UNEP

CBD

Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/WGRI/5/4/Add.2
13 May 2014

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

AD HOC OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP
ON REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION OF
THE CONVENTION
Fifth meeting
Montreal, 16-20 June 2014
Item 6.5 of the provisional agenda*

CONSIDERATION OF VIEWS AND LESSONS LEARNED ON POSSIBLE RISKS, BENEFITS AND SAFEGUARDS FOR COUNTRY-SPECIFIC INNOVATIVE FINANCIAL MECHANISMS

Note by the Executive Secretary

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In paragraph 19 of decision XI/4, the Conference of the Parties, recognizing that the Convention's strategy for resource mobilization calls for the exploration of new and innovative financial mechanisms at all levels with a view to increasing funding to support the Convention and its Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, and that some of those mechanisms are already being applied, and recalling decision X/3, reiterated that any new and innovative financial mechanisms are supplementary to and do not replace the financial mechanism established under Article 21 of the Convention.

2. In paragraph 20 of the same decision, the Conference of the Parties took note of the synthesis on innovative financial mechanisms (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/14/Add.3), which is based on submissions made in response to paragraph 8 (c) of decision X/3, and highlights activities related to innovative financial mechanisms that have taken place since the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, and the discussion paper on safeguards for scaling-up biodiversity finance and possible guiding principles (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/INF/7), recalled the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20), which encourages the further exploration and use of innovative sources of financing, alongside traditional means of implementation, noted the reports of the informal seminar dialogue on scaling up biodiversity finance held in Quito, from 6 to 9 March 2012, and the workshop on financing mechanisms for biodiversity: examining opportunities and challenges, held in Montreal, Canada on 12 May 2012, requested the Executive Secretary to further develop the discussion paper on safeguards, based on comments from Parties and other relevant stakeholders, for submission to the fifth meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention; and requested the Working Group, at its fifth meeting, to prepare a recommendation for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its twelfth meeting.

* UNEP/CBD/WGRI/5/1.

/…

3. In paragraph 21 of the same decision, the Conference of the Parties invited Parties and other relevant stakeholders to submit views and lessons learned on possible risks and benefits of country-specific innovative financial mechanisms, including on possible principles and safeguards for their use, in time for consideration by the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention at its fifth meeting, requested the Executive Secretary to compile this information, taking into account the discussion paper contained in document UNEP/CBD/COP/11/INF/7 and building on previous submissions and initiatives, including the Quito seminar and the Montreal workshop referred to in paragraph 20, and requested the Working Group, at its fifth meeting, to discuss this for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its twelfth meeting.

4. In response to paragraph 20 of decision XI/4, five submissions on discussion paper on safeguards were received from the European Union, India, Peru, Switzerland as well as International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN). In response to paragraph 21 of decision XI/4, a total of 18 submissions on innovative financial mechanisms were received from the following Parties: Bulgaria, China, Croatia, European Union, Denmark, France, Finland, Germany, India, Mauritius, Namibia, Netherlands, Poland, Spain, Switzerland, Thailand, Uganda, and United Kingdom. All the submissions are made available at: http://www.cbd.int/financial.

5. The present note is intended to provide more detailed information on innovative financial mechanisms from Parties and relevant organizations, complementing the information already provided in the main working document UNEP/CBD/WGRI/5/4. Section II contains a synthesis of the submissions from Parties and other relevant stakeholders on the discussion paper on safeguards in response to paragraph 21 of decision XI/4. Section III presents a compilation of views and lessons learned, from Parties and other relevant stakeholders, on possible risks and benefits of country-specific innovative financial mechanisms, including on possible principles and safeguards for their use. It should be noted that substantial information, not provided through the submission process, on individual innovative financial mechanisms is available at the website: http://www.cbd.int/financial. The final section contains some concluding remarks, and relevant recommendations on innovative financial mechanisms can be found in the main working document UNEP/CBD/WGRI/5/4.

II. DISCUSSION PAPER ON SAFEGUARDS AND SUBMISSIONS FROM PARTIES AND RELEVANT STAKEHOLDERS

The discussion paper on safeguards for scaling-up biodiversity finance and possible guiding principles (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/INF/7)

6. The discussion paper on safeguards for scaling-up biodiversity financing and possible guiding principles proposes the following elements and possible guiding principles for safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms (BFM):

(a) *Biodiversity Values for Local Livelihoods*: the fundamental underpinning role of biodiversity and ecosystem processed for insurance value, natural resilience and local livelihoods should be recognized and taken in the design and implementation of biodiversity financing mechanisms. Proper institutional arrangement are needed for safeguarding biodiversity and the associated ecosystem functions and services;

(b) *People's Rights, Access to* R*esources and Livelihoods*: measures to allocate rights and duties in biodiversity financing mechanisms, including the distribution of access to resources and benefit-sharing, should be done in fair and equitable manner and with the free prior informed consent of indigenous peoples and local communities to interventions that may have consequences for their livelihoods;

(c) *Local and Country-Driven/Specific Processes Linked to the International Level*: safeguards in biodiversity financing mechanisms need to be grounded in local realities and supported by country-driven and specific processes that make use of existing relevant international legal and policy frameworks;

(d) *Governance, Institutional Frameworks and Accountability*: appropriate institutional frameworks and accountability mechanisms to support effective and equitable governance are a prerequisite for all safeguards to function properly. This includes addressing drivers of biodiversity loss and removing perverse incentives. Besides developing appropriate socially and environmentally laws and policies, Parties should also have effective means for ensuring accountability and the compliance with safeguards.

7. The discussion paper also analyses lessons and challenges of specific biodiversity financing mechanisms through literature review, analysis of relevant official documents under the Convention on Biological Diversity and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change as well as in-depth semi-structured interviews, and provides examples and recommendations associated with the biodiversity financing mechanisms and their safeguards. These are summarized in the table below:

	Opportunities, Challenges and Risks	**Possible elements of Safeguards**
Payment for Ecosystem Services	PES programme has become the most important revenue stream for several indigenous communities. The Level of PES is based on an estimation of the opportunity cost of conservation. It takes a prolonged period of trust-building between actors. Strict conservation measures in PES including restrictions to local communities using their traditional agricultural land can lead to a loss in agro-biodiversity and ecological knowledge. Concerns regarding REDD+ associated negative impacts, such as the conversion of natural ecosystems into tree plantations at the expense of biodiversity and potential impacts on indigenous peoples and local communities.	Legislative and policy effort should not be focused on regulating indigenous and local communities with strict conservation efforts but rather on changing the drivers of unsustainable natural resource management such as illegal logging. A process can be put in place for achieving free prior informed consent and mutually agreed terms and conditions between land users and other stakeholders in PES contract. Appendix I to UNFCCC decision 1/CP.16 contains a list of safeguards for REDD+. Decision XI/19 and its annex contain further guidance on the application of biodiversity-related safeguards. .
Biodiversity Offsets	Biodiversity offset adhere to “polluter pays principle”. The biodiversity and social risks associated with offset schemes will therefore differ depending on the design, scale and place where these mechanisms are applied. Impacts in one area of an ecosystem may disturb the whole system and may affect its resilience. There is a risk of negative effects on unique ecosystems and species. Ecosystems and their functions, including the	Social safeguards for offset policies should include ensuring equity in the design and implementation of safeguards. Biodiversity offset mechanisms should not be developed such as, on the grounds of the biodiversity loss and social risks they pose and their lack of synchrony with the CBD’s objectives. Well-designed procedural safeguards should be in place for the careful and participatory assessment of the design, approval and implementation of offset mechanisms. CBD tools such as the Akwe:kon Guidelines and the Tkarihwaié:ri Code of Ethical Conduct, and

	livelihood opportunities that they offer, are not fully replaceable in as strict sense. Biodiversity offset risk not accounting for the non-use and intrinsic values of biological diversity. Social risks at the community level: local people in one region normally depend on the biodiversity in that area for their livelihoods.	social and cultural impact assessment can serve to inform such assessment and identify if they should be approved or rejected as well as the necessary substantive safeguards.
Environmental Fiscal Reform	Reducing perverse incentives are the most efficient way of raising revenues. EFRs often include increased tax on fossil fuels and reducing other taxes such as labour taxes or earmarking the tax revenue for specific uses. Possible sources for international innovative finances: new international taxes such as international airline taxes and international environmental foot print taxes; a financial transaction tax (FTT) on the sale of financial assets; a currency-transaction tax (Tobin Tax) Removing the most harmful subsidies makes economic sense but may be very hard politically.	One type of biodiversity financing mechanisms may be linked to another type of biodiversity financing mechanisms: PES can be financed by an earmarked fiscal reform. With strong political will, Parties can apply safeguards that reduce perverse incentives such by avoiding subsidies to environmental unsustainable practices.
Official Development Assistance	Official Development Assistance (ODA) is dealt with under Goal 3 and 5 of the strategy for Resource Mobilization, which relates to the increase of ODA associated with biological diversity and poverty alleviation and mainstreaming biological diversity and its associated ecosystem services in development cooperation plans and priorities While ODA may not be part of so-called IFMs, ODA can provide seed money for innovative financing mechanisms such as PES.	The development of policy coherence, notably between trade, environment and development cooperation, in safeguarding both social and environmental results. Biodiversity financing mechanisms can learn from ODA on relevant issues for safeguards, e.g. regarding transparency, efficiency, participatory approaches, the understanding ownership, tenure and user rights and right issues, socio-cultural understanding and importance of gender issues in development, as well as demands for impact assessment (through EIA, SIA and SEA) of contributions.

Comments from Parties and other relevant stakeholders

8. In its submission, the European Union suggested that the following points should be further explored and addressed in the discussion paper: synergies between the two objectives of social and environment benefits; the safeguards dimensions on environmental fiscal reforms; and other mechanisms such as markets for green products and biodiversity co-benefits in climate change funding.

9. India emphasized the importance of the national sovereignty over biological resources and stated that it needs to be recognized that the Convention on Biological Diversity provides for national autonomy in decision-making on all matters related to biodiversity conservation, including provision of “safeguards on biodiversity financing mechanisms”. India called for clarity for some terms in the proposed guiding principles, such as ‘broader processes’ and ‘free prior informed consent’ and revision of some politically loaded terms like ‘self-determination’. India requested the discussion paper to explain how a REDD+

MRV will provide a positive framework for biodiversity concerns. India also highlighted the lack of capacity of local communities to negotiate the complex financial and monetary dimensions associated with ABS agreements with bio-prospecting agents.

10. Peru indicated that biodiversity financing mechanisms must be aligned with the plans and programmes to achieve the Millennium Development Goals and local mechanisms must be coordinated with the plans of land management. Peru highlighted that biodiversity financing mechanisms should be based on local realities that are under the management of the territory, and with the support given by the international community either through country-driven processes such as protocols, agreements, transfer of resources, etc. The principles for biodiversity financing mechanisms should recognize the value of biodiversity beyond the economic benefits, as a natural safe livelihood for the local communities and also should help to settle disputes between property rights and resource access for vulnerable people. Peru also indicated that mechanisms should be designed flexibly under a defined institutional framework. Concerning PES schemes, Peru noted that if the transaction costs of the mechanisms for biodiversity are added, it might be less attractive, and could not complete with the decision to maintain economic activities that would give greater benefits allegedly.

11. In its submission, Switzerland proposed that the Nagoya Protocol and ABS system should also be considered as a finance mechanism. Switzerland indicated that the suggested guiding principles should be as specific as possible in order to allow an implementation of the safeguards. Switzerland called for a more specific definition of “proper institutional arrangement” including aspects such as transparency conditionality of payments on performance and sanctions, and the need to emphasize the participation of concerted stakeholders. Switzerland also underlined the importance of means of insuring the permanence safeguards and the additionality of measures. Concerning the biodiversity offset, Switzerland emphasized the importance of mitigation hierarchy. Biodiversity offsets need to be considered as a last resort after all reasonable measures have been taken first to avoid and minimize the impact of a development project.

12. The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) suggested that an additional guiding principle should be added on safeguards which would ensure that biodiversity financing mechanisms result in general benefits to biodiversity notwithstanding biodiversity’s input into local livelihood. According to IUCN, previous experience indicates that overly strict requirements for accountability and compliance with safeguards can pose a greater burden on countries with poor capacity. Therefore, two things should be more strongly emphasized: (i) greater focus on “appropriate” safeguards by making it more explicit in terms of scope and contents; (ii) strong insist on investing in building capacity and on means to do so. IUCN also stressed several points concerning safeguards of the different types of biodiversity financing mechanisms: an inventory of the different types of safeguards linked clearly to the risks and opportunities of each biodiversity financing mechanism would fill an important gap; efforts to engage the private sector should bot overlooked; and progress made on natural capital accounting should be referred.

III. VIEWS AND LESSONS LEARNED ON POSSIBLE RISKS AND BENEFITS OF COUNTRY-SPECIFIC INNOVATIVE FINANCIAL MECHANISMS, INCLUDING ON POSSIBLE PRINCIPLES AND SAFEGUARDS FOR THEIR USE

13. Given the ample and diverse range of examples of innovative financial mechanisms that have been already used in a number of countries, this section is organized by subjective matters.

Payment for ecosystem services

14. Finland’s Forest Biodiversity Programme (METSO) (2008-2016) is an example of PES, where the state pays land-owners for giving up economic use of forests. METSO has generated 159 million euros in 2008-2012. Uganda has tested the effectiveness of PES through providing incentives to private forest owners in Hoima and Kibaale district for protection of ecosystem services, including habitat for

chimpanzees, watershed, water quality, carbon stocks and soil erosion control. In the United Kingdom, DEFRA commissioned eleven PES pilot studies from 2011-2013. UK noted that PES is not about privatizing nature but rather seeks to deliver cost effective environmental improvements or 'natural solutions'. Through the pilot projects, UK witnessed some notable successes. For example, the development of a Peatland Code will encourage investment in peat restoration by giving investors a confidence that they are making a cost-effective, measurable and lasting difference to peatlands. The pilot has also shown potential for PES to deliver cost effective water quality investments through reverse auctions and catchment based interventions.

15. UK has published a PES Action Plan and a Best Practice Guide for PES schemes. The Best Practice Guide addresses several key principles which should ideally underpin any PES schemes (e.g. voluntary basis participation, beneficiary pays, payments based on additionality and conditionality, ensuring permanence, avoiding leakage, establishing the baseline position and stakeholder engagement); risks for PES schemes (e.g. leakage, unfairness, perverse incentives); and technical issues in developing and implementing a PES scheme.

Biodiversity offsets

16. Spain's Natural Conservation Bank is a voluntary mechanism to compensate, repair or restore net loss of natural values where credits generated in the banks are traded in the market. The Netherlands has contributed to the development of Business and Biodiversity Offsetting Programme (BBOP). UK has conducted pilot projects of biodiversity offsets in England (2012-2014) and the evaluation of the pilots will be announced in summer 2014. Uganda's Kalagala Offset was designed to make up for the loss of the Bujagali Falls during the construction of the Bujagali Hydropower station.

Environmental fiscal reform

17. The Danish Government has worked to integrate biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into a number of major fiscal policy decisions, including the decisions on investment in infrastructure and tax reforms. For example, Danish agro-environmental measures, aiming towards the creation of wetlands and maintenance of nature area, includes subsidies for nature and water efforts, subsidies for forestry, subsidies for organic farming and production, and subsidies for hedgerows and planting for improvement of biotopes. Croatia has adopted a range of taxation and pricing measures based on "polluter pays principle" that raise fiscal revenues from the private and public sectors. Each year a portion of the funds is "earmarked" for the biodiversity programme, projects, and related activities. For example, the Environmental Protection and Energy Efficiency Fund (EPEEF) leads to continuous programmes of investments in protection/conservation of biodiversity and natural values in protected areas. Croatia's Green tax in the field of forestry is another example of environmental tax reform. Fees are charged to individuals and legal entities in Croatia that are pursuing an economic activity for the use of beneficial functions of forests, which are paid at the special account of the Croatian Forest joint-stock company, and used for the management of forests and forest lands. In the Netherlands, the national tax revenues in 2012 may be considered up to 13.7 per cent as environmental taxes and are generally not being earmarked. Poland's National Fund for Environmental Protection and Water Management is mainly from fees and fines for exploitation of the environment, mining fees and concession fees, payments resulting from Energy Law and Act on recycling of end-of-life vehicles, revenue from sales of CO2 credits and other sources. Namibia has set a dedicated target under revised national biodiversity strategies and action plans (2013-2022): "by 2018, selected incentives for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use are in place and applied, and most harmful subsidies are identified and their phase out is initiated". The first phase of environmental taxes, including CO2 emission tax on motor vehicles, incandescent light bulbs and motor vehicle tires, is ready for implementation and was tabled in the 2014/15 budget. Game product trust funds are raised from park entrance fees, game fees and hunting fees.

18. National parks in Croatia collect entrance fees, while nature parks collect fees mainly for other services (e.g. guided tours, schools in nature, special programme, etc.). According to the Study of Best Practices in Financing Protected Areas in Croatia in 2009, supported by the World Bank, visitors are willing to pay for improved services. However, many protected areas, in particular, large 'open access' protected areas with multiple entry points, still do not have effective systems in place to either collect, or to maximize the potential income from these fees. Hence, Croatia is going to introduce a more market-based user-fee structure for national protected area, including automated entry/user fee collection system.

Markets for Green Product

19. Croatia's "Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Dalmatian Coast" (2007-2011) is an example of cases where innovative green products and services could result in new investment and jobs as well as the preservation of a valuable nature and environment. The project managed to develop a green vision for rural areas of Dalmatia and initiated the Green Business Support Programme (GBSP) in 2008 in order to support a 'small business' that will preserve the natural wealth and biodiversity of Dalmatia. The potential and importance of green business for rural development of Dalmatia was exhibited by 97 entrepreneurial projects in the total value of € 22.2 million. Netherlands and Switzerland are jointly supporting the Green Development Initiative (GDI), which aims at mobilizing private sector finance for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. GDI is piloting a public registry, international standard and best-practice toolkit for recognizing and supporting verified Conservation Areas (VCAs). Netherland's Green Procurement of products and services accounts for € 50 billion per year. Public procurement needs to fulfil environmental and social criteria. Monitoring and evaluation of the procurement and criteria are conducted every 2 years. Uganda reported its markets for green product, including coffee, beans, cotton and maize from organic farming, amount to US$ 2.6 million in fiscal year 2012/13.

Biodiversity and business partnership

20. Parties reported a number of Business and Biodiversity initiatives, such as the Finnish Business and Biodiversity Network; UK Ecosystem Markets Task Force and the National Capital Coalition; "Biodiversity in Good Company" Initiative in Germany; "Business and Biodiversity Initiative in Spain; and EU B@B Platform.

Biodiversity in climate funding

21. Auctioning revenues from the EU Emissions Trading Systems helps generate revenues for climate/biodiversity projects in Germany, Finland and Estonia and is under consideration in some other EU Member States. Other types of emission certificates or credits are used to improve climate footprint and conservation of biodiversity. For instance, the Federal States Meckleburg – West Pomeraina, Germany introduced voluntary emission certificates for the restoration of peatlands (Moorfuture) that can be purchased by local companies to improve their climate footprint, and so-called "forest share" where tourists are invited to the symbolic purchase of a tree to support a tourism forest protection programme and to improve the climate footprint of their holidays. The Woodland Carbon Code of the United Kingdom is a voluntary standard for carbon credits generated by forest planting and management and complying with the carbon code guarantees that forests are responsibly and sustainably managed to national standards. In the Netherlands, a common REDD+ Pilot programme (Dutch REDD+ Business Program) has started through a public-private partnership to stimulate and build the emerging REDD+ market. Uganda also highlighted the leveraging of financial resources from climate change finance (e.g. REDD+, voluntary carbon projects, reforestation, and ecosystem based adaptation).

International development finance and biodiversity

22. Uganda pointed out that another innovative financial mechanism (IFM) results from mainstreaming biodiversity concerns into projects that are funded by the international development finance. For example, hydropower development and exploration of oil in the Albertine Graben have provided opportunities for mobilizing financial resources for biodiversity conservation.

23. Parties provided some examples which show that innovative financial mechanisms can result in economic benefits by generating employment. The Green India Mission (GIM) aims to increase forest/tree cover and enhance carbon sequestration. The GIM is also likely to generate INR 1,352 crores worth of skilled employment for about 28,000 community youth. Bulgaria's Green Jobs initiative started in 2010 and aims at helping green businesses to hire employees by covering part of their payments. Croatia's GBSP is also a good example of programme which supports sustainable economic development of rural areas and the creation of new jobs in the traditional economic sectors such as agriculture, tourism, fisheries and mariculture.

24. China stated that fiscal funding is still the major source of biodiversity related inputs in china, and low awareness of and importance attached to biodiversity among stakeholders is still the main barrier that prevents them from exploring biodiversity friendly production and consumption patterns. Hence, the Government will continue to play a leading role and explore the mechanism for mobilizing social resources through eco-compensation, biodiversity offset, green products and environmental finance, integrating social resources into the overall national action framework. The Netherlands also highlighted the Government's role in facilitating innovative initiatives from society.

25. In its submission, the European Union stressed that the work of the Leading Group on Innovative Financing can provide some useful inputs in the discussions under the Convention on Biological Diversity, e.g. by clarifying the scope of innovative financing, identifying subcategories of innovative financing initiatives, and proposing some guiding principles to design, adopt and diffuse innovative financing as part of a toolbox for financing. In that respect, EU noted that there are two types of initiatives: (i) innovative sources of financing ("innovative sourcing"), which help generate new financial flows; and (ii) innovative mechanisms of financing ("innovative spending"), which help maximize the efficiency in the use of resources. The key principles proposed by the Leading Group include: (i) promoting multi-stakeholder approaches involving public and private actors from different levels of development; (ii) benchmarking existing financing and designing new financing tools to address unsolved problems; and (iii) diffusing and capitalizing on successful innovative financing.

IV. FINAL REMARKS

26. Some of the innovative financial mechanisms listed under goal four of the strategy for resource mobilization triggered considerable debate in recent years, while an increasing number of countries are experimenting or using some of these. It may be recalled that recommendation 3/9 of the third meeting of the Ad Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention, though not considered by the Conference of the Parties, it did list possible policy options concerning innovative financial mechanisms. This recommendation, *inter alia*, foresaw encouraging Parties, in accordance with their capabilities, to implement the Convention's strategy for resource mobilization, and to take an active part in ongoing processes to enhance innovative financing. It also foresaw encouraging Parties and Governments and relevant organizations to undertake concrete activities for developing, promoting and adopting innovative financial mechanisms, and inviting developed country Parties to provide voluntary financial contributions to support the further work on innovative financial mechanisms for the three objectives of the Convention, without diminishing their commitments under Articles 20 and 21 of the Convention (UNEP/CBD/WG-RI/3/INF/5).

27. Since the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, there have been several developments on innovative financial mechanisms, including:

(a) More pilot experiences on innovative financial mechanisms are supported by the Global Environment Facility and the European Union, as well as other donors;

(b) More case studies and national guidelines and strategies on certain innovative financial mechanisms have become available;

(c) More capacity-building activities have been organized on innovative financial mechanisms;

(d) More dialogues and consensus-building activities have been organized;

(e) More convergences among different stakeholders on innovative financial mechanisms;

(f) Decision XI/19, providing advice on the application of relevant safeguards for biodiversity with regard to policy approaches and positive incentives on issues relating to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries; and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries.

28. The synthesis on innovative financial mechanisms (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/14/Add.3) and the discussion paper on safeguards for scaling up biodiversity finance and possible guiding principles (UNEP/CBD/COP/11/INF/7) which were made available to the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties provided information, knowledge and perspectives. Some issues identified in these documents appear to have continuing relevance, such as (i) low awareness of and importance attached to biodiversity among stakeholders; (ii) high start-up and running costs for certain schemes; (iii) biological and economic leakage; (iv) impacts of the market based mechanisms on the livelihood of the indigenous people and local communities, as well as (v) the fair and equitable distribution of benefits and access to resources.

29. Further development of innovative financial mechanisms needs to address the challenges and risks identified on innovative financial mechanisms and consider the following: (i) establishing clear objectives and targets; (ii) identifying key actors and target ecosystem services; (iii) promoting multi-stakeholder approach and building trust among the stakeholders; (iv) establishing land ownership and tenure/property rights; (v) ensuring fair and equitable distribution of benefits and access to resources; (vi) implementation of risk assessment and opportunity assessment; (vii) development of best practice guides and standards to approach technical issues; (viii) establishing robust monitoring, reporting and evaluation system; and (ix) ensuring transparency and accountability. The discussions on safeguards need to consider at least the following: benefits to biodiversity; biodiversity values for local livelihoods; people’s rights, access to resources and livelihoods; local and country-driven/specific processes linked to the international level; transparency, accountability and compliance with safeguards; and institutional frameworks to support effective and equitable governance, including capacity-building.
