Paying for Local Biodiversity Outcomes

Place-specific conservation contracts and stablecoin settlement

Jace Shim · November 2026 · https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24612008

Abstract

A conservation fund can pay for verified habitat improvements under a local contract even where results from different sites cannot be treated as equivalent. This paper develops Chapter 11 of Target Money into a staged payment design. It asks how to reward measured progress while accounting for ecological uncertainty, community authority, and long monitoring periods.

Keywords · biodiversity finance, conservation contracts, ecological monitoring, stablecoin settlement

Why a local contract matters

A restored wetland and improved pollinator habitat can both be valuable. Combining them into a single quantity can obscure which ecosystem changed and who benefited. Specify the place, monitoring period, baseline, eligible activities, and rights of participating communities. A payment receipt confirms a transfer. Any environmental claim depends on separate evidence and the terms governing its use.

From field evidence to payment

Agree on a baseline and predefine indicators such as native plant survival, habitat condition, or abundance where monitoring can support inference. Separate reimbursement for documented work from bonuses for independently reviewed outcomes. A poor season or uncertainty in detection can affect measured results despite satisfactory work. Use scheduled observations and a documented dispute process. Report sensitive species locations only to authorized reviewers. Agree on the distribution of funding with affected communities before data collection.

For a hypothetical restoration contract worth 10,000, allocate 4,000 to documented work, 4,000 to the first validated outcome, and 2,000 to a later persistence check. If the first outcome is uncertain, the reviewer can confirm the work payment while deferring the outcome component. Such tranches protect operating cash flow and retain a reason to monitor persistence. The figures establish neither a price for biodiversity nor an offset right.

Measuring whether the arrangement helps

Compare outcomes-based tranches with work-only funding in sites matched by ecological and operational characteristics. Specify how baseline trends, extreme weather, and monitoring effort will be handled. Track time to usable funds, monitoring cost, participation, persistence, and adverse effects outside the project area. Compare stablecoin and conventional settlement under the same contract if both can deliver funds to recipients. The paper offers a conceptual and pilot design.

Relationship to earlier papers

The carbon paper addresses revisions to a quantity denominated in tonnes and distinct registry rights. This paper emphasizes site-specific ecological evidence and long-term stewardship. The voucher paper evaluates checkout eligibility. A conservation claim matures across field observations and review.

References

Shim, J. (2026). Target Money, Chapter 11. Raon Book.

International Advisory Panel on Biodiversity Credits. Framework for high integrity biodiversity credit markets. https://www.iapbiocredits.org/FRAMEWORK/framework

Shim, J. (2026). Paying for Verified Carbon Reductions. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24581582

Shim, J. (2026). When Do Programmable Vouchers Improve Public Spending? https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24578261