



New report: Exporting Extinction How the international financial system constraints biodiverse futures

By Third World Network

Despite a general recognition that the world is in the midst of an escalating ecological crisis, there has been a failure to act upon agreed CBD decisions such as the Aichi Targets. Why do governments struggle to meet agreed-upon targets to protect and restore biodiversity?

Conventional rationales for these failures tend to focus on a lack of political will, financial resources, awareness, and capacity to implement decisions. International and national biodiversity policy documents, including the GBF, often assume governments have autonomy to take action on biodiversity loss; that the issue is how biodiversity policy-making remains siloed in environmental ministries and neglected in consequential national decisions on finance, industry, and trade.

A new report called “Exporting Extinction” argues that these explanations are only part of the picture.

Across the planet, governments fail to meet biodiversity targets because the extraction that drives biodiversity loss continues. Extractive land use change is estimated to drive about 90 % of biodiversity loss globally. The impacts of this land use change are vastly uneven, often following patterns of extractivism, an economic development model based on largely unfettered resource exploitation, with highly unequal distributions of benefits and impacts, both between and within the Global North and Global South.

Governments around the world continue to approve, subsidise, and expand the extractive developments that erode biodiversity. The role of structural, international political and economic pressures in this is significantly under-recognised.

While domestic policies support extractive sector expansion, the pressures of the international monetary and financial system make extraction necessary to maintain financial stability.

The pressures of this system act on all states, but they are experienced unequally, such that countries with the least political-economic power are often the most subject to external pressures. As a result, Global South governments, to a variety of degrees, are constrained in their ability to choose different policy pathways due to their position within the international financial and monetary system under conditions of financial subordination. They imply that many governments must contend with an economic and financial order over which they are structurally disadvantaged and politically marginalised, leading states to face exceptional pressure to continue their role as exporters of extractive commodities due to the heightened risk of financial instability. The report argues that these risks to financial stability and their unequal application across countries are under-explored drivers of global biodiversity loss.

Find the report online here:



Survey on rights holders and civil society participation in NBSAPs process, preliminary highlights

Cristina Eghenter and Shruti Ajiit on behalf of the Human Rights& Biodiversity Working Group

The Human Rights and Biodiversity Working Group conducted an open survey to try to assess the participation of civil society and the realization of a whole-of-society approach in the NBSAP revision process. The survey had 54 respondents from civil society groups and rights holders from across 29 countries.

Some of the first results are:

- The level and quality of participation in the NBSAPs showed a great diversity of engagements and involvement. Some preliminary findings indicate that while invitations to participate come from the Governments, civil society networks also play an important role in further sharing information about the process. Moreover, there is a growing pro-active outreach of civil society organizations to the government to ask to join the process.
- Who is invited to the process? Conservation INGOs and NGOs tend to be included more than other rights holders in national level consultations. However, there is also a high number of Indigenous Peoples' networks and organizations invited, and Youth groups. Women's associations, especially grass-root ones, and human development organizations to be less visible.

- Issues around building trust, legitimate representation but also distribution and availability of information about the NBSAPs process exist, and one consultation cannot count for full and effective participation.
- Another emerging finding is that, overall, civil society and rights holders participate mainly in 'submitting written inputs' and participation in consultations (plenary and break-out group).

There are limitations to what the preliminary results of the survey can tell us about participation and the NBSAPs process. However, they do point to the need to secure more resources for realizing a truly meaningful and inclusive process at national and sub-national levels. Moreover, they highlight the critical importance of strengthening continuity of dialogue between governments and non-state actors, especially civil society and rights holders. This could be done by establishing for example inclusive multi-stakeholder platforms at national and sub-national levels to build mutual understanding, exchange, knowledge and information sharing. A whole-of-society approach is key and a social investment for the successful and just implementation of the KM-GBF

Find more details of the survey here:



ECO apologises for the scrambled text in the mainstreaming statement of yesterday's printed ECO, due to a software mix-up. The correct version can be found online.

