EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Financing the Pan-Amazon bioeconomy

Mapping financial mechanisms, success factors and recommendations

AMZ BIOECON

NATURE FINANCE

impact

Research coordination

Pan-Amazon Network for Bioeconomy

Support

NatureFinance

Research and preparation

Impact Finance

Authors

Gabriel Ribenboim

Leandro Pinheiro

Ébida Santos

Gabriela Minoboli

Carolina Valle

Reviewers

Arthur Vieira, WRI Brasil

Eduarda Thurler, WRI Brasil

Evelyn Lewi, WRI Brasil

Gustavo Martins, NatureFinance

Ian Lazoski, Impact Finance

Joana Oliveira, WRI Brasil

Luana Maia, NatureFinance

Marcelo Cwerner, Amazon Investor Coalition

Pedro Tufic Bouchabki, Impact Finance

Tiana Lins, NESsT

Suggested citation

Pan-Amazon Network for Bioeconomy (2025). *Financing the Pan-Amazon Bioeconomy: Mapping financial mechanisms, success factors and recommendations.* São Paulo: Pan-Amazon Network for Bioeconomy. Report. Available online at: https://amzbio.org/

Credits

Research supervision

Joana Oliveira

Engagement coordination

Ligia Tostes and Suzana Marte

Map production and editing

Lucas Marte

Layout and graphic design

Lucas Marte

Cover photo

Joana Oliveira/WRI Brasil

Internal photos

Bruno Kelly/WRI Brasil

Back cover photo

Bruno Kelly/WRI Brasil

October 2025

About the Pan-Amazon Network for Bioeconomy

The Pan-Amazon Network for Bioeconomy is a multisectorial alliance committed to promoting a locally-led sustainable bioeconomy across the Amazon. Its focus is on economic pathways that prioritize the conservation of standing forests, the region's rich biodiversity, and the well-being of its people.

As a "network of networks", it brings together actors from diverse sectors — including local producers and associations, Indigenous communities, impact investors, financial institutions, research institutes, and civil society organizations.

Through dedicated task forces, the Pan-Amazon Network for Bioeconomy coordinates studies, actions, partnerships, and programs that collectively foster the growth of a locally led bioeconomy sector in the region. The Access to Finance Task Force, co-led by the Amazon Investor Coalition and NESsT, is focused on building shared understanding and identifying pathways to mobilize appropriate financing for the bioeconomy at scale, with strong social and environmental safeguards.

amzbio.org

About NatureFinance

NatureFinance is an international think tank, solutions laboratory, and global catalyst that designs, tests, and scales financial instruments and partnerships aimed at aligning the global economy with planetary boundaries — spanning from sovereign finance to the bioeconomy — placing finance at the service of nature, climate, and people.

www.naturefinance.net

About Impact Finance

Impact Finance (formerly Impact Bank) is an innovative fintech company that connects capital with impact enterprises and communities, providing transparent and efficient financial solutions to drive a fair and regenerative economy.

It also operates as a think-and-do tank for the impact economy, combining strategic insight and knowledge generation with the practical implementation of financial and socio-environmental solutions.

www.impact-br.com

Analytical summary

The bioeconomy has emerged as one of the leading strategies for reconciling economic development with environmental conservation in the Amazon. Amid the climate emergency and growing demand for more inclusive, circular, and nature-based economic models, the bioeconomy has been increasingly recognized as a key pillar for environmental, economic, and social policy.

Considering the ongoing debate and multiple interpretations of the term bioeconomy, this study focuses on the sustainable bioeconomy of products and services that are compatible with the ecological integrity of the Amazon biome and the cultural identity of its peoples — also referred to as the sociobioeconomy — which emphasizes fair income distribution and the valorization of traditional knowledge.

Despite this recognition, consolidated data on the financial ecosystem that supports or could support these economic activities remain scarce. How are sociobiodiversity value chains being financed? Which financial mechanisms are effectively reaching local communities, entrepreneurs, and Amazonian territories? What barriers limit the scale and effectiveness of these instruments? Are these mechanisms adapting to this new economic logic? Is there truly a shortage of resources, or does the problem lie in coordination and access to existing mechanisms? Or, more fundamentally, does it stem from how "success" and "scale" are defined from the perspective of capital holders?

This publication seeks to address these fundamental questions through an unprecedented mapping and systematic analysis of 141 financial mechanisms with direct or indirect focus on the bioeconomy across the nine countries and territories of the Pan-Amazon region. The study reveals a surprisingly diverse and complex landscape: contrary to the common perception of resource scarcity, it identifies a sophisticated mosaic of financial solutions ranging from traditional instruments such as grants and equity funds to emerging innovations such as biodiversity credits, habitat banks, and debt-for-nature swaps.

However, a significant gap remains between sources of capital and effective access by community-based producers. This mismatch arises from multiple factors — ranging from complex documentation and procedural requirements to unstable funding flows — as well as limited technical capacity and persistent information asymmetries between financiers and beneficiaries.

At a deeper level, this gap reflects a conceptual divide: the sociobioeconomy proposes a new economic paradigm — grounded in values of regeneration, cooperation, and territoriality — yet most financial mechanisms have not been redesigned accordingly. As a result, success criteria and performance metrics remain anchored in traditional economic references, often misaligned with the nature and maturation timelines of community-based and forest-based initiatives.

Although the sociobioeconomy serves as the central axis of analysis, the mapping also covers instruments in sectors such as clean energy, sustainable transport, and green tourism, which can generate positive externalities for sociobiodiversity-related value chains. By showcasing both the diversity of existing mechanisms and the limited number of instruments with a dedicated focus, the study underscores the importance of advancing the development of financial solutions that are better aligned with territorial contexts and the needs of Amazonian actors.

Key findings from the mapping show that 57.5% of the mechanisms use blended finance structures, integrating public, private, and

philanthropic resources in increasingly sophisticated arrangements. This type of financial architecture enables capital providers with different objectives to invest together while achieving their respective goals — whether financial returns, social impact, or a combination of both. The study indicates that this is a growing trend in the sector; however, beyond its potential, it also introduces challenges related to governance, alignment of interests, and operational requirements.

Brazil accounts for the largest share of instruments mapped (45.4% operating exclusively in the country and participating in another 28.4%), highlighting its central role in the regional ecosystem. Mechanisms focused on payments for ecosystem services lead the portfolio (27.7%), followed by integrated agricultural systems and ecosystem restoration (both 21.3%), reflecting the growing recognition of the intrinsic value of natural assets.

The diversity identified represents both a potential and a challenge. On the one hand, it reflects a legitimate search for solutions adapted to Amazonian complexity and to the wide range of beneficiary profiles — from Indigenous Peoples and traditional communities to biotechnology startups and medium-sized agroforestry enterprises. On the other hand, it creates a fragmented landscape that can significantly increase the effort required from local entrepreneurs to navigate among multiple mechanisms with differing requirements, languages, and processes.

Several of the mapped mechanisms have already mobilized resources but have yet to complete their structuring cycle to operate effectively. This mismatch between financial availability and execution capacity highlights the importance of investing not only in fundraising but also in consolidating operational and governance frameworks.

The methodological approach involved two complementary levels of analysis: a general survey that systematized publicly available information on the 141 mechanisms identified; an in-depth qualitative analysis of representative cases across categories and strategies; and the application of a critical analysis matrix structured around three key dimensions: (1) size, structuring level, and operational status; (2) impact evaluation system, transparency, and public documentation; and (3) adaptability and perceived additionality.

This analytical matrix contributes to understanding not only what exists within the financing ecosystem, but also how these instruments operate in practice, which factors determine their success or limitations, and what their effective contribution is to strengthening the regional bioeconomy. The analysis considers aspects such as operational complexity, access requirements, monitoring and evaluation systems, transparency in communicating results, flexibility across different territorial contexts, and evidence of additionality relative to other existing instruments.

The study seeks to highlight the key determinants that either constrain performance (barriers and bottlenecks) or enhance and accelerate it (success factors) across financial mechanisms. This understanding is essential for improving existing instruments and developing new, more effective financial solutions tailored to the Pan-Amazon context.

The findings reveal that, while there is a solid base of financial mechanisms dedicated to the bioeconomy, the ecosystem would benefit substantially from strategic optimization and the promotion of mechanisms designed under new logics necessary to foster sociobiodiversity. The number and diversity of available instruments contrast with the perception of limited resources, suggesting that the central challenges lie in the coordination among mechanisms, the simplification of access procedures, the adaptation to specific territorial realities, and the creation of synergies that can amplify collective impact.

This executive summary synthesizes the main results of the full study and is addressed to a diverse audience of decision-makers — public and private financiers seeking to maximize the impact of their investments, as well as entrepreneurs and community organizations seeking to identify and access suitable financing opportunities.

Throughout this document, the following elements are presented: an overview of the 141 mapped mechanisms, including their territorial distribution, categories, and funding sources; a typology of the main mechanism profiles identified and their distinctive features; an analysis of recurring success factors and bottlenecks that limit the effectiveness of instruments; a critical assessment of the indicator and monitoring systems used by these mechanisms; and practical recommendations targeted at different types of actors to strengthen the ecosystem.

This research is an initiative of the Pan-Amazon Network for Bioeconomy, developed under the Access to Finance Task Force, with the technical and financial support of Impact Finance and NatureFinance. Its preparation was based on publicly available information on financial mechanisms applicable to the Pan-Amazon bioeconomy. It is important to note that this mapping is not intended to be exhaustive or statistically representative of the bioeconomy financing ecosystem. Factors such as asymmetries in public data and biases inherent to the mapped universe may introduce distortions in the percentages presented. The actual number of mechanisms should therefore always be considered greater than the scope of this study.

Executive summary

1. What is the Pan-Amazon bioeconomy

The Pan-Amazon bioeconomy represents a development approach grounded in the sustainable use of the Amazon's biodiversity and natural resources, integrating traditional knowledge, culture, science, innovation, and social inclusion. It is distinguished by its deep connection to the region's ways of life and socio-cultural assets, prioritizing production models that keep the forest standing, value sociobiodiversity, and ensure tangible economic benefits for local populations.

While global and national advances in defining the bioeconomy — such as the G20 High-Level Principles on Bioeconomy and Brazil's National Bioeconomy Policy — are acknowledged, the Pan-Amazon perspective emphasizes a territorial and socio-cultural vision. This entails recognizing Indigenous and traditional knowledge as foundations of innovation and promoting value chains that respect the rhythms, rights, and territories of Amazonian peoples.

This conception aligns with the principles of climate justice, territorial equity, and ecological transition, connecting the bioeconomy to global frameworks such as the Paris Agreement, the Global Biodiversity Framework, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and the G20 Principles. More than an alternative economic model, it represents an integrated strategy for sustainable and regenerative development that seeks to reconcile environmental conservation, economic prosperity, and collective well-being.

For the purposes of this study, the definition adopted by the Pan-Amazon Network for Bioeconomy considers the bioeconomy as the set of productive activities — grounded in local and traditional knowledge, science, and innovation — that value sociobiodiversity and promote the sustainable use of nature as a development strategy for the region. This definition served as a reference for selecting the mechanisms mapped and for assessing their alignment with the Pan-Amazon bioeconomy.

2. Methodology

The study was conducted between April and July 2025 and structured into three complementary phases: (i) scoping and methodological design; (ii) collection and systematization of publicly available information; and (iii) in-depth analysis of selected financial mechanisms.

In the first phase, the scope of the research was defined, prioritizing financial mechanisms with direct or indirect engagement in the bioeconomy of the Pan-Amazon region. A data collection protocol was developed based on five key dimensions: institutional characterization; mechanism design and operationalization; beneficiary profile; monitoring, reporting, and safeguards; and success factors and challenges. This protocol guided the systematization of information through a structured document review supported by artificial intelligence tools.

The second phase mobilized multiple sources of information, including public documents, impact reports, institutional websites, and specialized databases. The data were standardized, consolidated, and analyzed in aggregate form, enabling the identification of patterns, trends, and gaps within the bioeconomy financing ecosystem.

This mapping was not exhaustive, and the number of mechanisms should always be considered greater than the universe captured by the study. The analyzed sample should not be interpreted as a statistically representative set of all existing mechanisms. Furthermore, the sector is highly dynamic and rapidly expanding, with new financial mechanisms being launched continuously. To ensure analytical consistency, a temporal cut-off was applied, meaning that the structuring level of some mechanisms may have changed between the period of data collection and the completion of this publication.

3. Overview of mapped financial mechanisms

Recognizing the diversity of interpretations surrounding the concept of bioeconomy, the study found that only 34 percent (48 mechanisms) of the 141 mechanisms mapped exclusively serve bioeconomy value chains in the broad sense, while just 8.5 percent (12 mechanisms) focus solely on sociobiodiversity

or sociobioeconomy value chains, according to the typology adopted in the study[1].

The analysis of the 141 mapped mechanisms allowed the identification of eight main categories of financial instruments that sustain the Pan-Amazon bioeconomy, reflecting the diversity of approaches used to reach different beneficiaries and objectives. The categories are:

1. Hybrid[2] (29%): Combine instruments such as loans, equity investments, guarantees, and grants, allowing flexibility to support initiatives with multiple integrated financial services, from startups to cooperatives.

2. Grants (23%): Non-reimbursable resources directed to early-stage initiatives such as community or pilot projects, often implemented by local organizations.

3. Equity (18%): Direct equity investments focused on scalable businesses such as biotechnology startups or agroforestry enterprises.

4. Debt (17%): Loans with defined repayment terms, generally targeted at ventures with proven repayment capacity, such as cooperatives or small enterprises.

5. Subsidy (4%): Public financial support that covers part of project or value-chain costs, helping to ensure the economic viability of strategic bioeconomy chains (e.g., rubber, fibers, pirarucu). Unlike grants, subsidies complement the remuneration of production rather than fund specific projects.

6. Fiscal or tax incentives (3%): Tax reductions or exemptions designed to increase the competitiveness of sustainable businesses. Only fiscal measures applied directly to bioeconomy value chains were considered here.

7. Guarantee (3%): Instruments that mitigate credit risk, facilitating access to finance for ventures with limited collateral or reducing borrowing costs.

8. Innovative financial initiatives (3%): Emerging tools such as biodiversity credits, habitat banks, or debt-for-nature swaps, generally in testing or early-structuring stages.

These categories encompass distinct types of financial mechanisms and reflect the complexity of the bioeconomy financing ecosystem. The classification is not intended to serve as a rigid taxonomy for the sector but rather as an analytical framework to identify patterns, gaps, and opportunities for strengthening existing mechanisms and inspiring new solutions better suited to the Pan-Amazon context.

4. Success factors

The analysis of the 141 financial mechanisms identified a set of factors that enhance their effectiveness and ability to generate positive impact on the Pan-Amazon bioeconomy. These factors provide insights into the structural and operational conditions that contribute to the success of such mechanisms.

The first factor concerns clarity of purpose and alignment with context — that is, the existence of clear objectives focused on strengthening sociobiodiversity value chains, directly connected to the socio-cultural and environmental contexts of the territories where they operate. Mechanisms that engage in active listening and foster the participation of local actors tend to be more effective in resource allocation and in delivering tangible social and environmental results.

Another decisive factor is the quality of governance, understood as the capacity of mechanisms to establish transparent

[1] See Section 1.4

[2] Throughout the study, it was observed that the term blended finance is used both to describe mechanisms that combine resources from different sources and to refer to mechanisms that integrate multiple financial strategies or services. For the sake of clarity in this study, the term **hybrid** is used for mechanisms that integrate multiple financial strategies and services, while **blended finance** is used to describe mechanisms that draw resources from diverse origins — namely, those that combine public/governmental, private/corporate, and philanthropic capital, or any combination thereof.

arrangements with clearly defined roles, shared decision-making processes, and strong accountability systems. When governance becomes excessively oriented toward institutional control or investor compliance — to the detriment of responsiveness to clients and beneficiaries — mechanisms risk losing connection with their intended purpose.

The presence of trusted local partners and organizations that support the broader ecosystem also emerges as a key condition. Mechanisms that collaborate with proximity-based organizations — such as cooperatives, associations, and local civil-society organizations — achieve greater legitimacy and outreach within communities and local enterprises, while reducing transaction costs and operational risks.

In addition, the combination of financial instruments with complementary forms of support — such as technical assistance, capacity-building, and managerial support — as well as the integration of multiple sources of capital, increases the effectiveness of mechanisms by ensuring stronger alignment with the needs of clients and beneficiaries. Specialized technical assistance for sustainable projects and practices should be understood as a de-risking strategy.

Mechanisms that combine financial support with capacity-building, market access, and specialized technical assistance are more likely to succeed; however, they also face the risk of losing focus given the multiple vulnerabilities present in the region. In this sense, implementing structured programs for training, mentoring, technical assistance, and market facilitation — through partnerships with specialized organizations — was consistently mentioned as a success factor.

Finally, effective monitoring of operations enables continuous strategic adjustments and the recognition of actual impacts. Indicators that are genuinely used as management tools — and not merely for reporting — strengthen the learning cycle of mechanisms and consequently enhance their overall effectiveness.

When these factors are present in an integrated manner, they amplify the results of financial mechanisms and indicate clear pathways for improvement, creating more favorable conditions for replication across diverse contexts of the Pan-Amazon region.

5. Barriers and recurrent bottlenecks

Although the mapping reveals a diversified and technically sophisticated financial ecosystem, the study also identified recurring bottlenecks that limit the effectiveness of the mechanisms and constrain their ability to foster and scale the bioeconomy.

These bottlenecks overlap in many cases — some are linked to the internal operation and management of financial mechanisms and can be addressed directly, while others are structural and contextual, stemming from the broader business and policy environment and beyond the control of mechanism managers.

One of the most critical issues is the fragmentation of the financial ecosystem, characterized by the multiplicity of mechanisms operating under distinct logics, conceptual frameworks, criteria, and processes. While this diversity is positive from an innovation perspective, it makes navigation difficult for beneficiaries and undermines synergies among mechanisms. As a result, entrepreneurs are often required to adapt to multiple due diligence formats, accountability procedures, and reporting systems, increasing operational costs and reducing overall efficiency.

The analysis also identified weaknesses in governance and accountability systems. In many cases, decision-making processes remain concentrated in actors external to the territories, with limited participation from local representatives and little transparency in defining priorities and allocating resources.

This contributes to a growing disconnect between the instruments and the actual needs of local territories.

Additionally, mechanisms face challenges related to the predictability and continuity of financing. Many operate with short funding cycles and are vulnerable to political shifts, market volatility, and fluctuations in external sources. The absence of long-term financial sustainability strategies limits the ability to conduct patient and incremental investments, increases transaction costs for both operators and clients, and compromises the generation of consistent results and robust impacts.

There is also a mismatch between the timeframes of financial operations and expectations of results or returns, compounded by low predictability — often subject to external factors beyond the control of clients or beneficiaries. This creates a business environment marked by constant tension among actors at different levels of the financing chain.

A significant share — 52 mechanisms (36.9%) — were classified as having high access complexity. These mechanisms frequently involve extensive due diligence processes, stringent collateral requirements, alignment with multiple standards (such as ESG certifications), or dependence on governmental negotiations and multi-stakeholder coordination. Examples include blended finance funds and thematic bonds, which, although innovative, are particularly challenging to access for small producers or community-based organizations.

The complexity of access to and contracting of financial mechanisms within the bioeconomy reflects the intersection between sophisticated financial instrument design, the need for multi-sector coordination, the geographic particularities of the Amazon, and the relative immaturity of the bioeconomy financing ecosystem. At a deeper level, it raises a fundamental question: to what extent is the financial ecosystem truly adopting new logics compatible with the sociobioeconomy — rather than merely adapting traditional models of success and scale to the specificities of the Amazon?

One of the most frequent barriers concerns the difficulty of access to financing faced by communities, local organizations, and small entrepreneurs. This difficulty results from excessively complex requirements, technical language that is not accessible, disproportionate documentation demands, the need for physical presence, and the absence of communication channels adapted to local realities. Such conditions tend to favor organizations with greater institutional capacity and exclude precisely those segments that have historically faced structural barriers — reinforcing the perception of limited financial availability for the bioeconomy.

The predominance of mechanisms with medium and high complexity suggests that, despite growing efforts to make financing available for the bioeconomy, significant barriers to access remain — especially for smaller or less structured actors. High complexity reduces the inclusiveness and overall effectiveness of mechanisms, particularly in regions such as the Amazon, where communities often lack the infrastructure or institutional experience to navigate complex financial processes.

Although mechanisms aim to serve a broad range of actors — from startups and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) to cooperatives, family farmers, fintechs, impact businesses, and Indigenous and traditional communities — access requirements often demand high levels of formalization, which limit participation from community-based initiatives that are more informal or in early stages of development.

Lastly, the limited integration with public policies and national or subnational regulatory frameworks undermines the scalability and institutionalization of the solutions mapped. In some cases, mechanisms function as “islands of innovation,” disconnected from broader structural policies, which hinders the

expansion of their positive effects and the consolidation of their most successful models.

The climate emergency and the global demand for forest-positive solutions cannot be addressed through time horizons incompatible with the natural cycles of the bioeconomy. The development of consistent results requires adequate time — time for mechanisms to learn, adjust, and refine their strategies before being labeled as successful or not.

Addressing these bottlenecks requires not only improving existing instruments but also promoting an integrated strategic vision that strengthens articulation among mechanisms, territories, and public policies.

6. Analysis of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

The analysis of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) disclosed by the financial mechanisms mapped reveals relevant patterns regarding how these instruments define, measure, and report their results across operational, environmental, social, and economic dimensions. Although most mechanisms adopt some form of performance indicators, their depth, quality, and alignment with bioeconomy objectives vary substantially.

Operational indicators — such as volume of disbursed resources — and output-based metrics — such as number of beneficiaries reached or proxies like hectares conserved — remain predominant. In contrast, indicators that measure outcomes and impacts — such as increases in revenue and margins of supported businesses, income generation, or tangible social and environmental benefits — are less frequent or used only as complementary evidence.

There is also a clear tendency to replicate generic indicators required by investors, particularly multilateral and philanthropic organizations, with limited contextualization to the territorial specificities of the Pan-Amazon region. In several cases, the metrics adopted fail to engage with local ways of life, overlooking socially, culturally, or symbolically relevant dimensions. This disconnect limits the ability of KPIs to capture real impacts, reducing monitoring systems to bureaucratic compliance tools rather than instruments for learning and adaptive management.

Furthermore, the diversity of bioeconomy value chains and the sensitivity of indicators in capturing results pose additional challenges. Mechanisms designed for community-based or traditional enterprises often apply the same KPIs used in conventional businesses, disregarding their structural and operational differences.

The study also notes an increasing complexity of measurement systems, which does not necessarily translate into better results across the multiple dimensions of impact. Even among mechanisms with more robust evaluation frameworks, the data produced are not always used to inform strategies, adjust approaches, or guide decision-making. Monitoring efforts frequently prioritize reporting to investors rather than strengthening internal learning and institutional capacity.

Rather than creating and promoting additional or more complex sets of indicators, it may be more effective to develop a curated base of context-sensitive indicators that can be adopted and adapted by mechanism managers according to their operational maturity and context.

By doing so, mechanisms can reduce the effort and cost associated with developing bespoke metrics and redirect resources toward their core financial operations.

Monitoring fewer KPIs — but doing so more meaningfully and strategically — may be more efficient and cost-effective than enforcing multiple indicator standards that may not be relevant to the specific mechanism, its operations, its beneficiaries, or the value chains in which it operates.

7. Critical reflections on the limits and dilemmas of financial mechanisms

Despite the growing number and sophistication of financial mechanisms directed toward the bioeconomy in the Pan-Amazon region, the study reveals structural dilemmas that help explain why the impact of these instruments has not yet materialized more broadly on the ground.

First, the quality of governance stands out as a decisive factor for success — not only in terms of institutional control, but also as a foundation of legitimacy and territorial alignment. Mechanisms often need to navigate a delicate balance between the demands, requirements, and expectations of investors and those of clients and beneficiaries, within a clear asymmetry of power between these two poles.

Second, there remains a persistent challenge associated with the multiplicity and rigidity of environmental and social safeguard standards. Although these safeguards are necessary and well-intentioned, in practice they often translate into overlapping controls, layers of bureaucracy, and ultimately, higher costs and barriers to access. Excessively rigid compliance requirements can exclude legitimate enterprises, while overly flexible ones may compromise environmental integrity. Finding the right equilibrium remains a complex and delicate task.

Another critical point concerns the risk of investment substitution. Not all mapped mechanisms necessarily mobilize new or additional capital. In some cases, resources previously allocated to philanthropy have been rebranded and incorporated into more complex financial structures. While this can help cover early-stage or first-loss costs within such mechanisms, it may also restrict access for less-structured clients or beneficiaries who once accessed those philanthropic resources but are now excluded from blended mechanisms with stricter eligibility criteria.

The technical and institutional complexity of financial arrangements also constitutes a major barrier. Many instruments require sophisticated governance structures, collateral guarantees, financial valuation methods, and management capacities that are far removed from the realities of Amazonian enterprises — which are often informal, collectively managed, and embedded within complex local dynamics.

Furthermore, there is a dilemma between scale and impact measurement. The pressure to deliver standardized and comparable metrics can discourage support for smaller, territorially rooted models that are highly relevant socio-environmentally but less “scalable” in conventional investment terms. This dynamic makes it harder to attract capital to effective, place-based initiatives that do not fit within traditional investment frameworks. Additionally, the requirement to report standardized indicators often imposes operational costs on beneficiaries — and in many cases, it remains unclear who actually bears those costs.

Finally, the study emphasizes that structural barriers such as land tenure insecurity, excessive bureaucracy, and widespread informality cannot be solved by financial mechanisms alone. These issues demand broader reforms and coordinated public policy action to create an enabling environment for sustainable finance in the Amazon.

These reflections underscore the need not merely to multiply financial mechanisms, but to ensure that they can operate within a favorable and coherent enabling environment — managing resources under conditions compatible with the Pan-Amazon reality. Such mechanisms must integrate local knowledge, respect territorial timeframes, and promote development grounded in alternative concepts of success — beyond conventional financial paradigms.

8. Strategic recommendations for different actors

Based on the evidence gathered throughout the mapping and analysis of financial mechanisms, the study presents a set of practical recommendations aimed at different key actors within the Pan-Amazon bioeconomy ecosystem. The objective is to guide the improvement of existing instruments, inspire the design of new ones, and foster institutional synergies to amplify collective impact.

For **financial mechanism operators and managers**, it is recommended to:

1. Adopt new logics compatible with the sociobioeconomy, rather than merely adapting traditional models of success and scale to the specificities of the Pan-Amazon region;

2. Improve governance systems to enhance transparency, accountability, and local participation;

3. Integrate different financial services and support structures (e.g., shared solutions, back-office systems) in ways that allow clients and beneficiaries to focus on their core activities;

4. Simplify access and reporting procedures to reduce transaction costs and administrative barriers;

5. Adopt incremental approaches, with progressively larger tickets and proportionate requirements according to the maturity of the beneficiaries;

6. Use data and indicators as management tools, not merely as reporting obligations, to inform learning and strategic decision-making; and

7. Broaden and redefine the concept of Return on Investment (ROI) to include non-financial benefits such as avoided deforestation, biodiversity conservation, and cultural valorization.

For **private and philanthropic financiers**, it is advised to:

1. Support hybrid mechanisms with specialized focus on specific value chains, designed from an understanding of local realities and the diversity of territorial contexts.

2. Invest in long-term arrangements that prioritize financial sustainability and the durability of positive impacts, allocating adequate time and resources for building trust and pre-investment community engagement;

3. Redesign formal and documentary requirements based on local realities — moving beyond mere "flexibilization" toward a reconfiguration of access criteria that reflect socio-cultural and productive contexts, promoting genuine inclusion and valorization of sociobiodiversity; and

4. Adopt KPIs that are context-sensitive, reflecting territorial specificities and community priorities.

For **local organizations, territorial networks, and civil society**, it is suggested to:

1. Promote greater coherence in eligibility criteria, defining minimum common principles among mechanisms — without imposing rigid standardization — to respect the territorial and cultural diversity of the sociobioeconomy while facilitating understanding and access for beneficiaries;

2. Support the creation of a regional taxonomy of financial mechanisms, aligned with existing international standards and with the principles and objectives of the sociobioeconomy;

3. Strengthen collaboration networks and cross-institutional coordination to enhance collective learning and efficiency;

4. Develop a minimum set of standardized KPIs, adaptable to each context, that can be integrated into local impact systems;

5. Create integrated technical and financial support hubs that connect and articulate different mechanisms, promoting operational

synergies, knowledge exchange, and easier access for community-based entrepreneurs;

6. Improve communication strategies to facilitate access to information and navigation through the financial ecosystem for community and grassroots organizations;

7. Develop shared structures to reduce indirect and transaction costs among mechanisms;

8. Design collective risk-management solutions (e.g., guarantee or insurance funds) to enhance resilience;

9. Coordinate more effectively with public authorities to create a favorable business and regulatory environment; and

10. Engage with financiers strategically to prevent cascading or overlapping safeguard and KPI requirements — promoting incremental implementation and contextual alignment of standards.

Finally, for **national and subnational policymakers**, it is recommended to:

1. Align bioeconomy regulatory frameworks with long-term financing strategies, including a regional taxonomy consistent with existing international standards and the principles and objectives of the sociobioeconomy;

2. Strengthen public incentive policies that recognize and value hybrid instruments integrating public, private, and philanthropic resources;

3. Acknowledge and support mechanisms based on environmental assets and ecosystem services, integrating them into policy frameworks;

4. Incorporate criteria of adaptability and territorial relevance into public programs and calls for proposals;

5. Recognize Pan-Amazon diversity and redesign approaches based on new logics that integrate socio-cultural diversity — placing territories, their knowledge, and their ways of life at the center, not as variables of adaptation, but as starting points for policy and financial mechanism design; and

6. Invest in enabling infrastructure — such as energy, connectivity, and transportation — to reduce systemic costs and enhance territorial access;

These recommendations should not be interpreted as prescriptive, but rather as inputs for a continuous process of capacity-building and institutional strengthening. The success of the Pan-Amazon bioeconomy depends on strategic convergence among actors and on the creation of an environment rooted in trust, transparency, and shared responsibility.

9. Final considerations and next steps

The study's findings demonstrate that strengthening financing for the Pan-Amazon bioeconomy is not merely a regional agenda, but a key pillar for achieving global commitments undertaken by Amazonian countries under international frameworks such as the Paris Agreement, the Global Biodiversity Framework, and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Although the high proportion of mechanisms with strong additionality indicates a genuine effort toward innovation and the design of tailored financial solutions to address Amazon-specific challenges, the study shows that such innovation still largely operates within the boundaries of traditional financial architectures, which are not always suited to the region's territorial and socio-cultural realities.

Thus, even within a diversified and technically sophisticated ecosystem, structural and operational bottlenecks persist — including high access complexity, lack of alignment with local temporal and cultural rhythms, and weak connections between mechanisms and territories. These gaps limit the effectiveness and transformative potential of the

instruments. In other words, the pursuit of innovation has not always resulted in a true paradigm shift, and many mechanisms remain constrained by external logics disconnected from the sociobioeconomy they seek to advance.

The analysis of additionality and perceived differentiation among bioeconomy financial mechanisms in the Amazon reveals a strong drive toward innovation. The ability to combine risk capital with socio-environmental impact, the strategic use of technology to improve transparency and efficiency, and the focus on local autonomy and community empowerment stand out as key pillars that distinguish high-additionality mechanisms and signal a meaningful evolution in sustainable development financing approaches in the region.

Financial mechanisms that support sustainable value chains, value traditional knowledge, promote the sustainable use of biodiversity, and foster inclusive economic models contribute directly to climate mitigation and adaptation goals, biodiversity conservation, poverty reduction, gender equity, and the reduction of inequalities.

However, this transformation will not be achieved merely through more financial resources, but through better-designed arrangements, greater institutional coherence, and stronger capacity for territorial adaptation.

The mapping demonstrates that there is already a solid foundation of active mechanisms. Many of them combine multiple financial instruments, offer technical support, pursue positive impacts, and operate in partnership with local organizations. These promising experiences highlight the potential of financial innovation as an ally of sociobiodiversity.

By recognizing the standing forest as economic and social infrastructure and forest peoples as key agents of the transition to regenerative economies, the Amazon bioeconomy positions itself as a tangible bridge between conservation and development.

Rethinking the role of finance in the Amazon is imperative. The future of the bioeconomy depends not only on technical innovation but on institutional courage, active listening, and the ability to connect worlds that have historically operated in separation.

The strategic organization of the regional financial ecosystem — grounded in territorial justice, shared responsibility, and diversity of instruments — represents an essential lever for building a fairer and more sustainable future, both for the Amazon and for the planet.

More than a mapping exercise, this study serves as an invitation to collective action — to co-create a robust, inclusive, and adaptive financial ecosystem capable of valuing the standing forest, traditional knowledge, and the sustainable enterprises that emerge from the territory.

We are committed to providing accurate and up-to-date information. If you identify any errors or have suggestions for improving this publication, please contact us at info@amzbio.org

This study employed artificial intelligence tools to support the collection, systematization, and analysis of data.

Disclaimer

This report has been translated using artificial intelligence. While efforts have been made to ensure accuracy, the translation may contain errors or inconsistencies. In case of any discrepancies, the original version should be considered the authoritative source.