## **Biodiversity Finance Factbook**

•	1H 2023 Edition	· · · ·		 	· · ·	· · ·	 	· · ·	· · ·	 · · ·	· · ·	· · ·
				 · ·			 · ·			 • •		/
	Victoria Cuming			 	•		 	•	• • •	 • •		· · /
			6 - F - F	 			 			 		· ·/
	Hugh Bromley			 			 			 		· ·/
							 			 		·/
				 			 			 1.1		•/
				 			 			 		/
				 			 			 	· ·	/
				 			 			 	· · /	
		• • •		 	•	• • •	 	•	• • •	 	· /	
				 		• • •	 			 $(\cdot, \cdot)$	· /	
	April 2023			 		• • •	 • •	· ·		 • •	·/	
		· · · ·		 · ·			 			 	1	
				 			 			 1.1	/	



### About BloombergNEF

BloombergNEF (BNEF) is a strategic research provider covering global commodity markets and the disruptive technologies driving the transition to a low-carbon economy.

Our expert coverage assesses pathways for the power, transport, industry, buildings and agriculture sectors to adapt to the energy transition.

We help commodity trading, corporate strategy, finance and policy professionals navigate change and generate opportunities.

Learn more at about.bnef.com

### Sustainable Agriculture research coverage



Green agrochemicals proteins & fats



Sustainable intensification

Carbon-smart

farming



**Biodiversity** markets & finance

#### Links to sample research

**Sustainable** 

Sustainable Agriculture: The New Green Revolution Tech Radar: Decarbonizing Beef and Dairy Production Sustainable Agriculture: 10 Things to Watch in 2023 Meat Producers Contemplate an Alternative Future Advancing Agriculture: Biologicals Advancing Agriculture: Majors Bet On Digital Technology

TNFD: Nature-Related Reporting Following Climate Cousin Biodiversity COP's Bold Targets Now Need Follow-Through Ukraine War Has Tainted Europe's Breadbasket for Years Agriculture Carbon Offsets Outlook: Barren to Bountiful Rainforest Finance: How to Make \$500 Billion Flow Advancing Agriculture: Decoding Carbon Emissions

### Contents

	÷	÷			÷						÷	÷				÷					÷		÷	÷	÷		÷	
	÷	÷			÷						÷	÷				÷					÷		÷	÷	÷		÷	
	÷																										÷	
	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷		÷	÷	÷		÷	÷	÷		÷	
															-												÷	
	÷																										÷	
	÷	÷	÷		÷	+	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷		÷	÷	÷	$^{+}$	÷	÷	÷		÷	÷

Importance of biodiversity finance	6
Finance flows	10
Funding priorities	38
Challenges and key actions	48
Appendix	63



### **Executive summary**

The Global Biodiversity Framework, agreed in December, could make a meaningful contribution to halting and reversing biodiversity loss. But significant funding will be required to realize the targets. The Biodiversity Finance Factbook aims to kickstart and frame discussions on current finance flows, where funding should be prioritized and how to make this happen.

- Current biodiversity financial flows amount to some \$166 billion per year, with the lion's share comprising domestic government spend.
- This leaves a gap of roughly \$830 billion between current annual biodiversity financing and what's needed by 2030. While this may be a huge sum, that is roughly the same size as the global tobacco product market (in 2022).
- More importantly, it is far less than the anticipated economic costs of biodiversity loss: global GDP could be \$2.7 trillion a year lower than projected levels by 2030, even by conservative estimates.
- Some 73% of the sum needed by 2030 is to sustainably manage productive land- and seascapes, with the biggest amount allocated to transitioning the agricultural sector to conservation practices in croplands.

Current annual biodiversity finance flows vs biodiversity conservation funding needs by



Source: Taskforce on Nature Markets, 2022; UNEP, 2022; Paulson Institute, Nature Conservancy, and Cornell Atkinson Center for Sustainability, 2020; BloombergNEF. Note: Figure uses upper range of estimates adjusted for inflation to 2021.

### Executive summary (continued)

- BloombergNEF has developed a weighted framework to guide biodiversity restoration and preservation funding priorities to maximize impact. It is founded on the principle that funding is required where biodiversity is plentiful, providing value, and at risk.
- The highest funding priorities are large middle-income countries such as Brazil, China, Indonesia, and India. They perform well on biodiversity presence and threat. But their high ranking is driven by the value of ecosystem services provided by nature, due to their large economies or land mass.
- These are followed by a longer second tier of small, middle- and low-income nations. Their value scores are lower, although these are partly offset by high threat scores in some cases.
- Despite sharing common characteristics, the biomes and species in need of protection vary greatly across the priority regions. They encompass terrestrial and marine resources, plants and animals.

## BloombergNEF biodiversity funding priority regions and target ecosystems



### BloombergNEF

**4** Biodiversity Finance Factbook: 1H 2023

### Executive summary (continued)

- Scaling up biodiversity finance will require overcoming a range of challenges, which can be split into six main categories (see figure). Governments, companies and financial institutions need to integrate biodiversity into their risk assessments, planning processes, policies and investments.
- This poses an opportunity for the private sector to take the lead, but regulation may be required. More detailed data is needed as well as a consistent set of metrics and frameworks.
- Government should identify the abundant environmentally harmful subsidies, and repurpose these funds for nature-positive actions. New biodiversity incentives are needed, especially market-based schemes placing an economic value on nature.
- All players can support initiatives to improve the environmental rigor of offset programs, sustainable finance instruments and green commitments.
- The private sector and development financial institutions should collaborate on initiatives to promote the standardization and replicability of biodiversity projects. Blended finance has a role to play, as well as risk-mitigation mechanisms.

## Principal challenges in scaling up biodiversity finance



# Importance of biodiversity finance

The global economy at risk



## Biological diversity underpins life on Earth but is shrinking faster than at any point in human history

### Distribution of nature dependency by market



Source: World Economic Forum, Nature Risk Rising: Why the Crisis Engulfing Nature Matters for Business and the Economy, 2020.

- Over half of the global economy is highly or moderately dependent on nature and the goods and services it generates (known as "ecosystem services"), according to the World Economic Forum. Some of the fastest-growing economies are the most exposed to nature loss, such as India and Indonesia.
- Indeed, \$44 trillion of global economic value generation is highly or moderately dependent on nature. Yet even this estimate does not cover all nature-related benefits, including the provision of clean air and water, natural barriers to disease, and aesthetic and recreational value.
- However, biodiversity is shrinking faster than at any point in human history. If we continue the current trajectory, 30-50% of all species may be lost by mid-century. Five direct drivers have caused over 90% of nature loss in the last 50 years (in order of impact): land-and sea-use change, climate change, natural resource use and exploitation, pollution and invasive alien species.

#### 7 Biodiversity Finance Factbook: 1H 2023

## Biodiversity loss will result in significant economic costs, even by conservative estimates

## \$2.7 trillion

Drop in global annual GDP by 2030 compared with baseline scenario under partial ecosystem collapse

Real GDP in 2030 under partial ecosystem collapse versus no-tipping-point scenario



Source: World Bank, The Economic Case for Nature, 2021.

- As a conservative estimate, the loss of selected services like wild pollination, provision of food from marine fisheries and timber from native forests could mean global GDP in 2030 is \$2.7 trillion lower than projected levels, even by conservative estimates. The impacts are especially severe in lower-income countries.
- As a result, nature loss is fourth in the ranking of risks with the most severe potential impact over the next decade, according to the World Economic Forum's 2023 Global Risks Perception Survey. The related threats of climate change, natural disasters and extreme weather events make up the top three.
- For business, biodiversity loss brings physical risks with financial repercussions, such as supply-chain disruptions and price volatility, and destruction of real assets due to erosion or wildfire, for example. Companies also face transition risks such as higher costs spurred by tougher regulations to mitigate biodiversity loss, denial of permits and reputational harm, together with consumer, media and supply-chain scrutiny.

### Importance of biodiversity finance Global Biodiversity Framework creates roadmap for nature

## BNEF's evaluation of COP15 based on seven key indicators for a meaningful outcome



- December 2022 saw 195 nations agree on a Global Biodiversity Framework at COP15. The deal contains 23 targets for 2030 as part of a strategic pathway to 2050. Overall, BNEF rated the success of the summit at 6 out of 10 based on seven indicators. The GBF is the boldest deal on biodiversity to date and sets an overall level of ambition. But it is not legally binding – countries must implement their own policies to realize the goals.
- Parties agreed that the biodiversity funding gap is to be bridged with a combination of additional payments and the phasing out of environmentally harmful subsidies. For the first time they agreed on a quantitative target for \$200 billion of total biodiversity funding per year by 2030, with \$20 billion of international finance by 2025 and \$30 billion by 2030.
- In addition, UN member states agreed on March 4, 2023, to a High Seas Treaty, creating a legal framework for the establishment of protected marine areas. Covering almost two-thirds of the world's oceans, the deal outlines mechanisms to conserve, sustainably use, and share the monetary and non-monetary benefits of marine biodiversity.

### BloombergNEF

9 Biodiversity Finance Factbook: 1H 2023

Insufficient sources of biodiversity funding



## Current biodiversity financial flows amount to \$166 billion per year, with the lion's share provided by governments

		76%		4% 17%	% <mark>3%</mark>	Annual global biodiversity financial
Public	domestic	Public international	Private	Any		flows (\$ billion, real 2021)
				Payments for eco-system services, \$10B	Sustain- able supply chain finance, \$8B	Page 15 onwards explores selected mechanisms in more detail. Source: BloombergNEF, Taskforce on Nature Markets, Global Nature Markets Landscaping Study, 2022; UN Environment Programme, State
				Offsets/ credits, \$6B	Impact investing, NGOs, \$5B	of Finance for Nature 2022; The Paulson Institute, The Nature Conservancy, and the Cornell Atkinson Center for Sustainability, Financing Nature: Closing the
Government spending a	nd tax policy, \$12	26B		Overseas development assistance, \$6B	Green finance, \$5B	Global Biodiversity Financing Gap, 2020. Note: NGOs = conservation and philanthropic non-governmental organizations, ODA = official development assistance.



## There is gap of roughly \$830 billion between current annual biodiversity financing and what's needed by 2030

Current annual biodiversity finance flows vs biodiversity conservation funding needs by 2030 \$ billion, real 2021



Source: Taskforce on Nature Markets, 2022; UNEP, 2022; Paulson Institute, Nature Conservancy, and Cornell Atkinson Center for Sustainability, 2020. Note: Figure uses upper range of estimates adjusted for inflation to 2021.

- Up to \$996 billion (\$ 2021) per year is needed by 2030 to sustainably manage biodiversity and maintain ecosystem integrity, based on the 2020 report by the Paulson Institute, Nature Conservancy and Cornell Atkinson Center for Sustainability. This was equivalent to 0.7-0.9% of global GDP in 2022.
- Some 73% of the future funding need is to sustainably manage productive land- and seascapes, with the biggest sum allocated to transitioning the agricultural sector to conservation practices in croplands by 2030.
- The upper estimate for future funding needs yields a gap of some \$830 billion per year. As context, that is roughly the same size as the global tobacco product market (in 2022).
- Note that these are initial estimates, based on the limited data available, reporting inconsistencies and assumptions required. <u>Read more on data challenges</u>.

## Biodiversity funding rivals that of lasting global priorities, not existential threats

### Current global expenditure by sector or category



Source (with expenditure year in parentheses): SIPRI (2021), BloombergNEF (2022), Space Foundation (2020), IEA (2021), Vantage Market Research (2021), World Bank (2020), Paulson Institute (2019), Fortune Business Insights (2021), S&P Global (2021), Statista (2020)

- To give context, biodiversity preservation and restoration receives only a fraction of the funding directed toward managing climate change or geopolitical fall-out. The \$166 billion of public and private funds is closer to the global spend on cyber security and overseas aid.
- Only marginally more annual investment flows into biodiversity than into individual agricultural segments such as equipment and machinery. The required funding is roughly 15 times larger than the annual market for crop protection chemicals.
- Biodiversity funding needs to rise to levels disbursed when urgency is recognized. The biodiversity funding requirements are equivalent to what is currently being invested to decarbonize the energy system, based on <u>BloombergNEF data</u>, or almost half of global military expenditure. It currently receives just one-sixth of the annual investment in the energy transition.

## Restoring biodiversity is one-seventh as costly as building a net-zero emissions energy system

## Annual expenditure required to achieve environmental outcome



Source: BloombergNEF Note: Energy system investment requirements taken from the 'Net Zero Scenario' of the BloombergNEF New Energy Outlook 2022 (web | terminal).

- Investment into measures to avert biodiversity loss and climate change both need to increase by a factor of five times or more.
   <u>BloombergNEF analysis</u> shows that investment in the energy transition should reach an average of \$6.7 trillion per year through 2050 if net zero is to be achieved.
- The annual funding required to restore and preserve biodiversity is equivalent to approximately 15% of the investment needed to achieve a net-zero emissions energy system. In scale, it compares to the \$1.2 billion per annum investment in renewable generation that is required by 2050, and the \$0.7 billion per annum required to ensure power grids can manage a net-zero emissions system.
- Restoring biodiversity requires less than a third of the annual spend required to achieve net-zero mobility emissions, and less than half the investment needed to build a net-zero power sector.
- The funding objectives are complementary. Actions taken to lower emissions will in most cases be positive for biodiversity: Nature preservation will typically provide a climate or climate-resilience benefit.

## **Public finance**

÷																																
÷	÷					÷				÷	÷		÷					÷		÷		÷		÷		÷	÷	·			÷	
÷							÷									+									+							÷
																																+
																		÷		÷		÷		÷		÷	÷	÷			÷	
																		÷		÷		÷		÷		÷	÷	÷			÷	
÷	÷	÷		÷		÷	÷	÷		÷	÷		÷		÷			÷		÷		÷		÷		÷	÷	÷			÷	
																		÷		÷		÷		÷		÷	÷	÷			÷	
÷																		÷		÷		÷		÷		÷	÷	÷			÷	
÷	÷	÷		÷		÷	÷	÷		÷	÷		÷		÷			÷		÷		÷		÷	۰.	÷	÷	÷			÷	÷
÷																		÷		÷		÷		÷		÷	÷	÷			÷	
÷	÷	÷		÷		÷	÷	÷		÷	÷		÷		÷			÷		÷		÷		÷		÷	÷	÷			÷	
÷																		÷		÷		÷		÷		÷	÷	÷			÷	
÷	÷	÷		÷		÷	÷	÷		÷	÷		÷		÷			÷		÷		÷		÷		÷	÷	÷			÷	
÷																		÷		÷		÷		÷		÷	÷	÷			÷	
÷																		÷		÷		÷		÷		÷	÷	÷			÷	
÷	÷	÷		÷		÷	÷	÷		÷	÷		÷		÷			÷		÷		÷		÷		÷	÷	÷			÷	
÷	÷	÷		÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷		÷	÷	÷			÷	
÷	÷	÷		÷		÷	÷	÷		÷	÷		÷		÷			÷		÷		÷		÷		÷	÷	÷			÷	



## Government support for domestic projects accounts for around \$126 billion – almost three-quarters of biodiversity finance today

Breakdown of domestic public biodiversity finance



Source: UN Environment Programme, State of Finance for Nature 2022. Note: Figures may not sum to 100% due to rounding

- Public finance that is government spending and tax breaks drives most biodiversity conservation. Almost 98% of this support is spent domestically.
- The \$126 billion total is the upper estimate, based on UNEP's 2022 State of Finance for Nature report. Almost half comprises public support explicitly allocated to biodiversity protection. The remainder will fund projects that will likely mitigate biodiversity loss – for example in sustainable agriculture and wastewater management.
- This figure is comparable to other estimates: for example, a 2020 report by the Paulson Institute, Nature Conservancy and Cornell Atkinson Center for Sustainability had an estimate of some \$104 billion in 2019, including domestic budgets, tax policy and public grants and contracts for watershed protection.

BloombergNEF

#### **16** Biodiversity Finance Factbook: 1H 2023

## Government funding for overseas climate projects is 11 times higher than biodiversity-related support

International public finance for climate change and biodiversity



Source: OECD data. Note: Biodiversity finance comprises ODA under UN Sustainable Development Goal indicator 15.a.1 minus revenue from biodiversity-related economic fees, charges and taxes from the OECD PINE database. Given that biodiversity loss and climate change are related fields, there may be some overlap in the data.

- Biodiversity-related official development assistance (ODA) averaged some \$5.3 per year billion in 2016-20, based on OECD data. This is only a slight (8%) increase on the average for the preceding five-year period. Global ODA across all sectors totalled some \$161 billion in 2020.
- Climate change attracts significantly more international public finance than biodiversity: Climate-related bilateral and multilateral funding averaged \$58 billion over 2016-20.
- Developed countries have been under increasing pressure to deliver on their target agreed in 2009 for \$100 billion per year of climate finance by 2020. In contrast, countries only agreed to their first quantitative finance target for biodiversity at COP15 last year.
- More broadly, climate change is seen as a bigger risk by companies (see <u>above</u>) and the public, and attracts much greater media coverage.

## Germany, France and the US are the biggest donors of international public finance, but Norway gives more relative to its economy

## Biodiversity-related official development assistance by donor



Source: OECD data. Note: Biodiversity finance comprises ODA under UN Sustainable Development Goal indicator 15.a.1 minus revenue from biodiversityrelated economic fees, charges and taxes from the OECD PINE database.

- Biodiversity donors come from a relatively small pool: five countries (Germany, France, US, UK and Japan) accounted for threequarters of 2016-20 funding.
- However, other nations are bigger donors compared with the size of their economy: Norway, for example, allocated \$0.90 to biodiversity overseas for each \$1,000 of GDP. This compares with \$0.03 for the US and \$0.10 for the UK.
- In contrast, funding is distributed to a much wider range of countries, although many are located in biodiversity-rich emerging markets like Asia, Latin America and Africa.
- At the top comes Colombia, which attracted 8% of public finance for developing countries on average over 2016-20. India follows with 5%, and Brazil and Indonesia each had 3%.



## New government pledges and main UN funding facility total \$6.5 billion in 2025 – some way from \$20 billion target

Bilateral international public finance for biodiversity announced in joint donor statement



Source: Governments' joint donor statement. Note: Includes bilateral finance only. Assumes funding is split into equal annual increments over the relevant period. Norway said it would "significantly increase" nature finance but did not specify an amount so the figure assumes it maintains current levels of support.

- In Montreal last year, parties agreed to reach \$20 billion in annual international finance for biodiversity by 2025 and \$30 billion by 2030. Any nation can be a donor, but developed countries will likely be expected to provide the lion's share.
- Indeed, during COP15 some developed country governments announced new pledges for international biodiversity finance in a 'joint donor statement'. These total some \$6.2 billion in bilateral funding for 2025, based on BNEF assumptions.
- For nations such as the UK, Australia and the Netherlands, their pledges would mean a higher or similar level of support than recent years. However, for others like Germany, France, Japan and the US, their new commitments would mean a reduction compared with the 2016-20 average (see <u>above</u>).
- The \$20 billion target for 2025 includes multilateral funding such as the UN's existing biodiversity financing mechanism, the Global Environment Facility (GEF). Some \$1.9 billion has been allocated to biodiversity for 2022-26. This would equate to \$384 million if this sum is split equally on an annual basis.

## **Green financial products**



## **Biodiversity-related bond issuance saw compound annual growth of** 51% over 2015-22

Green and sustainability bond issuance with biodiversity-related use of proceeds \$ billion



Source: BloombergNEF, Bloomberg Terminal. Note: Figure is based on use-ofproceeds data and therefore represents a maximum that could be allocated to biodiversity activities.

- Sustainable debt has surged in recent years thanks to the climate transition. For more detail on how sustainable finance is tracked, see the <u>Appendix</u>. Nearly \$1.3 trillion of green and sustainability bonds over 2015-22 were earmarked for biodiversity activities as potential use of proceeds, such as forest conservation and nature-based solutions. This equates to almost half of green and sustainability bond issuance over the period, although a much smaller share was likely spent on biodiversity in practice.
- Last year saw a drop in biodiversity-related bonds across sustainable debt markets. This decline was driven by factors, including the general global economic downturn, high interest rates and increased scrutiny and skepticism around "greenwashing".
- In addition, 2021 had seen an unprecedented increase in sustainable finance, with the rise of net-zero targets and the momentum around the COP26 climate talks in Glasgow. In addition, debt issuance was postponed from 2021 due to Covid-19related uncertainty in 2020.
- Sustainable debt levels will likely stabilize in 2023, which had already seen \$30 million in biodiversity pledges by mid-January.

## Pollution prevention and control accounted for 74% of annual average biodiversity bond issuance between 2015 and 2022

Green and sustainability bond issuance by pledge category related by biodiversity



Source: BloombergNEF, Bloomberg Terminal. Note: Use of proceeds categories are not mutually exclusive and many bonds include more than one target project type. Figure is based on use-of-proceeds data and therefore represents a maximum that could be allocated to biodiversity activities.

- Green and sustainability bonds earmarked to finance one or more main biodiversity-related categories. Pollution prevention and control has been the most popular, with the largest year-on-year increase (68%) in 2021. Overall, it has accounted for the most biodiversity bond issuance, partly because it is financially beneficial and relatively easy to implement.
- In contrast, biodiversity conservation comprised only 29% of annual bond issuance over the period. This could be because it can be difficult to make an investment case for such projects. There are also alternative ways to raise conservation finance, such as reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation (REDD+). However, this category has seen the biggest compound annual growth (62% over 2015-22).
- Agriculture and forestry did not have quite the same jump in the amount pledged in 2021, at 146% compared with an average of 218% for the other categories analyzed.

### Government and financial institutions issued 83% of biodiversityrelated bonds per year on average (by value)

Green and sustainability bond issuance related to biodiversity by industry sector



Source: BloombergNEF, Bloomberg Terminal. Note: Consumer (non-cyclical) sectors will continue to do well even during an economic downturn. Consumer (cyclical) sectors rely heavily on the business cycle and economic conditions.

- Government has the largest share (49%) of biodiversity-related bond issuance over 2015-22, followed closely by the finance sector (at 34%). This is partly because it is easier for such players to earmark large sums of bonds to biodiversity-related projects.
- In addition, governments and financial institutions have growing commitments to transitioning toward a greener economy and raising funds for projects which deliver environmental benefit. Both sectors saw a surge in green and sustainability bond issuance in 2021 – the year when the share of global greenhouse-gas emissions covered by government net-zero targets expanded from 45% to 80%.
- There was an overall decrease in pledges made in 2022, with a 39% drop for government. However, the total for the financial sector remained stable. Energy companies were unusual in 2022 as they increased biodiversity-related bond issuance by 32% (\$4 billion). This may have been linked to funding clean infrastructure.

BloombergNEF

#### **23** Biodiversity Finance Factbook: 1H 2023

## France contributed \$150 billion to biodiversity-related bond issuance over 2015-22, with compound annual growth at 26%

Share of biodiversity-related bond issuance by country, 2015-22



Source: BloombergNEF, Bloomberg Terminal. Note: SNAT refers to supranational organizations, such as the UN and EU.

- Supranational organizations (SNAT) have accounted for the largest share of biodiversity-related bond issuance, with a key reason being that these players will issue sustainable debt in order to lend to other organizations.
- A few individual nations dominate the picture. Most are developed countries, with strong climate credentials and mature financial markets. The breakdown by country is also relatively stable over time. One exception was 2017 when France accounted for a 61% share, which is likely linked to its launch of the world's first sovereign green bond in January of that year.
- The UK had an especially large increase in 2021, when it comprised 93% of the global total. This was partly due to its £10 billion (\$12 billion) 'Green Gilt' issued just before COP26. This was the world's largest ever sovereign green bond and meant to help fund the government's plan for a green industrial revolution.
- China's biodiversity-related bond issuance increased in 2022 by 28%, unlike all other leading nations, which saw falls. This was due to government initiatives to expand the investor base and encourage bank lending to energy transition projects.

## Debt worth almost \$2 trillion could be eligible for restructuring to boost biodiversity investment

### Debt-for-nature swaps made since 1989

Sri Lanka (2023)		1,000
Ecuador (2023)		800
Cape Verde (2023)	12	
Gabon (2022)		700
Belize (2021)		553
Syria (2001)	32	
Poland (1998)	32	
Peru (1997)	177	
Egypt (1995)	121	Complete
Jamaica (1993)	94	Under discussion
Peru (1993)	131	
El Salvador (1992)	196	
El Salvador (1992)	268	
Jamaica (1991)	217	
Poland (1991)	370	
Costa Rica (1989)	33	\$ million

Source: BloombergNEF, African Development Bank Group.

- Debt-for-nature swaps typically allow an emerging economy to restructure debt at a lower interest rate or longer maturity, with the proceeds being allocated to conservation or green projects. As much as \$2 trillion of developing country debt may be eligible for this kind of restructuring, according to a rough estimate by The Nature Conservancy.
- A flurry of such deals was announced in the 1980s and 1990s, followed by a hiatus until a few years ago. The recent resurgence in interest has been due to deals arranged by The Nature Conservancy as well as a debt crisis for developing nations catalysed by the Covid-19 pandemic, the fallout from Russia's invasion of Ukraine, and rising interest rates.
- However, there are concerns of potential greenwashing where the lion's share of the proceeds are not spent on environmental projects. Such cases are not prohibited on legal grounds, but they do raise reputational risk. Other barriers to debt-for-nature swaps are the need for robust preparation and monitoring, as well as high transaction costs. It is also not clear that such deals achieve longterm financial stability for the developing country.

## **Offsets and credits**





## Some 355 million carbon offsets were issued from agriculture, forestry and land use projects in 2015-22

## Carbon offsets issued from agriculture, forestry and land-use projects

Million metric tons of CO2 equivalent



Source: BloombergNEF, Verra, Gold Standard, American Carbon Registry, Climate Action Reserve

- Carbon offsets from agriculture, forestry and other land use, or AFOLU, projects are a growing source of biodiversity finance. These certificates represent a unit of greenhouse-gas emissions reduced or removed as a result of the project.
- The vast majority of AFOLU offsets have been generated by avoided deforestation (REDD+) projects, although supply dropped 32% in 2022 (see next slide). Reforestation and agriculture supply both rose in 2022, but not by enough to counterbalance the REDD+ decline.
- Reforestation projects had the highest over-the-counter (OTC) average price in 2022, at \$12/ton. OTC transactions make up the largest portion of offset purchases at present, though their market share is shrinking as exchanges grow in prominence.
- REDD+ projects had the second-highest offer prices, averaging \$10.7/ton in 2022. The sector also had the widest range of prices, which could signal that the market is starting to bifurcate between high- and lower-quality offsets. Out of all sectors, the lowest prices came from emissions projects at \$5.3/ton.

## The 2022 drop in offset supply from avoided deforestation was driven by concerns around greenwashing and reputational risk

Carbon offset supply by most prominent sector



Source: BloombergNEF, Verra, Gold Standard, American Carbon Registry, Climate Action Reserve. Note: Figure only includes geographies that have issued a voluntary offset since 2015

- Some countries with avoided deforestation as their most prominent offset sector have attracted controversy around greenwashing in recent years.
- Deforestation is a real climate threat that the voluntary carbon market is well positioned to help address. But some projects have been criticized for a lack of additionality - in other words, whether they drive new, added decarbonization that would not have occurred without revenue from offsets.
- There are also questions over permanence, as companies like Microsoft were left without offsets after projects in which they had invested were devastated by fire.
- While there have been genuine issues with some large REDD+ projects, there are also many high-quality projects listed on registries. Of the 38 REDD+ projects scored on their quality by BeZero – a ratings agency focused on the offsets market – some 84% received an AA-AAA rating, meaning they have a moderate to high likelihood of achieving a real, additional ton of avoidance. The sector will be essential if the offset market is to scale.

### Carbon offset supply from projects with biodiversity co-benefits has risen 49% on a compound annual basis, even with a dip in 2022

conversion

#### Carbon offsets issued from projects with potential biodiversity co-benefits Avoided grassland

Million metric tons of CO2 equivalent

120 106 Agricultural land management 100 Wetland rewetting 80 and conservation 55 52 60 Forest management 34 40 Afforestation. 21 20 reforestation and 20 revegetation 2 2 Reduced emissions 0 from deforestation 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 and degradation

Source: BloombergNEF, Verra. Note: Includes offsets from projects allocated to Biodiversity Gold/Silver or CCB Gold/Silver.

 A growing number of AFOLU projects bring "co-benefits" – that is, advantages in addition to decarbonization, such as nature conservation and restoration. One of the four major offset registries, Verra, has created the Climate, Community and Biodiversity Standards to earmark projects with these co-benefits. Some 301 million such offsets have been issued since 2011 - equivalent to Poland's annual greenhouse-gas emissions.

- Projects with such co-benefits tend to be valued higher: the highest-priced reforestation projects - located in markets like China and Tanzania – all have Verra's CCB verification. The most expensive REDD+ offsets in 2022 came from the Community Based Avoided Deforestation Project in Guinea-Bissau, which received an AAA rating from BeZero.
- Such offsets could provide a significant source of biodiversity finance for developing countries. However, today these projects are heavily concentrated in certain nations: two-thirds of offsets with biodiversity co-benefits came from projects in Indonesia, Peru, Cambodia, Brazil and the Democratic Republic of Congo.

## Biodiversity offsets and credit markets attract \$6-9 billion in annual financing, and are expected to reach over \$160 billion by 2030

### Mitigation hierarchy

First companies seek to avoid and then minimize biodiversity loss. Next comes restoration of areas in the development and only then should offsetting be undertaken.



- Finance mobilized by biodiversity offsets and credits is estimated at \$6-9 billion per year, with most from projects such as wetland and stream mitigation banks. These are areas that are preserved, restored, created or enhanced, to compensate for unavoidable impacts elsewhere, like the loss of streams and wetlands.
- Offsets are part of the mitigation hierarchy, which is meant to help users to lessen their negative impacts on nature. These certificates are purchased to compensate for unavoidable biodiversity loss in development projects, while credits are tradable units of biodiversity with a nature-positive outcome.
- Government programs like market-based schemes are needed to raise demand. Over the longer term, supply may be the limiting factor due to scaling challenges, measurement, transparency and monetization. In addition, investment in biodiversity certificates could cannibalize investment in carbon markets. To be able to monetize the same plot of land for both biodiversity and emission cuts, one likely needs to be a complementary revenue stream (like a co-benefit - <u>see above</u>) to the other.

Source: BloombergNEF, Paulson Institute, Nature Conservancy and Cornell, 2020, OECD, 2020

## **Other flows**

÷																																
÷						÷				÷	÷		÷		÷					÷			÷		÷		÷				÷	
÷							÷									+										+						÷
																				÷							÷				÷	
							+													÷						۰.	÷				÷	÷
																				÷							÷				÷	
																				÷							÷				÷	
÷																				÷							÷				÷	
÷																				÷							÷				÷	
																				÷							÷				÷	
÷		÷	÷	÷		÷	÷	÷		÷	÷		÷		÷					÷			÷		÷		÷				÷	
÷		÷	÷	÷		÷	÷	÷		÷	÷		÷		÷					÷			÷		÷	۰.	÷				÷	÷
÷																				÷							÷				÷	
÷		÷	÷	÷		÷	÷	÷		÷	÷		÷		÷					÷			÷		÷		÷				÷	
÷																				÷							÷				÷	
÷		÷	÷	÷		÷	÷	÷		÷	÷		÷		÷					÷			÷		÷		÷				÷	
÷																				÷							÷				÷	
÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷		÷				÷	
÷		÷	÷	÷		÷	÷	÷		÷	÷		÷		÷					÷			÷		÷		÷				÷	
÷		÷	÷	÷		÷	÷	÷		÷	÷		÷		÷					÷			÷		÷		÷				÷	
÷		÷	÷	÷		÷	÷	÷		÷	÷		÷		÷					÷			÷		÷		÷				÷	



## At some \$8 billion a year, sustainable supply-chain investment comprises a large share of current private-sector biodiversity finance

Market value and financial flows associated with sustainable supply-chain management allocated to biodiversity



Market value (2019) Flows to biodiversity (midpoint, 2020)

Source: BloombergNEF; the Paulson Institute, the Nature Conservancy, and the Cornell Atkinson Center for Sustainability, 2020.

- Global supply chains have generally had a negative effect on nature. Some \$8 billion (in 2022 US dollars) in supply-chain investment may be allocated to biodiversity, according to UNEP. But this is growing slowly and pales into insignificance compared with overall market value for those products.
- Companies have varying levels of influence and resources to invest in sustainable supply chains. Involved in 80% of global trade, multinational corporations have significant sway over the suppliers and producers in their supply chains.
- But few companies take account of their nature-related impact and dependencies via supply chains. Some have made sustainable commitments (mostly related to deforestation). However, implementation of these pledges is hindered by the lack of guidance, reporting and monitoring frameworks.
- Companies have four main mechanisms to improve supply-chain impacts on nature: improved corporate policies, standards and implementation, third-party sustainability standards, sustainable jurisdiction and landscape-level sourcing, and conservationfocused management of naturally sourced ingredients.

## Payments for ecosystem services attract significant funding globally but are poorly tracked

Global annual flows into payments for ecosystem services



Source: BloombergNEF; total figure – OECD, A Comprehensive Overview of Global Biodiversity Finance, 2021; breakdown is based on upper estimates of Salzman, J., Bennett, G., Carroll, N., Goldstein, A. and Jenkins, M., 'The Global Status and Trends of Payments for Ecosystem Services', Nature Sustainability, 2018; OECD, 2020.

- Under a payment-for-ecosystem (PES) program, the user or beneficiary of an ecosystem service pays the resource owner or manager to change their land-management practices. While in some cases governments pay on behalf of citizens (indirect beneficiaries), the private sector is increasing its role in PES schemes.
- These comprise the largest share of private financial flows in our estimate of biodiversity funding <u>above</u>. This uses the \$9.8 billion per year estimate based on OECD research of 153 PES schemes in 37 countries. However, other estimates are far higher: a 2018 overview counted 550 active PES programs, comprising \$36-42 billion in annual transactions.
- PES relating to watersheds (areas of land that drain water into a specific water body) account for the most funding, followed by forest and land-use carbon. However, ecosystem services are often not well defined and there is a lack of data and international standards on PES costs and benefits. Other challenges are payment volatility, equity, insecure land and resource tenure, high project costs and red tape.

## **Other potential funding sources**



## At least \$1.8 trillion per year is spent on subsidies that accelerate the production or use of natural resources or undermine ecosystems

## Environmentally harmful government subsidies (per year)



Source: Koplow, D. and Steenblik, R., Protecting Nature by Reforming Environmentally Harmful Subsidies: The Role of Business, February 2022; BloombergNEF. Note: \*Marine capture fisheries. Figure excludes subsidies for hard rock mining as the sum is unknown.

- A significant source of funding could come from repurposing government support that is harmful to nature. Parties agreed in Montreal to identify such subsidies by 2025 and "eliminate, phase out or reform" them by 2030, with an overall goal to cut the spending by at least \$500 billion per year by 2030.
- Estimates of subsidies harmful to biodiversity vary. Agriculture alone stands at some \$520 billion per year, rising to \$1.8 trillion when taking account of support for fossil fuels and other environmentally harmful subsidies.
- Scrapping such subsidies would free up government funding for nature-positive projects and weaken negative externalities, although subsidy reform can be politically challenging. While the G-20 countries agreed in 2009 to phase out "inefficient" fossil-fuel subsidies, they have made limited progress to date. One reason is that nations have yet to define "inefficient" and "subsidies", giving governments wiggle room to interpret the commitment as they wish. Without clarification of what is meant by "subsidies harmful for biodiversity", the GBF target will also be at risk of selfdetermined interpretations.

## A total of 52 countries have implemented 222 national-level biodiversity taxes, fees/charges and tradable permit schemes

A rising number of governments are introducing economic instruments to promote more sustainable use of biodiversity and raise revenue for nature conservation. The most common of the three types in the figure are fees/charges on, for example, entry to parks, hunting licenses and sewage discharge, accounting for 73% of the schemes. With an 18% share, taxes apply to pesticides, fertilizers and forest products, for example. Tradable permit schemes limit the amount of a natural resource that can be exploited (through activities like fishing and hunting). Permits are allocated to users, who can trade them.

In most countries, these programs are implemented by the national government. But some – notably the US, Canada, Australia, Belgium and Germany – also have a range of state-level programs. Biodiversity-relevant taxes across all countries in the PINE database generated an average of \$8.9 billion per year over 2017-19, although this was less than 1% of all environmentally-relevant fiscal revenue.



## Up to \$23 billion of illegal wildlife products are traded globally each year, with forestry crime valued at \$152 billion

### Average annual value of wildlife trade





Source: Anderson, A., et al. CITES and beyond: Illuminating 20 years of global, legal wildlife trade, Global Ecology and Conservation, Vol 26, 2021.

- Another pot of potential biodiversity finance could come from preventing the illegal trade of wildlife products, estimated at some \$7-23 billion per year. More broadly, environmental crime is valued at \$91-258 billion annually based on 2016 research by UNEP and Interpol. Forestry crime, including illegal logging, was estimated at \$50-152 billion per year.
- Legal and illegal wildlife trade comes in many forms: seafood, fashion, furniture, traditional medicines, ornaments and jewelry, pets, wild meat and exhibition (for zoos and aquariums).
- Forcing trade through legal avenues would allow the capture of a revenue stream that indirectly protects wild habitats. Sustainable, legal and traceable commercialization ensures wild species of commercial interest are not over-exploited. Population management can be controlled via a quota system, and habitat is preserved for the continued harvesting of species of interest.
  - Revenue generated goes to local and indigenous peoples. Such revenues displace the requirement for these communities to resort to slash and burn agriculture, mining operations, or dispersal to urban populations.

### Where to direct finance for maximum impact



## Funding is required where biodiversity is plentiful, providing value, and at risk



Source: BloombergNEF

- BloombergNEF has developed a weighted framework to guide biodiversity restoration and preservation funding priorities to maximize impact. This framework comprises three indicators of countries that would benefit from external funding and intervention: the *presence* of biodiversity, *value* of ecosystem services provided by nature, and degree to which these resources face *threats* which can be overcome by support or intervention.
- An ideal candidate for biodiversity funds will have a high degree of species richness, endemism, or rarity providing unvalued or under-valued ecosystem services that support the local and global economies. It would be located in a region that lacks the financial or jurisdictional means to protect the resource from human population pressures, extractive and agricultural industries, or illegal trade.
- Lower funding priorities include regions lacking biodiversity, where the ecosystem services do not support economic activity, where the host nation has sufficient financial resources to manage the nature loss themselves, or where funding outcomes could be diluted by corruption.

## Biodiversity hotspots indicate species richness and endemism

#### National Biodiversity Index



Source: BloombergNEF, CBD. Note: Index based on estimates of country richness and endemism in four terrestrial vertebrate classes and vascular plants; vertebrates and plants are ranked equally; index values range between 1.000 (maximum: Indonesia) and 0.000 (minimum: Greenland). The National Biodiversity Index includes some adjustment allowing for country size. Countries with land area less than 5,000 square kilometers are excluded. Overseas territories and dependencies are excluded.

		÷										÷	÷		÷		÷		÷	÷	÷	÷		÷			÷	÷				÷				
		÷								·		÷	÷		÷		÷		÷	÷	÷	÷		÷			÷	÷				÷				
÷		÷										÷	÷		÷		÷		÷	÷	÷	÷		÷			÷	÷				÷	÷			
												÷	÷		÷		÷		÷	÷	÷	÷		÷			÷	÷				÷	÷			
÷		÷										÷	÷		÷		÷		÷	÷	÷	÷		÷			÷	÷				÷	÷			
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	۰	1	1	1			1		1		۰	1	1	1		1		1	1	۰		1	1	1		1	1	1	1

- Biodiversity increases around the tropics where the environment causes increased selection pressure, forming new species (such as Brazil and the Amazonia).
- Biodiversity hotspots can also occur in isolated habitats like islands, mountains and valleys, forcing species to diverge (such as Indonesia and Wallacea).
- Low index scores suggest a region's conditions either do not promote diversity (Middle East, Scandinavia) or have anthropogenically damaged their biodiversity (Western Europe).

The biodiversity index is a function of the number of species in a location (richness) and the number found *only* in that location (endemism).

## Nature provides unvalued or under-valued services to the local and global economy



Source: BloombergNEF, Jiang et al, 'Mapping Global Value of Terrestrial Ecosystem Services by Countries', Ecosystem Services, 52, 2021. Note: DRC = Democratic Republic of Congo, Congo, Rep. = Republic of Congo

- Ecosystem services provided by nature underpin many economic activities. These services include *provisioning services* of material and energy extracted from nature, *cultural services* that support recreation, tourism, art and health, and *regulating services* that maintain air and soil quality and protect against natural disasters and disease. *Supporting services* provide habitat for plants and animals that supply the other three services.
- Many ecosystem services are not directly commercialized. This is especially true of regulating and supporting services, which tend to be the most valuable provided by nature. In most countries, climate regulation is the most valuable ecosystem service.
- Ecosystem services tend to be more valuable when they support a large economy across a vast land-mass. The larger the economy and land area, the more valuable the services provided by nature, regardless of how much economic value is explicitly extracted from nature.
- This dynamic may also be due to a lack of data and studies demonstrating value in less-developed nations. The value provided by ecosystem services should be considered in partnership with the presence of biodiversity as an indicator of potential value.

## Preserving ecosystem services will also help address climate change



• The value of ecosystem services is highest in the world's largest economies and land masses.

- However, several hotspots provide value disproportionate to their host nation's wealth. Many ecosystem services transcend national borders.
- Global preservation priorities should include the climate-regulation services provided by Brazil, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and Indonesia, along with the carbon sequestration and oxygen release services provided by Russia.
- Biodiversity in countries with less valuable ecosystem services should not be foregone. It tends to represent a greater share of GDP in these countries and will increase as economies develop.

## Highest-risk areas are economically dependent on exploiting nature



- Biodiversity is under the greatest threat in low-income economies where a greater share of economic activity is derived from natureexposed industries such as agriculture, forestry and fisheries.
   These resources may be over-exploited to drive economic development and improve living standards.
- Agrarian nations lack the economic resources to support biodiversity initiatives themselves. They may also lack robust environmental protection laws and authorities, and credible policing and legal systems to address illegal farming, fishing, land-clearing, or wildlife trade.
- Many low-income and agrarian nations are not investment-grade, leading to limited foreign private investment. Investors across varying risk tolerances are needed to address biodiversity threats in non-investment-grade and unrated economies.
- Biodiversity possessed by higher-income countries is less at risk. It is exploited to a lesser degree, and wealthy countries tend to possess the financial, regulatory and legal systems to address any threats internally.

## The developing world faces threats to nature that can't be addressed domestically

### Biodiversity threat index



- Much of the world faces a very high level of threat to biodiversity, as nations are unlikely to sacrifice economic activity in nature-exposed industries without support.
- Relatively few of these high-risk areas will attract private investment. Western governments, agencies, NGOs and philanthropic organizations will be key to
   protecting biodiversity in countries that are not investment grade.
- The private sector may be attracted to investment-grade nature preservation destinations across Southeast Asia, China, India, Peru, and Botswana.
- The biodiversity threat index considers the GNI per capita, the value of agriculture, forestry and fisheries as share of GDP, and the actual or shadow sovereign credit rating.

### Funding priority regions are geographically diverse

10p-20 BIO	omberginer	biodiversity ful	naing priorities	
Prese	nce index (20%)	Value index (30%)	Threat index (50%)	Priority score
Brazil	88	100	76	86
China	84	79	84	83
Indonesia	100	46	86	77
DRC	65	55	80	70
India	73	28	87	66
Colombia	94	15	81	64
Peru	84	16	82	63
Philippines	79	11	85	62
Mexico	93	11	79	61
Tanzania	67	17	84	61
Sierra Leone	65	1	94	60
Madagascar	81	8	83	60
Malaysia	81	5	83	59
Comoros	81	0	85	59
Somalia	53	1	95	58
Chad	36	1	100	58
Bolivia	72	12	78	57
Bhutan	61	0	90	57
PNG	78	6	80	57
Thailand	67	7	83	57

### 20 Discussion and IEE bio diversity from diversity or the state

Source: BloombergNEF, CBD. Note: DRC = Democratic Republic of Congo, PNG = Papua New Guinea

- Funding should be prioritized for the biodiverse, valuable and threatened biomes across the developing world.
- The BloombergNEF biodiversity funding • priority scores derived from the weighted presence, value and threat indices suggest that Brazil is the world's top biodiversity funding priority.
- Brazil sits atop a shortlist of vast middle-income countries that are the highest funding priorities. These are followed by a longer second tier of small, low- and middle-income nations.
- The top-20 funding priorities are • geographically diverse. They include five Latin American countries, seven African nations, and eight in the Asia-Pacific region.

## Biodiversity funding priorities fall into two groups

Characteristics of biodiversity funding priority regions



46



- The biodiversity funding priority regions share common characteristics. The top-five priorities receive high scores on all three metrics. They all perform well on biodiversity presence, ranging from 65 (DRC) to 100 (Indonesia), and threat, with scores from 76 (Brazil) to 87 (India).
- Most notably, the top-five nations achieve the highest ecosystem service value scores of all developing nations, between 28 (India) and 100 (Brazil), owing to their large economies or land masses.
- The second tier of smaller, lower-income countries make up the top-20 priority regions. They possess far lower ecosystem service scores – in some cases rounding to zero value. This is partly offset by very high threat scores, between 78 (Bolivia) and 100 (Chad). Biodiversity presence scores are varied, between 36 (Chad) and 94 (Colombia).
- Despite sharing common characteristics, the biomes and species in need of protection vary greatly across the priority regions. They encompass terrestrial and marine resources, plants and animals.

Source: BloombergNEF Note: All axes show scores ranging from 0 to 100. Contours at 20 points.

## Each priority region possesses a unique resource in need of protection



The changes needed to deploy funds effectively





### The challenges to scaling up biodiversity finance are multifaceted but the most urgent can be split into six categories

This section presents the main challenges and a sample case study from the initiatives to tackle these barriers. It then highlights key actions that could be taken to mitigate these challenges. Each action has one or more actors (governments, public- or private-sector financial institutions, public- or private-sector companies) and an indicative timeframe.

L stan data, r cor fran	ack of adardized netrics and nsistent neworks	Need to integrate biodiversity into key decision- making	Absence of effective policy support	Dearth of bankable biodiversity projects	Uncertain environmental integrity of offsets and other mechanisms	Insufficient industry and local community buy-in
- Data c sharin - Harmo framev metric cleare manag financ	collection and g onized works and s to enable or assessment, gement and ing capability	- Efforts and policies to integrate biodiversity into risk assessments, planning processes, corporate reporting, policies, investments and supply chains	<ul> <li>Subsidy reform</li> <li>New financial and fiscal incentives, especially market- based mechanisms</li> <li>International finance</li> <li>Better regulatory oversight</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Replicable business models and project structures</li> <li>Concessional funding and technical support</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Initiatives to develop high- integrity carbon and biodiversity markets</li> <li>Avoid 'green washing' around sustainable finance</li> <li>Science-based targets and actions</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Enabling environment</li> <li>Communication and incentives to engage industry and local communities</li> <li>Just transition</li> </ul>

#### **49** Biodiversity Finance Factbook: 1H 2023

### Standardized data and frameworks

### Challenge explained

Biodiversity is difficult to measure and quantify, with no agreed metrics akin to emissions for climate change or comprehensive target framework like the 1.5 and 2° Celsius targets. Currently over 3,000 metrics are used to measure how much a company affects or relies on nature.

Without a smaller set of standard metrics, it is difficult to compare potential returns from multiple biodiversity projects with disparate contexts, players and objectives. It is also hard to quantify required financing to tackle biodiversity loss and demonstrate efficacy of sustainable financial flows.

Overall, there is a dearth of comprehensive, granular and up-to-date data, hindering rigorous analysis and forecasting. Standards are evolving. But there is little consensus on how to solve the intractable measurement issues and the dissemination of multiple frameworks raises challenges around alignment. The availability of such information, available in a consistent manner, is key to ensuring more accurate nature-risk assessments.

## Case study: Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures

The TNFD is developing a framework that provides recommendations for companies on how to report on their interaction with nature and the resulting risks and opportunities.

Designed to complement the more established climate-related framework, the TNFD's recommendations follow a similar structure and are attracting significant business attention.

The Taskforce comprises 40 members with over \$20 trillion assets under management, supported by over 1000 corporate, academic and civil organizations.

The completed framework is expected to be released in September 2023. Biodiversity is a key part of much of the disclosure guidance, which is centered around four key pillars: governance, metrics and targets, strategy, and risk management. In the medium term, several G-20 governments are expected to introduce disclosure regulations that align with the framework.

Challenges and Challenges and C C Key action	key actions	Short-term (2023) Vedium-term (20 Long-term (2031)	3-25) )26-30) -) <b>Time</b>
Data and metrics	Scale up funding for initiatives to collect more granular biodiversity-related data and to develop and deploy technolog to improve data quality and availability	y <u>a</u> î	
	Developed countries and DFIs to support data collection in emerging economies		
	Together with NGOs and academia, develop methodologies and platforms for sharing biodiversity data		
	Undertake and publish spatial landscape planning to identify areas of crucial habitat, to support planning of offset an credit projects	d 🙆	
Consistency across	Together with NGOs and academia, publish research and agree at a cross-country level on what is an environmentally harmful subsidy		
frameworks	Devise common frameworks and metrics for assessing and managing biodiversity impacts and dependencies, including supply chains		
	Establish a harmonized system for tracking and reporting biodiversity finance, making use of existing processes and systems		
	Adopt natural capital accounting or reach to enable information to be collected in a standardized manner, for example the UN standard (System of Environmental Economic Accounting)	e 庙	

Ð

### Integration into decision-making

### Challenge explained

To effectively tackle biodiversity loss, governments, companies and financial institutions need to integrate or "mainstream" biodiversity into their risk assessments, planning processes, policies and investments.

Parties took a step in the right direction at COP15 by agreeing for the first time to "encourage and enable, and in particular to ensure that large and transnational companies and financial institutions" report their dependencies and impacts on biodiversity. But this was not mandatory disclosure, as advocated by some business lobby groups.

Still, effectively integrating biodiversity into decision-making is a time-consuming and challenging task, requiring specific expertise and the standardized data, metrics and frameworks outlined above. Complex supply chains with disparate actors make it difficult to accurately understand biodiversity impacts and dependencies, particularly for multinational corporations.

#### Case study: ASN Bank

Biodiversity is one of the three pillars of ASN Bank's sustainability strategy, together with climate and human rights. It was the first financial institution to set a long-term biodiversity goal for all its investments and loans to have a net positive effect on nature by 2030.

To understand its impact on biodiversity, it helped devise the Biodiversity Footprint Financial Institutions (BFFI) in 2015. While the accuracy of the footprint calculation is limited, it enables the bank to identify changes in impact, relative contribution of asset classes and main impact drivers.

In 2020, ASN Bank and five other Dutch financial institutions founded the Partnership for Biodiversity Accounting Financials (PBAF), which is developing a 'standard' to enable financial institutions to assess and disclose impact and dependencies on biodiversity of loans and investments. As of December 2022, PBAF totals 47 partners and supporters from across the world.

#### Challenges and key actions Government Short-term (2023-25) Integration into decision making Medium-term (2026-30) Financials Ð (continued) Long-term (2031-) Companies Key actions to mitigate challenges Actor(s) Time Â Publish guidance on biodiversity-related disclosures (potentially in line with TNFD recommendations) Naturerelated Â Include biodiversity within generic ESG disclosure policies and regulations, as well as mandatory environmental reporting impact assessments and risk Take a leading role in understanding nature impacts and dependences; improving biodiversity risk management managepractices; using screening tools, standards and policies to avoid harmful investments; and implementing biodiversityment related ESG and financial disclosures Request central banks to integrate biodiversity risks into routine stress-testing Devise a standardized investment taxonomy for biodiversity (or integrate into an existing framework), with clear definitions Central banks to request other financial institutions to integrate biodiversity risks into routine stress-testing ŵ Public and multilateral financial institutions to take the lead by aligning portfolios with the Global Biodiversity Framework Mandate biodiversity risk disclosure for broader set of companies in line with international frameworks like TNFD, requiring companies to measure and report risks from, and impacts on, biodiversity loss Adapt definition of 'fiduciary duty' beyond economics and price in impact of biodiversity loss into risk-management 俞 practices, investment and lending activities

#### Challenges and key actions Short-term (2023-25) Government Integration into decision making Financials Medium-term (2026-30) € (continued) Long-term (2031-) Companies Key actions to mitigate challenges Actor(s) Time Pledge to reach net-zero emissions by 2050 and release plan on how to achieve goal **Biodiversitv** rfh: in planning Align National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans with the GBF, including national finance plans, and highlight the role of the private sector â Integrate biodiversity into climate Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), together with emission targets on AFOLU sector and dedicated support for nature-based solutions Align efforts to tackle climate change and biodiversity loss, and prioritize crossover initiatives/projects ÎÌÌÌ Consider nature impacts when devising policies, including for infrastructure, natural resources, economic development, energy and Î poverty reduction, and planning for private sector and state-owned enterprises Implement internal performance metrics that spur the offering and use of biodiversity-related financial products Commit to no more nature-negative investment and release plan to shift portfolio towards 100% nature-positive **m Sustainable** Evaluate and report on biodiversity impact of supply chains, and release plans on how to switch to sustainable supply chains supply â ch Support voluntary initiatives on greening supply chains like certification by the Forest Stewardship Council chains Governments and large companies, especially AFOLU players, to leverage purchasing power through their procurement strategies, r fh to incentivize suppliers to avoid and minimize biodiversity loss Î Leverage financial contributions to projects by demanding nature-positive practices through value chain Implement regulations that enforce sustainable supply chains (such as ban on imports from deforested areas)

## Challenges and key actions Lack of effective policy

### Challenge explained

The COP15 deal means countries now have a stronger policy framework at international level. But few governments provide domestic support that effectively promotes conservation, restoration and sustainable use of nature.

Abundant subsidies distort prices and incentivize environmentally harmful activity. But subsidy reform can be politically challenging, as seen for example by opposition to efforts to revamp fossil-fuel support. Such attempts have also floundered due to a lack of agreement on what constitutes a subsidy, giving governments leeway to interpret commitments as they wish.

As well as environmentally harmful subsidies, governments offer insufficient support to tackle biodiversity loss. Crucially policy can be used to frame nature as an asset, spurring companies to integrate the value of nature in their decision-making (see <u>above</u>). Governments also have a role to play in ensuring that the "enabling environment" is conducive to investment, especially in emerging economies.

## Case study: Forest Biodiversity Program for Southern Finland

In southern Finland, the government only provides forestry subsidies for sustainable timber production, maintaining biodiversity protection and ecosystem-management activities.

In addition, it introduced the Forest Biodiversity Program for Southern Finland, known as METSO, which aims to reach some 96,000 hectares of forest established as permanent or temporary nature reserves.

Forest owners volunteer to submit tenders, with the winners selected based on biological criteria and the offer price. They may also be paid to maintain or improve the biodiversity of the forest.

Overall, forest protection relies on cooperation networks involving local government, NGOs and other stakeholders. This collaboration is meant to boost buy-in of local communities. By end-2021, the program had reached 88% of its 2025 target. Due to its success, the government has decided to extend it to 2026-30.

Challenges and Challenges and Challe	ack of effective policy		Government Financials Companies		Short-term (20) Medium-term ( Long-term (20)	23-25) 2026-30) 31-)
Key action	ons to mitigate challenges				Actor(s)	Time
Subsidy	Identify environmentally harmful subsidies based on clear and transparent definitions					
reform	Repurpose support for nature-positive actions, taking account of impact on vulnerable grou target for a \$500 billion annual decrease by 2030. See: <u>Actions to improve industry and loc</u>	ps and a al comm	achieving the nunity buy-in	) GB	F 📠	
	Review and disclose plans to transition away from reliance on environmentally harmful sub	sidies				
New financial and fiscal	Implement new financial and fiscal incentives for biodiversity, especially market-based med economic value on nature, such as offset/credit and payment-for-ecosystem schemes. Provi biodiversity is a complementary revenue stream (like a co-benefit - <u>see above</u> ) to avoid inve	hanisms mote scł estment	s that place a nemes wher cannibalizat	an e tion		
incentives, and other	Introduce or ramp up tradeable permit systems, fees, charges and taxes on nature-related fishing, and use the revenue to fund new biodiversity incentives	activities	s such as hu	ntinç	g, 🧰	
Support	Raise finance for coastal and marine areas, to ensure 30% by 2030 preservation goal is me	et for oce	eans <i>and</i> lar	nd		
	Expand the scope of publicly sponsored financing facilities like green banks to biodiversity					
Internationa finance	Scale up international public finance for biodiversity each year, to meet the finance-specific focus on biodiversity-rich and/or least developed recipient countries	targets	of the GBF a	and		
	Developed countries and DFIs to provide support to emerging economies, for subsidy refor	m and p	olicy design			
Regulations mandates	Establish exploitation-proof, nature-positive wildlife trade regulations at national level to cor policy (like CITES), remove loopholes and create sustainable trade models	nplemer	nt internatior	al		
	Implement voluntary and then mandatory labeling standards for nature-positive products, to	build co	onsumer dei	mano	d 📠	
56 Biodi	versity Finance Factbook: 1H 2023		B	slo	omberg	NEF

. . .

### **Biodiversity project characteristics**

#### Challenge explained

A crucial set of challenges to raising biodiversity finance relates to characteristics of the projects themselves: most are smaller than financial institutions would typically fund. They are also highly localized due to the nature of biodiversity; solutions need to be tailored to individual conditions, making it difficult for the private sector to identify appropriate opportunities and finance biodiversity projects at scale.

In addition, projects rarely have easily monetizable cash flows, as biodiversity is a public good whose true value is not captured in economic transactions. This poses a challenge to attracting private financing and matching investor profiles despite growing interest.

Financial returns are often low or below market hurdle rates. The risky and untested nature of biodiversity investment often requires a blended approach of concessional and commercial finance.

### Case study: Rewilding Europe Capital

Rewilding Europe Capital (REC) is a microfinance institution that provides commercial loans to nature-focused companies in the region. It seeks to help tackle the challenge of small project size, and bridge funding gaps between restoration actions and finance availability. In its first phase (2013-16), it focused on small businesses mainly operating in nature tourism. It offered loans up to €80,000 (\$86,176) and provided 18 loans totaling €520,000 (\$560,144).

In 2017, Rewilding Europe signed an agreement with the European Investment Bank, through the new Natural Capital Financing Facility, for a new loan facility of  $\in$ 6 million (\$6.5 million). In this second phase, it scaled up to a maximum of  $\in$ 600,000 (\$646,320) per loan. Rewilding is the large-scale restoration of nature to the point it can take care of itself.

Challenges and B (C Key, actic	iodiversity project characteristics continued)	Government Government Financials	Short-term (202 Medium-term (2 Long-term (203	23-25) 2026-30) 1-)
Replicable	Improve "enabling environment" for biodiversity investment such as long-term nature targe regulatory frameworks (including on land rights), streamlined project-permitting processes	ets, transparent and enfor , and overall policy stabili	ced	
models and project structures	Support and develop initiatives to promote project standardization and replicability like the Investment in Conservation's blueprints	Coalition for Private		
	Increase the use of blended finance for biodiversity projects, develop innovative financing risk-mitigation and revenue-stabilization instruments like guarantees and insurance produc	mechanisms and introduc	ce 🏠 î	
	Pool developers, projects, investment vehicles or initiatives at a sector or geographic level cooperatives, via application of sector standards), to overcome the challenge of small-sca	l (potentially into le, local projects		
	Publish clear guidelines on factors that make projects more appealing to investors, akin to Readiness Guidelines for climate	the CFLI Investment		
Conces-	Accelerate the implementation of new fund for the Global Environment Facility and talks o	n a separate facility	<u>í</u>	
sional funding and technical support	DFIs to help establish a track record for investment, partner with banks and asset manage facilitate regulatory change needed for commercial investment and develop a pipeline of b	ers to co-finance projects, ankable biodiversity proje	ects	
	Developed countries and DFIs to provide technical support for emerging economies to dev	velop enabling environme	nt 🛕 🏦	
	Invest in, or partner with, local project developers or other companies to facilitate new mar	ket entry	Î	
	DFIs and government to devise guidelines for blended finance to avoid long-term reliance which can prevent the transition to commercial, undistorted markets	on concessional capital,		



### Environmental integrity of mechanisms

#### Challenge explained

Some mechanisms with the most potential to scale biodiversity finance have courted controversy, with a key example being offsets. The voluntary carbon markets have been criticized for not delivering genuine, permanent emission reductions and deterring companies from cutting their direct greenhouse-gas output.

Some carbon offset projects are also not "additional", meaning they do not drive new added decarbonization that would not have otherwise occurred without the offset revenue. Note too that investment in carbon offsets likely cannibalizes investment in biodiversity offsets/credits, and vice versa.

Initiatives like the Integrity Council on Voluntary Carbon Markets should improve the environmental integrity of these markets and the results can also be used to enhance the fledgling biodiversity offset and credit markets. But progress is slow and in the meantime companies have become warier of the reputational risk from using carbon offsets. Concerns of greenwashing accusations and transaction fees have also hindered the sustainable debt markets.

### Case study: Integrity Council for the Voluntary Carbon Market

The voluntary carbon market has come under increased scrutiny due to the surplus of low-quality projects. One initiative that aims to improve the environmental rigor of the market is the Integrity Council for the Voluntary Carbon Market.

It released draft 'Core Carbon Principles' in 2022, outlining the criteria that offsets need to meet in order to be considered high quality. While just a draft, these principles will go a long way to standardizing carbon offsets and have already driven the creation of futures products. The final version is due to be released in March 2023.

However, two of the four major voluntary carbon offset registries Verra and Gold Standard have criticized the principles for duplicating their own efforts. In addition, other groups like the Carbon Credit Quality Initiative are also working on guidance and tools to improve the quality of carbon offsets. The release of multiple, slightly different guidelines could lead to confusion.

#### Challenges and key actions Short-term (2023-25) Government Environmental integrity of mechanisms Financials Medium-term (2026-30) (continued) Long-term (2031-) Companies Key actions to mitigate challenges Actor(s) Time 'High-Support and accelerate initiatives to develop high-integrity carbon and biodiversity markets m quality' Push for agreement on robust new carbon market mechanisms in Article 6 negotiations and accelerate roll-out offset/ credits Adhere to, promote and eventually enforce the mitigation hierarchy by prioritizing purchase of credits and then avoidance, Î minimization and restoration of negative biodiversity impacts before offsetting. Developing countries and DFIs to support emerging economies in this area Implement biodiversity credit programs and incentives to promote high-quality offset purchases Allocate a growing share of offset purchases to high-quality units and credits Î Require project developers to undertake long-term monitoring and reporting on carbon and biodiversity projects, to ensure credibility, and establish a recourse mechanism Participate in, and follow the guidance of, the Science Based Targets Network in devising measurable, actionable and time-bound Sciencenature-related targets, such as the goals in the Terra Carta charter based targets for Devise plans to meet these targets, including interim targets for deforestation, land and freshwater use and ecosystem integrity (if m fr nature applicable), starting with companies in the AFOLU sector Back initiatives to define "green washing" and "sustainable investment", to mitigate criticism and lack of credibility. See also: Sustainable Actions to facilitate integration into decision making finance Scale up issuance of sustainable/green bonds and loans and debt-for-nature swaps Set aside certain share of funding or proceeds from green/sustainability bonds, loans and swaps to spend on biodiversity projects â î

 $\sqrt{}$ 

### Industry and local community buy-in

#### Challenge explained

"Transformative change" will be required to move "away from the current, limited paradigm of economic growth", the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services wrote in a 2019 global assessment. Indeed, companies are showing more interest in prioritizing biodiversity loss. However, some industry groups have shown less willingness, while greenwashing has stymied progress on nature, introduced additional uncertainty into markets and hindered sustainable finance.

Local communities are also critical players in tackling biodiversity loss. The GBF notes that indigenous peoples are the best stewards of nature, comprising only 5% of humanity but protecting up to 80% of the world's biodiversity. Many of the GBF targets reference the need to recognize and protect their rights. But with indigenous peoples continuing to face abuse and forced eviction, the challenge now is to ensure that these commitments translate into action.

#### Case study: Botswana

A key way to promote buy-in among local communities is via initiatives that protect or create jobs. Botswana, for example, was an early adopter of ecotourism. The sector accounts for a significant share of employment and is the second-biggest source of income.

In 2002, the government released an ecotourism strategy, to conserve natural resources and wildlife, and in 2009, it implemented the Ecotourism Certification System to promote responsible environmental, behaviour by tourism companies.

Over 40 camps and lodges have achieved the top two ratings. In addition, the Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) program aims to achieve biodiversity conservation as well as rural development.

Most CBNRM projects are based on a joint venture whereby the community-based organization sub-lets a concession area in return for rental income and employment opportunities. These are especially valuable as the projects are often in remote regions.

Challenges a	nd key actions Continued)  Companies	ort-term (2023 dium-term (20 ig-term (2031	3-25) 026-30) -)						
Key act	ions to mitigate challenges	Actor(s)	Time						
Engage- ment	Ensure that the enabling environment encourages local communities and indigenous peoples become involved in biodiversity markets, projects and initiatives, and raise their awareness about how to participate	Â							
	Clarify uncertainties over land tenure rights and introduce predictable, fair and easily accessed dispute resolution frameworks, to resolve disagreements between local community groups, investors and project developers	Â							
	Prioritize new support measures that can create jobs and revenue streams for local communities like eco-tourism	Â							
	Allocate a share of public finance for biodiversity to indigenous peoples	Â							
	Provide guidance for companies in the land sector on how they can obtain government support, and create opportunities for players to share best practices								
	For companies wishing to use natural resources, allocate a share of the financial benefits from their use to local communities or contribute to the protection and restoration of these resources. Make this a condition for your lending and investment activities and/or supply chain								
Just transition	Plan how to achieve a just transition for the land sector sufficiently early, and look to coal and industrial sectors for lessons. Create forums for all stakeholders to participate in the planning process, including family-owned farms which account for almost 75% of global agricultural land, indigenous peoples and local communities								
	Consider effects of subsidy reform on vulnerable groups and companies in the land sector. See: <u>Actions to mitigate</u> <u>lack of effective policy</u> .								
	Support workers and local communities affected by the nature-positive transition, for example through social protection programs, training schemes and economic diversification								

## Appendix





The estimates of current biodiversity financial flows (see <u>above</u>) are based on the following four sources, adjusted for inflation to 2021 US dollars:

- OECD, Official Development Assistance database, data for 2021.
- Taskforce on Nature Markets, Global Nature Markets Landscaping Study, 2022.
- The Paulson Institute, Nature Conservancy and Cornell Atkinson Center for Sustainability, Financing Nature: Closing the Global Biodiversity Financing Gap, 2020.
- UN Environment Programme, *State of Finance for Nature 2022.*

The estimate for biodiversity conservation needs by 2030 was based on the 2020 report by the Paulson Institute, Nature Conservancy, and Cornell Atkinson Center for Sustainability

#### Sources for current biodiversity financial flow estimate

Гуре	Sub-type	Estimate (\$ billion 2021)	Source
Public domestic	Government spending and tax policy	126	UNEP
Public nternational	Overseas development assistance	6	OECD
Private	Sustainable supply chain finance	8	UNEP
	Payments for ecosystem services	10	Taskforce on Nature Markets
	Impact investing, NGOs	5	Taskforce on Nature Markets
	Offsets/ credits	6	Taskforce on Nature Markets
Any	Green finance	5	Paulson Institute et al

Source: BloombergNEF

## Green financial products



Due to data availability, this Factbook focuses on activity-based sustainable debt, specifically green and sustainability bonds (see <u>above</u>), based on information from Bloomberg Terminal. In total, green bonds comprise the largest sustainable debt market, with a market size of \$2.4 trillion. Sustainability bonds, which can be used to finance environmental and/or social projects, total some \$615 billion. Altogether these instruments account for some 53% of the sustainable debt market.

#### Sustainable debt explained

Sustainable debt comprises borrowing activity via loans and bonds that is used to promote environmental or social improvement. These can take two forms:

- Activity-based debt: these instruments, encompassing green bonds, social bonds, sustainability bonds and green loans, are used to raise money to finance new, or refinance existing, green projects or activities. The money raised must be used for these activities, which can be for environmental benefit, social benefit, or both. The profile of the issuer (the borrower) is not important, as long as the activities such as greenhouse gas emission reductions or biodiversity conservation are eligible. In 2022, activity-based sustainable debt totaled \$986 billion based on BloombergNEF data, with more than \$4.3 trillion issued since 2007.
- Behavior-based debt: these instruments, encompassing sustainability-linked loans and bonds, are used to raise money for general purposes. The activities performed with the raised money are not what earns behavior-based debt types their 'sustainability' label. Behavior-based debt is dubbed 'sustainable' when tied to a sustainability target for the issuer, requiring it to modify its behavior. This could be an emission reduction goal, a quota for worker diversity, or many other types of behavior. In 2022, behavior-based debt totaled more than \$504 billion, with \$1.5 trillion issued since inception in 2017.

# BloombergNEF biodiversity funding priority scores

The BloombergNEF biodiversity funding priority scores are the weighted product of three indices capturing presence, value and threat.

This quantitative assessment considered the biodiversity present within a nation, the estimated value of ecosystem services it is providing (whether or not commercialized), and the government's financial and jurisdictional ability to protect the resource from human population pressures, extractive and agricultural industries, or illegal trade.

Threat scores have been risk-adjusted by the sovereign credit-worthiness, as an indicator of the likelihood that funding will flow efficiently through to projects.

	Index methodology	Data source
Presence	<i>National Biodiversity Index</i> expressed as a percentile <i>(Indonesia = 100)</i>	Convention on Biological Diversity, Global Biodiversity Outlook 1 (2011)
Value	National gross ecosystem product value expressed as a percentile of global maximum (Brazil = 100)	Jiang et al, 'Mapping <i>Global Value of</i> <i>Terrestrial Ecosystem Services by</i> <i>Countries</i> ', Ecosystem Services, 52 (2021)
Threat	<ul> <li>Weighted product of:</li> <li>Reverse percentile of GNI/capita (50%)</li> <li>Share of GDP from agriculture, forestry, and fishing (30%)</li> <li>Trading Economics credit-worthiness score (20%)</li> <li>Proxies used where deemed appropriate</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>World Bank, <i>GNI per capita, Atlas method (current US\$)</i>, December 2022 update</li> <li>World Bank, <i>Agriculture, Forestry, and Fishing, Value Added (% of GDP)</i>, December 2022 update</li> <li>Trading Economics, Government Credit Rating</li> </ul>
Priority	Weighted product of presence (20%), value (30%) and threat (50%) indices	

Source: BloombergNEF

### **Copyright and disclaimer**



#### Copyright

© Bloomberg Finance L.P. 2023. This publication is the copyright of Bloomberg Finance L.P. in connection with BloombergNEF. No portion of this document may be photocopied, reproduced, scanned into an electronic system or transmitted, forwarded or distributed in any way without prior consent of BloombergNEF.

#### Disclaimer

The BloombergNEF ("BNEF"), service/information is derived from selected public sources. Bloomberg Finance L.P. and its affiliates, in providing the service/information, believe that the information it uses comes from reliable sources, but do not guarantee the accuracy or completeness of this information, which is subject to change without notice, and nothing in this document shall be construed as such a guarantee. The statements in this service/document reflect the current judgment of the authors of the relevant articles or features, and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of Bloomberg Finance L.P., Bloomberg L.P. or any of their affiliates ("Bloomberg"). Bloomberg disclaims any liability arising from use of this document, its contents and/or this service. Nothing herein shall constitute or be construed as an offering of financial instruments or as investment advice or recommendations by Bloomberg of an investment or other strategy (e.g., whether or not to "buy", "sell", or "hold" an investment). The information available through this service is not based on consideration of a subscriber's individual circumstances and should not be construed as tax or accounting advice or as a service designed to facilitate any subscriber's compliance with its tax, accounting or other legal obligations. Employees involved in this service may hold positions in the companies mentioned in the services/information.

The data included in these materials are for illustrative purposes only. The BLOOMBERG TERMINAL service and Bloomberg data products (the "Services") are owned and distributed by Bloomberg Finance L.P. ("BFLP") except (i) in Argentina, Australia and certain jurisdictions in the Pacific islands, Bermuda, China, India, Japan, Korea and New Zealand, where Bloomberg L.P. and its subsidiaries ("BLP") distribute these products, and (ii) in Singapore and the jurisdictions serviced by Bloomberg's Singapore office, where a subsidiary of BFLP distributes these products. BLP provides BFLP and its subsidiaries with global marketing and operational support and service. Certain features, functions, products and services are available only to sophisticated investors and only where permitted. BFLP, BLP and their affiliates do not guarantee the accuracy of prices or other information in the Services. Nothing in the Services shall constitute or be construed as an offering of financial instruments by BFLP, BLP or their affiliates, or as investment advice or recommendations by BFLP, BLP or their affiliates of an investment. Information available via the Services should not be considered as information sufficient upon which to base an investment decision. The following are trademarks and service marks of BFLP, a Delaware limited partnership, or its subsidiaries: BLOOMBERG, BLOOMBERG ANYWHERE, BLOOMBERG MARKETS, BLOOMBERG NEWS, BLOOMBERG PROFESSIONAL, BLOOMBERG TERMINAL and BLOOMBERG.COM. Absence of any trademark or service mark from this list does not waive Bloomberg's intellectual property rights in that name, mark or logo. All rights reserved. © 2023 Bloomberg.

BloombergNEF (BNEF) is a strategic research provider covering global commodity markets and the disruptive technologies driving the transition to a low-carbon economy.

Our expert coverage assesses pathways for the power, transport, industry, buildings and agriculture sectors to adapt to the energy transition.

We help commodity trading, corporate strategy, finance and policy professionals navigate change and generate opportunities.

#### Get the app



On IOS + Android about.bnef.com/mobile

	 		 1.00	 	 	 		 		 								1.1			 	
	 		 	 	 	 		 	+ + -	 											 	
	 		 1.1	 	 · · ·	 		 		 						1.1		1.1			 	
	 		 	 	 · · ·	 	· ·	 		 											 	
	 		 	 	 · · ·	 	· ·	 		 											 	
	 		 	 	 · · ·	 	· ·	 		 											 	
	 		 	 	 · · ·	 	· ·	 		 											 	
	 		 	 	 · · ·	 	· ·	 		 											 	
	 		 	 	 · · ·	 	· ·	 		 											 	
	 	* * *	 	 	 · · ·	 	· ·	 	+ +	 										* * *	 	
	 		 	 	 · · ·	 	· ·	 		 											 	
	 		 	 	 · · ·	 	· ·	 		 <b>-</b>								. in			 	
	 		 	 	 · · ·	 	· ·	 		 	21	-	$\sim r$			<u> </u>		NI	I	<u> </u>	 	
	 		 1.1	 	 · · ·	 1.1	· ·	 	· · ·	 1.1	Ð	$\mathbf{O}$	U	• • •	Ut	31	U I	I N		· · ·	 	
	 		 	 	 · · ·	 	· ·	 		 		<u> </u>	₩. •				J'				 	
	 		 1.1	 	 · · ·	 1.1	· ·	 	· · ·	 1.1								1.1			 	
	 		 	 	 · · ·	 	· · ·	 		 											 	
	 		 	 	 · · ·	 	· ·	 		 											 	

#### Victoria Cuming, Head of Global Policy, vcuming@bloomberg.net

Hugh Bromley, Sustainable Agriculture Research Manager, hbromley1@bloomberg.net

#### **Client enquiries:**

Bloomberg Terminal: press <a href="https://www.elemail.com">Help></a> key twice Email: <a href="https://www.elemail.com">support.bnef@bloomberg.net</a>

#### Learn more:

about.bnef.com | @BloombergNEF