marginal financial source. How many ecotourists visit inaccessible (i.e. expensive and time-consuming to get to) locations? Or visit areas that have a reputation as dangerous or lawless? Or will risk their health or comfort through putting up with poor hygiene, poor accommodation and/or extreme weather risks? Some, but not enough to provide a significant income stream for biodiversity.

Business activities related directly to biodiversity or protected areas (e.g. crafts, licensing etc) are again frequently mentioned as a source of funding. However, normally they are in fact marginal. To be viable they require a market place and ready buyers. These may be found alongside ecotourism, where this is at a significant level, but otherwise these activities rely on exporting the product from the protected area to willing buyers elsewhere. In general, the obstacles, which include competing with products sourced more cheaply, make this a niche funding source that is not likely to be applicable to the majority of protected areas. If such activities were to be really economic, then it would be very likely that they would already be exploited by local entrepreneurs? If local entrepreneurs are not already trading in this product, there is usually a good reason, which is often lack of profitability - hardly a good basis for funding Convention-related activities. Of course there are exceptions, but they are just that - exceptions, not the rule.

A further obstacle to commercial activity to support biodiversity is that normally the amounts of funding and the specialized commercial and management skills that are needed for commercial activities, such as ecotourism, are not available in biodiversity organizations.

This leaves project funding from bilateral or multilateral donors (including commercial donors and short term payments from e.g. mining). An overwhelming problem with donor funding is short-term thinking. Typically most projects are relatively high value and short term (3-5 years). This leads to cycles of boom and bust, with little or no continuity in practice. Such short term cycles stand in sharp contrast to the needs of protected areas, that are a commitment for decades ahead and which require stable long-term funding if they are to achieve their objectives and provide funds for opportunities forgone. The RSPB has seen the consequences of projects that make no provision for continued funding, but result in boom-and-bust, with expensive equipment left decaying, with no maintenance possible and no funding to pay the salaries of staff that have been trained, who not unnaturally, if they are any good, move on to other jobs. The consequence of this disregard for financial sustainability is that much donor investment in capacity-building is lost during the ‘bust’ years.

Our conclusion is that not only is the total global amount of funding available for implementation of the Convention inadequate, but that what is available is often being ineffectively spent in boom and bust project cycles that ensure that the long-term planning and capacity building necessary for the implementation of NBSAPs and for the effective protected area management is not possible.

The solution lies both in increasing funds and in making the spending of existing funding more effective. The RSPB’s preferred mechanism to achieve this is to recognize the importance of sustainable funding to achieve biodiversity objectives and to recognize the part environmental funds can play in achieving this. The main reason is that they are able to offer a secure and sustainable means of providing funding, thereby breaking away from boom-bust and providing the base for long-term planning and capacity building.

Environmental funds of course have the drawback of requiring a relatively large amount of initial funding (20x the annual running cost of the project is a good guide) up front, but in our view their advantages outweigh this drawback. Once projects are started, they need to have the funding to continue, build professional capacity and enter into commitments with communities etc if they are to succeed. The capital sum invested in a Trust Fund, if properly invested, is never lost, and remains available to be directed to the agreed goal, maintaining long-term focus on delivery. Most importantly, for many areas of the globe such funds would provide the only currently available means capable of providing the secure long-term financing that enables proper planning, best use of available resources, retention of trained staff and maintenance of community and livelihood commitments – the building blocks of competent biodiversity management. Other financing mechanisms simply cannot do this except in rather specific circumstances.

Protected area environmental funds also make it possible to draw on disparate funding sources and to facilitate the formation of partnerships (e.g. with local communities, business). From a donor’s point of view, advantages of environmental funds include the continuity they provide, which means that there is less risk that investment in capacity-building is lost and funding provision is aligned with the (long-term) goal.

Environmental funds, properly managed, also offer considerable advantages to recipients. Funding is assured, allowing individuals, organizations and communities to plan ahead with certainty for the long-term. Another advantage is that environmental funds provide an adaptive, resilient funding mechanism, capable of evening out episodic funding, such as single large donations or income from debt swaps, mineral exploitation etc.

‘Environmental funds’ are often used as a generic term as if they were all the same. But they are not and it is important to note that a wide range of different models exist, with the focus of the funds and the governance arrangements capable of being varied according to the requirements of both donors and

recipients. There is no single 'correct' model of environmental fund and different models bring different advantages and disadvantages. Criticisms are sometimes heard of such funds on the grounds of overheads being too large, or poor investment decisions etc. But these are (or should be) as much criticisms of those who created the funds without clearly thinking through the consequences, as they are a criticism of those who subsequently managed (or in some cases mis-managed) them. What is clear however is that they are avoidable and are not a valid criticism of trust funds as a whole.

In decision VIII/24 on protected areas the Conference of the Parties urged Parties, other Governments and multilateral funding bodies to provide the necessary financial support to developing countries, in particular the least developed and small island developing states, as well as countries with economies in transition, taking into account Article 20 and Article 8(m) of the Convention. Environmental funds for protected areas provide a way of beginning to implement Article 8(m).

It should also be noted that in paragraph 24 (b) of decision VII/24 the Conference of the Parties urged donor countries to: '...provide enhanced support for conservation endowment funds and other long-term financing mechanisms, such as debt-for-nature swaps, that have proven to be particularly successful in supporting recurrent protected area management costs;'

The question is to what extent should the world do this – and our answer is to a much greater extent than it has to date if it wishes to manage biodiversity effectively and pay communities that are affected by such management for the opportunities they forgo. And secondly, how such support, be it at the present level or at an enhanced level, is best applied in order to achieve the objective of delivering biodiversity effectively? And our answer to this is that attention to sustainable financial planning needs to be given much more attention and in most cases a Trust Fund (or funds) will have a significant role to play in achieving this, by providing continuity and removing boom and bust.

For your information, the RSPB has a long history of working for conservation with our Partners in BirdLife International, governments and others and of providing new and additional money for conservation. For example, with the Conservation Society of Sierra Leone (CSSL - the BirdLife Partner in Sierra Leone), and in collaboration with the Sierra Leone Government, with further support from organizations such as Conservation International, the RSPB is currently working to establish a \$10 million Trust Fund to fund the management of the 75,000 hectare Gola Forest, one of the few surviving blocks of the once extensive Upper Guinea Forest. The Upper Guinea Forest harbors 274 bird species with at least 14 species of global conservation concern, as well as Chimpanzee, Elephant and Pygmy Hippopotamus. This commitment will enable Sierra Leone to fund the protection of the Gola Forest in accordance with its National Biodiversity Strategy and to change its status from a forest gazetted for logging into a National Park.

I hope that these thoughts on funding are useful to you. Please let me know if there is further information or assistance we might be able to provide. The RSPB looks forward to collaborating with the Secretariat and others engaged in the Convention on this issue.

-----