



## Fostering Justice across the Rio Conventions: Emerging Levers for Cooperation and Coordination

Mariya Aleksandrova, Aparajita Banerjee, Marcelo Inacio da Cunha, Jean Carlo Rodríguez de Francisco, Michael Brüntrup & Daniele Malerba

### Summary

The ever-deepening planetary crisis stipulates the urgency of bringing the Rio Conventions – the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) – closer together to achieve common goals and overcome trade-offs. The 2024 meetings of the Conferences of the Parties (COPs), the supreme decision-making bodies of the Conventions, offer a window of opportunity towards that end. High-level political momentum was created with the official launch of the pioneering Rio Trio Initiative in the run-up of the three COPs in September to catalyse urgent collaboration between the three Rio Conventions to achieve sustainable futures for all.

This Policy Brief explores entry points for enhanced cooperation and coordination with a focus on three emerging themes under the UNFCCC: nature-based solutions (NbS), loss and damage, and just transition pathways. In addition, we argue that the Rio Conventions offer multilateral and national platforms for integrating common justice principles (distributive, procedural, recognition, restorative, cosmopolitan, ecological) to meet shared goals across these three themes.

### Key policy insights

- There is a need to strengthen the governance of NbS across the three Rio Conventions so that NbS are not considered as the ticket to business as usual. Even though there is controversial evidence of the impacts of NbS on social and ecological justice, currently there are not enough developed joint measures between the Conventions to address these risks.
- The evolving loss and damage governance and finance space under the UNFCCC could be instrumental for creating synergies in the areas of capacity development, policy instruments and financial mechanisms for building just response frameworks of interconnected risks.
- The Just Transition Work Programme (UNFCCC) should be informed by relevant priorities along with the inclusion of justice elements established under the CBD and UNCCD.
- Existing formats for cooperation and coordination between the Rio Conventions and their financial mechanisms should be enhanced to catalyse linkages while integrating common justice principles.
- Establishing coordination mechanisms at the national level is key. The success of the Rio Conventions hinges on how Parties can design coherent policies that have a synergistic approach to achieve multiple environmental objectives and align them with broader domestic development goals for a just and equitable society for present and future generations.

## Introduction

The Rio Earth Summit in 1992 marked a significant turning point in global environmental history. It was here that the need for a global response to multiple environmental challenges was internationally and formally recognised, leading to the adoption of two global environmental agreements – the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) – and the decision for developing the third agreement, the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), which was adopted in 1994. Since then, the three Rio Conventions have been at the heart of multilateral cooperation on climate change, biodiversity and desertification. They play a pivotal role in driving the national environmental action of signatory member states, in that they stipulate formally agreed common principles, goals, targets and indicators, and reporting frameworks. These are often also the prerequisites for support through international financial mechanisms.

However, progress to date has also shown that the different objectives shaped by these agreements are difficult to achieve without trade-offs. Solutions for achieving one goal may conflict with or be harmful to the process for achieving other goals. Varying ecological and economic conditions across countries can lead to competing domestic priorities and conflicting policies. At the global level, different national priorities can influence the commitment under the three Conventions and thus create implementation imbalances. A coherent approach is therefore required to balance environmental and development objectives to reduce conflicts and leverage synergies between policies pursuing the Rio Conventions.

Essentially, policy synergies for enhanced coherence should be just, especially for vulnerable and marginalised sections of society. Although climate change, biodiversity loss and land degradation are mounting crises, the simultaneous challenges of poverty and inequality are a grave concern, too. The actions taken to achieve various climate and

environmental goals could create new societal injustices or exacerbate existing ones.

Within this context, this Policy Brief discusses avenues for enhancing synergies and reducing trade-offs across the Conventions hinged on co-operation and coordination to promote coherence and foster justice. We argue that three emerging thematic areas and related processes under the UNFCCC provide opportunity towards that end: nature-based solutions (NbS), loss and damage, and just transition.

## Global goals under the Rio Conventions

The UNFCCC aims to stabilise greenhouse gas concentrations to prevent climate change and has facilitated agreements such as the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement. The latter aims to limit the global temperature rise to well below 2°C, with efforts to cap it at 1.5°C. It also sets a global adaptation goal to enhance adaptive capacity and climate change resilience. Specific adaptation targets were agreed upon at COP28 (e.g. on water, food, health and ecosystems), while COP29 will focus on defining a post-2025 collective goal on climate finance. Nationally, countries must prepare climate strategies with specific goals, known as Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), though their implementation remains voluntary. Member countries are currently gearing up to submit the third generation of NDCs in 2025.

The CBD's objectives are to preserve biological diversity, promote its sustainable use and ensure a fair benefit-sharing of genetic resource uses. These goals are further supported by the introduction of the Kunming–Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (KMGBF) in 2022, a non-binding agreement with 23 targets to guide global biodiversity efforts until 2030. These include, among others, setting 30 per cent of the planet's land and water surfaces under public and private conservation status, restoring 30 per cent of all degraded ecosystems, reducing subsidies harmful for biodiversity and mobilising at least USD 200

billion per year to support the implementation of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAP).

The UNCCD addresses desertification, land degradation and drought. Unlike the UNFCCC and the CBD, the UNCCD has no global target, as it was initially mainly targeted towards arid and semi-arid poor countries under stress of desertification. However, two main goal-oriented processes have developed under the UNCCD. The first relates to the Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) target setting, which is aimed at avoiding new – and reducing existing – land degradation and restoring degraded land. This positions the UNCCD as the custodian UN agency for Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) target 15.3 (combat desertification and restore degraded land and soil). The UNCCD's LDN initiative invites countries to formulate voluntary targets in accordance with their national circumstances and development priorities, and it supports them throughout the process of achieving these. The second approach relates to promoting drought resilience through various initiatives, such as support to Parties to develop national drought plans or the drought toolbox.

### ***Trade-offs and co-benefits***

Land (and also water) is pivotal in uniting targets across Conventions, serving as carbon sinks (forests, peatland, biofuels, biomaterials) and aiding climate adaptation (e.g. food and income security). However, achieving climate, biodiversity and land restoration goals may involve trade-offs with implications for social and ecological justice. For example, KMGBF priorities such as the 30 by 30 targets (30 per cent restoration and 30 per cent protection) might weaken local climate resilience, especially in areas managed by Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities. The one-sided promotion of biomass and bioenergy for climate change mitigation might endanger biodiversity and (smallholder) crop diversity or local livelihoods. In some cases, biodiversity protection may impede the activities of local (smallholder) farmers and threaten their livelihoods and even food security,

for instance by restricting the use of natural resources for grazing domestic animals, certain crops or cultivation practices such as fertiliser or pesticide application.

Nevertheless, such trade-offs can often be avoided, mitigated or even reversed, bringing along co-benefits. For instance, many types of agro-ecological agriculture can support biodiversity, mitigation through carbon capture in soils and vegetation, and livelihoods. Biomass and bioenergy production – if observing some rules such as the avoidance of vast monocultures and local value-addition – can also combine mitigation with local livelihood support. The (re-)discovery of the use of plants for substituting oil-based materials contributes to (agro-) biodiversity and local incomes. In addition, given the current climate and nature funding gap, combining resources to address climate change, biodiversity conservation and desertification through integrated land management approaches can be an effective strategy. Other options to reconcile environmental with economic objectives can be found in ecotourism, which values ecological and landscape wealth for local populations.

### **Cooperation and coordination mechanisms**

Overcoming potential trade-offs and generating co-benefits from interventions that benefit climate, biodiversity and land resources, both at the global and national levels, requires a coherent approach that could be enabled through enhanced cooperation and coordination between the three Rio Conventions.

In 2001, the secretariats of the UNFCCC, CBD and UNCCD established a Joint Liaison Group (JLG), which was mandated to enhance coordination between the Rio Conventions through information-sharing and to explore opportunities for cooperation (e.g. joint work plan and activities) (JLG, 2013). These have provided space for exchange and action on issues such as exploring options for piloting the joint implementation of national strategies and the harmonisation of

reporting requirements across the Conventions, as well as joint capacity-building, outreach and communication initiatives (see JLG, 2011). Yet, the potential for enhancing coherence between the three Conventions through the work of the JLG has been limited due to the differing mandates assigned by each Convention as well as financial and institutional constraints (Elsässer, 2024; Tsioumani, 2022). Furthermore, the increasing complexity of processes and politicisation of issues, especially under the UNFCCC (e.g. mitigation ambition and climate finance), pose challenges to developing a joint action agenda of the Rio Conventions (Elsässer, 2024; Tsioumani, 2022).

A certain level of cooperation and coordination has also been achieved by the financial mechanisms of the Conventions. The Global Environment Facility (GEF), acting as a key financial mechanism for six Conventions, including the UNFCCC, CBD and UNCCD, increasingly tries to promote synergies between climate, biodiversity and land degradation initiatives. Current programming includes integrated programmes such as the Food Systems Integrated Program and the Ecosystem Restoration Integrated Program (Global Environment Facility, 2022). Efforts have been made to strengthen coherence between the UN climate funds at the institutional and operational levels (e.g. harmonisation of processes) and national programme levels (e.g. GEF/Green Climate Fund (GCF) joint investment planning in pilot countries). At COP28, the heads of the GEF and the GCF, among others, released a joint declaration on enhancing access and increasing the impact of the funds, creating momentum for collaboration (GCF, 2023a). Synergies with the new Fund for Responding to Loss and Damage (FLD) under the UN climate change regime have yet to be built.

When coordination and cooperation between the three Rio Conventions is challenging at the global level, it is not surprising that member states find it difficult to create coherence between their climate, biodiversity and land restoration priorities within broader socio-economic development goals.

## Emerging avenues for synergies

The UN climate change regime has established a particularly complex and fast-evolving multilateral environment and received the most potent political attention compared to the CBD and UNCCD. In the following section, we highlight three emerging thematic areas within the UNFCCC policy space suitable for generating synergies and avoiding trade-offs with the CBD and UNCCD.

### 1. Nature-based solutions

In recent years, NbS have gained prominence under the UNFCCC and within the shared policy space of the three Rio Conventions (Boran & Petteorelli, 2024; Elsässer, 2024; Tsioumani, 2022). NbS utilise natural processes and ecosystems to tackle global challenges such as climate change, biodiversity loss and land degradation. This broad definition aligns with the goals of the three Rio Conventions. The UNFCCC recognises that NbS can play a crucial role in mitigating climate change impacts, for instance, through ecosystem-based mitigation and adaptation. The CBD emphasises the use of NbS to achieve targets of the KMGBF, for example, minimising the impacts of climate change on biodiversity and area-based conservation. Similarly, the UNCCD addresses land degradation and desertification, areas where NbS can be highly effective through restoration (e.g. forest landscape restoration) and sustainable land management.

NbS are also key to carbon and biodiversity market mechanisms under the Conventions. Although it is appealing to use markets and private funds alongside public funds, there are risks. The Kyoto Protocol introduced carbon market mechanisms, namely emissions trading, the Clean Development Mechanism and Joint Implementation. Currently, international carbon markets are governed by Article 6 of the Paris Agreement. Under the KMGBF framework, most funding is expected to come from the private sector, including biodiversity and carbon credits. These markets are used by both state and non-state actors to offset environmental impacts through

funding mitigation, restoration and conservation projects, earning credits for avoided or removed emissions or nature loss. However, biodiversity offsets often fail to provide equivalent or comparable biodiversity benefits to the impacted original site. Restoring or creating new habitats may not fully replace the original site's complex ecological functions, species interactions and long-term evolutionary processes, and may even result in more biodiversity loss. Similarly, carbon offsets face well-known challenges such as additionality (e.g. in reducing deforestation), permanence, leakage, miscounting emission reduction and over-reliance on offsets (see Hein & Rodríguez de Francisco, 2016). Also, bioenergy and biomass production aiming to reduce fossil oil and gas use has been shown to create risks for local users of land and water (Brüntrup & Herrmann, 2010; Brüntrup et al., 2016).

Likewise, poorly designed NbS can have negative impacts on human well-being and even on human rights. Numerous counts of the social implications of area-based conservation and ecosystem-based mitigation measures implemented in a way that displaces (Brockington, 2002), limits the use of natural resources by (Hein, 2018; Inacio da Cunha, 2024) and/or criminalises Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities are well documented (Rodríguez de Francisco et al., 2021). Moreover, ecosystem-based adaptation projects might have negative impacts such as the eviction of residents from suburban areas and gentrification (Richerzhagen et al., 2019).

Although there is controversial evidence of the impacts of NbS on social and ecological justice, currently, no joint measures have been developed between the Conventions to address these risks.

## **2. Loss and damage**

Loss and damage has been a disputed issue in the negotiations under the UNFCCC since the early 1990s. However, distinct progress has been made in the last 10 years with the establishment of institutional structures, including the FLD, the Warsaw International Mechanism on Loss and

Damage (WIM) and the Santiago Network (a technical assistance mechanism). Noticeably, to date, the loss and damage policy space under the UNFCCC has evolved largely disconnected from the other two Conventions.

Still, climate-induced biodiversity loss, drought, land degradation and desertification, which count as loss and damage, exemplify critical areas for cooperation and coordination between the Rio Conventions. First, actions for averting and minimising observed and anticipated loss and damage through climate change mitigation and adaptation have implications for the implementation of the CBD and UNCCD. Second, holistic approaches to address residual risks and impacts – such as drought response and recovery, rehabilitation of degraded landscapes following an extreme weather event, or migration and relocation of communities due to desertification – are needed to close important policy and finance gaps across the Conventions and to avoid potential trade-offs. Essentially, addressing the social justice implications of loss and damage related to loss of territory, cultural heritage, Indigenous knowledge, social cohesion and cultural identity and continuity require synergistic policies across the three Conventions.

## **3. Just transition pathways for climate change mitigation and resilience**

The Preamble of the Paris Agreement recognises justice and equity imperatives. Elaborating on these imperatives, the Silesia Declaration on Solidarity and Just Transition (2018) tied together both the goals of the Paris Agreement and the SDGs to address social, economic and environmental problems in such a way to increase synergies while reducing trade-offs. In this Declaration, the term “just transition” is used to recognise the rights of the workers and communities who would be affected by the transition from high-emitting industries, especially those depending on fossil fuels. This is because the energy sector is directly connected with economic growth, job creation and social equity. Overall, climate action

can negatively affect one or many SDG-related socioeconomic indicators. Consequently, Parties are undertaking policy actions to integrate just and equitable transition principles in their NDCs and Long-Term Low-Emission Development Strategies.

In 2022, with a COP27 Decision, the UNFCCC initiated the Work Programme on Just Transition Pathways (JTWP). The objective of the work programme is to safeguard that the commitments of the member states under the Paris Agreement are achieved justly and equitably, especially in developing countries, by buffering the possible negative effects of mitigation and adaptation responses while reducing poverty and inequality. The JTWP recognises that ensuring decent work, social protection support, and inclusive and participatory approaches are critical to achieving a just transition to a low-carbon and resilient future, while eradicating poverty and leaving no one behind. Social protection as a policy tool for promoting social justice has also gained acknowledgment in the contexts of loss and damage and the global goal on adaptation. The strategies of the UNFCCC's Financial Mechanism have been responsive to these new elements of global climate policy; for instance, the Strategic Plan for the GCF (2024-2027) has a focus on just transitions, among other priority areas (GCF, 2023b). However, there are divergent views on "just transition pathways" between developing country Parties to the UNFCCC, which are demanding more structural and multilateral transformations based on the principles of Common but Differentiated Responsibilities and Respective Capabilities (CBDR-RC), and developed countries, which are focussing on narrower policies around workforce and climate resilience.

Largely, however, justice principles occur (implicitly) in various work streams under the three Rio Conventions, but these differ in scope and framings. Ideas such as equity, equality, inclusivity, human rights and fairness have also found resonance in the texts of the CBD and UNCCD with the mention of imperatives such as ensuring

resilient livelihoods; fair and equitable resource- and benefit-sharing; land rights and good land governance; gender; and free, prior and informed consent. Therefore, synergies between the three Conventions can be based on principles of justice, which are explained in the next section.

## Building synergies based on common justice principles

The Rio Conventions offer multilateral and national platforms for integrating common justice principles in planning, implementing and evaluating policies to meet shared goals related to NbS, loss and damage, and just transition (for mitigation) (Table 1). This could strengthen coherence around social justice in environmental governance at the global and national levels. Below, we outline some of the main justice dimensions discussed in academic and policy literature (Banerjee, 2024).

- **Distributive justice** can ensure the fair sharing of environmental benefits and burdens so that vulnerable communities are not excessively at risk of environmental harm. This necessitates policies and measures that address the possible negative effects of climate and environmental policies on jobs, livelihoods and well-being.
- **Procedural justice** elements can help establish fair and transparent processes that can produce equitable outcomes based on the representation of affected stakeholders in decision-making and social dialogue and through transparency.
- **Recognition justice** stresses recognising all who are affected and how the integration of local knowledge, values and rights in environmental policies can be safeguarded. Value- and rights-based approaches to the planning and implementation of activities can ensure that people's perspectives, rights, needs and experiences within their locally and culturally specific contexts are respected.
- **Restorative justice** underlines the need for rehabilitation of those who are endangered by

climate change, environmental damage and biodiversity loss, and how long-term adaptation, restoration and resilience of people and ecosystems can be achieved.

- **Cosmopolitan justice** highlights that principles of justice are global in scope and that there are also ethical responsibilities to upholding justice, which applies everywhere and to every community and is especially relevant in addressing climate injustice.

Beyond human-centred values, **ecological justice** relates to preserving ecological integrity, protecting non-human species and respecting the rights of nature.

## Recommendations and policy implications

Various work streams and processes under the UNFCCC provide opportunities to enhance synergies between the three Rio Conventions while integrating the principles of justice discussed in this paper.

### *Nature-based solutions (for land)*

Efforts should be geared towards ensuring that NbS interventions are designed and governed in an inclusive and transparent manner with embedded human rights considerations. For instance, the newly established “appeal and grievance processes under the Article 6.4 mechanism” of the Paris Agreement allows groups affected by market-based climate interventions to file complaints about the (unintended) negative social effects of carbon and biodiversity credit projects in lands and ecosystems stewarded by forest peoples. The four-year “Sharm el-Sheikh joint work on implementation of climate action on agriculture and food security” is envisioned to enhance synergies for land-based interventions, among others. These processes can provide the basis for exploring common justice approaches to address and redress the social-ecological tradeoffs of given NbS with already established or emerging policies and frameworks under the UNCCD and CBD.

### *Loss and damage*

Collaborative activities should seek to advance understanding on complementarities (and gaps or contradictions) between the Conventions in terms of the (unintended) impacts, capacity development, policy instruments and financial mechanisms relevant for building a just response framework for loss and damage. For example, policy and institutional frameworks under the UNCCD at the global and national levels could be used to guide loss and damage responses in the context of drought, land degradation and desertification. Opportunities exist in the areas of drought early warning and preparedness systems, national drought plans and finance instruments such as insurance, to name some. These can be facilitated through the work of the WIM, the recently established Santiago Network and the FLD. The annual high-level dialogue on coordination and complementarity for loss and damage (agreed at COP28) could further facilitate cooperation on finance, as it aims to strengthen synergies across funding modalities, initiatives and processes under and outside of the UNFCCC and the Paris Agreement.

### *Work Programme on Just Transition Pathways*

The programme encompasses various activities such as Dialogue series, an annual high-level ministerial round table and other events aimed to advance issues, including means of implementation (finance, technology and capacity-building), fair and inclusive workforce transition to meet the Paris Agreement goals and inclusive approaches to the development of national climate strategies. These processes should be informed by relevant priorities and existing policies and frameworks established under the CBD and UNCCD. For instance, synergies can be catalysed in the areas of capacity-building, gender, green jobs and agriculture workforce, and inclusive approaches to the development of NBSAP, LDN targets and drought plans.

Beyond UNFCCC-related processes, existing formats for cooperation and coordination, such as the JLG, can be used to build synergies in the

three domains through knowledge-sharing, capacity development, and joint outreach and advocacy (Elsässer, 2024). However, as new inter-linked policy issues develop under the Rio Conventions, new formal formats (see Boran & Petto-relli, 2024) may be necessary to safeguard coherent and just responses to multiple environmental problems and their links to socio-economic development issues. The financial mechanisms of the Conventions will also need to be adjusted. Joint work on strengthening coherence and complementarity between the funds – for example through improved multi-purpose programming, alignment of monitoring and evaluation policies, and joint learning from evaluations – will be essential.

Last but not least, establishing coordination mechanisms to promote coherence at the national level is key. Collective actions between different government departments and between different levels of government are necessary to find solutions to complex problems whereby each department brings its expertise in a collaborative set-up. Such an approach can help identify proper policy frameworks and instruments that can reduce trade-offs and increase co-benefits, offering a promising future. To that end, training and capacity-building of state and non-state actors, as well as holistic research for evidence-based policy-making on the benefits and limitations of synergistic policies would be critical. The latter could be enabled by greater alignment of the transparency frameworks of the three Rio Conventions. The close and essential coordination of national focal points of the three Conventions is another key starting point for creating more coherence.

## Outlook

The forthcoming (and future) COPs, with their negotiation and decision-making processes, provide legal and policy avenues to build linkages. At the CBD COP16, Parties are expected to discuss the mainstreaming of biodiversity within and across sectors, finance, and the revised and updated NBSAP in alignment with the KMGBF (CBD, 2024). The UNFCCC COP29 will be a critical moment for raising the mitigation ambitions of countries, and for making progress on the work concerning carbon removal and markets (Article 6), loss and damage, and the new climate finance goal. In addition, last year, the Presidencies of three climate COPs – COP28 (UAE), COP29 (Azerbaijan) and COP30 (Brazil) – launched the Troika Vision to boost international cooperation and create strong political momentum for Parties to deliver ambitious climate plans that keep 1.5°C within reach. The UNCCD COP16 will be a focal point for raising global ambitions on land restoration and drought resilience. Among other agenda items, Parties will consider the findings and recommendations of the midterm evaluation of the 2018-2030 Strategic Framework of the UNCCD (2024). The recommendations emphasise the need to scale-up implementation of the voluntary LDN targets by fostering locally adapted NbS among other approaches, and to develop a long-term financing framework. Another recommendation relates to establishing global drought and land degradation target(s) and an implementation framework under the UNCCD that complements existing targets under the UNFCCC and CBD. All of these fora and events provide unique opportunities that should not be missed for signatory countries to the Conventions to build synergies at the global and national levels.



**Table 1: Strengthening synergies between the three Rio Conventions based on justice principles: examples of how justice elements can guide policy-making at the global, national and local levels**

Selected justice dimensions	NbS	Loss and damage	Just transition (mitigation)
Distributive	<p>Fair and just benefit-sharing between all actors in natural resource value chains</p> <p>Safeguard mechanisms to ensure that new policies do not exacerbate current injustices for marginalised and vulnerable communities and people</p>	<p>Just allocation of technical and financial support to countries and communities experiencing loss and damage</p> <p>Reducing risks of mal-adaptation especially in lands inhabited by marginalised people</p>	<p>Setting policies and measures to reduce impacts of mitigation policies on livelihoods, especially hard to reach communities</p> <p>Ensuring access to affordable food, water, energy, transport and other needs for health and well-being of all</p>
Procedural	<p>Co-creating and institutionalising spaces for effective participation and inclusion of potentially NbS-affected communities from the outset of any nature-based intervention</p> <p>Upholding free, prior and informed consent principles in resource access, use and management decisions</p>	<p>Inclusive approaches to the development and implementation of loss and damage response strategies and measures, and financial mechanisms</p>	<p>Timely and transparent communication of information to all actors</p> <p>Encouraging social dialogue and collective bargaining rights of citizens</p> <p>Establishing just and fair processes to provide inputs in planning, legislations and regulations</p>
Recognition	<p>Recognising that communal land tenure rights are essential enablers of effective climate change adaptation, biodiversity conservation and land restoration</p> <p>Recognising the relation Indigenous People have with their land</p> <p>Recognising access to drinking and productive water as a key (potentially endangered) resource in many NbS and investments</p>	<p>Adopting value-based approaches to ensure that loss and damage assessments are centred around local values, including people's perspectives on what they experience as tolerable and intolerable losses within their locally and culturally specific contexts (McNamara et al., 2024)</p>	<p>Addressing gender gaps and intersectionality in the energy industry and access to energy and transport systems</p> <p>Recognising informal workers within energy industry</p> <p>Respecting community rights to contest and resist new energy projects in conflict with their local socio-ecological values</p>
Restorative	<p>Linking ecological restoration projects with skills-development programmes, e.g. through forest landscape restoration initiatives</p>	<p>Providing finance and capacity-building for responding to loss and damage, e.g. decent jobs for relocated populations or people affected by shifts in economic patterns due to adverse climate impacts</p>	<p>Supporting capacity development through education, research and training to encourage local innovation and technology development</p>
Cosmopolitan	<p>Including locally adapted NbS in long-term integrated land-use planning for addressing the triple crisis, e.g. in integrated landscape management</p>	<p>Ensuring intergenerational and global climate justice based on the CBDR-RC principles that account for historical responsibility (e.g. in terms of share of global GHG emissions), capacity to pay and debt sustainability in recipient countries</p>	<p>Provision of grant funding to least developed countries, technology transfers and assistance with renewable energy development</p> <p>Promoting sustainable and inclusive value chains considering the needs of vulnerable frontier communities</p>
Ecological	<p>Protecting and acknowledging ecological integrity and rights of nature</p>	<p>Strengthen understanding and acknowledgement of adverse climate impacts on non-human living beings</p>	<p>Protecting non-human species prioritised in mitigation measures, e.g. impacts of new energy projects on wildlife</p>

Source: Authors. Justice dimensions defined and extended based on Banerjee and Schuitema (2022) and Banerjee (2024).

## References

- Banerjee, A. (2024). Transforming the rhetoric of Just Energy Transition Partnerships into reality: The devil lies in the details. *PLOS Sustainability and Transformation*, 3(8), e0000121.
- Banerjee, A., & Schuitema, G. (2022). How just are just transition plans? Perceptions of decarbonisation and low-carbon energy transitions among peat workers in Ireland. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 88, 102616.
- Boran, I., & Pettorelli, N. (2024). The Kunming–Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and the Paris Agreement need a joint work programme for climate, nature and people. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 61(9), 1991-1999.
- Brockington, D. (2002). *Fortress conservation: The preservation of the Mkomazi Game Reserve, Tanzania*. James Currey.
- Brüntrup, M., Becker, K., Prothmann, J., Ostermann, S., Gaebler, M., & Herrmann, R. (2016). *Policies and institutions for assuring pro-poor rural development and food security through bioenergy production: Case studies on bush-to-energy and Jatropha in Namibia* (DIE Studies 90). German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE).
- Brüntrup, M., & Herrmann, R. (2010). Bioenergy value chains in Namibia: Opportunities and challenges for rural development and food security. In *Proceedings to 9th European IFSA symposium: Building sustainable rural futures* (pp. 1461-1472).  
[https://www.idos-research.de/uploads/media/Conference\\_Paper\\_Wageningen\\_Namibia\\_Bioenergy\\_MB\\_RH\\_final.pdf](https://www.idos-research.de/uploads/media/Conference_Paper_Wageningen_Namibia_Bioenergy_MB_RH_final.pdf)
- Convention on Biological Diversity. (2024). *Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity Sixteenth meeting*. Cali, Colombia, 21 October-1 November.
- Elsässer, J. P. (2024). Managers of complex change? How United Nations treaty secretariats jointly govern institutional interplay in global environmental governance. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 1-13.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/eet.2105>
- GCF (Green Climate Fund). (2023a). *Enhancing access and increasing impact: The role of the multilateral climate funds*. <https://www.greenclimate.fund/statement/enhancing-access-and-increasing-impact-role-multilateral-climate-funds>
- GCF. (2023b). *GCF's 2024–2027 strategic plan sets out greater ambitions and results for critical global climate action*. <https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/gcf-b36-17-rev01>
- Global Environment Facility. (2022). *GEF-8 programming directions*. <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/gef-r-08-29-rev-01>
- Hein, J. (2018). *Political ecology of REDD+ in Indonesia agrarian conflicts and forest carbon*. Routledge.
- Hein, J., & Rodríguez de Francisco, J. C. (2016). *Carbon and biodiversity offsetting: A way towards sustainable development?* (The Current Column). German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE).
- Inacio da Cunha, M. (2024). Institution-based access implications faced by traditional communities in Amazônia: Towards co-managing protected areas and Terms of Compromise for socio-biodiversity. *Sustainability in Debate*, 15(2), 243-262.
- JLG (Joint Liaison Group). (2011). *Eleventh meeting of the Joint Liaison Group of the Rio Conventions*. <https://www.cbd.int/doc/reports/jlg-11-report-en.pdf>
- JLG. (2013). Terms of reference and modus operandi for the Joint Liaison Group between the three Rio Conventions. <https://www.cbd.int/cooperation/doc/jlg-modus-operandi-en.pdf>
- McNamara, K. E., Clissold, R., Westoby, R., Yee, M., Mariri, T., Wichman, V., ...Nand, M. M. (2024). Values must be at the heart of responding to loss and damage. *Frontiers in Climate*, 6, 1339915.
- Richerzhagen, C., Rodríguez de Francisco, J. C., Weinsheimer, F., Döhnert, A., Kleiner, L., Mayer, M., ...Philipp, E. (2019). Ecosystem-based adaptation projects, more than just adaptation: Analysis of social benefits and costs in Colombia. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16, 4248.
- Rodríguez de Francisco, J. C., del Cairo, C., Ortiz-Gallego, D., Velez-Triana, J. S., Vergara-Gutiérrez, T., & Hein, J. (2021). Post-conflict transition and REDD+ in Colombia: Challenges to reducing deforestation in the Amazon. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 127, 102450.

Tsioumani, E. (2022). *Linkages and synergies between international instruments on biodiversity and climate change*. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD), Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research (UFZ).

United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification. (2024). Midterm evaluation of the 2018-2030 Strategic Framework of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification.

[https://www.unccd.int/sites/default/files/2024-07/cop2-midterm%20advanced%20copy\\_0.pdf](https://www.unccd.int/sites/default/files/2024-07/cop2-midterm%20advanced%20copy_0.pdf)

**Dr Mariya Aleksandrova** is a project lead and senior researcher in the research programme “Environmental Governance” at the German Institute of Development and Sustainability (IDOS) in Bonn.

Email: [mariya.aleksandrova@idos-research.de](mailto:mariya.aleksandrova@idos-research.de)

**Dr Aparajita Banerjee, Dr Marcelo Inacio da Cunha** and **Dr Jean Carlo Rodríguez de Francisco** are senior researchers in the research programme “Environmental Governance” at the German Institute of Development and Sustainability (IDOS) in Bonn.

**Dr Michael Brüntrup** and **Dr Daniele Malerba** are senior researchers in the research programme “Transformation of Economic and Social Systems” at the German Institute of Development and Sustainability (IDOS) in Bonn.

*Published with financial support from the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), based on a resolution of the German Bundestag.*

Suggested citation:

Aleksandrova, M., Banerjee, A., Inacio da Cunha, M., Rodríguez de Francesco, J. C., Brüntrup, M., & Malerba, D. (2024). *Fostering justice across the Rio Conventions: Emerging levers for cooperation and coordination* (IDOS Policy Brief 31/2024). IDOS. <https://doi.org/10.23661/ipb31.2024>

Disclaimer:

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the German Institute of Development and Sustainability (IDOS).



Except otherwise noted, this publication is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0). You are free to copy, communicate and adapt this work, as long as you attribute the German Institute of Development and Sustainability (IDOS) gGmbH and the author(s).

IDOS Policy Brief / German Institute of Development and Sustainability (IDOS) gGmbH

ISSN (Print) 2751-4455

ISSN (Online) 2751-4463

<https://doi.org/10.23661/ipb31.2024>

© German Institute of Development and Sustainability (IDOS) gGmbH

Tulpenfeld 6, 53113 Bonn

Email: [publications@idos-research.de](mailto:publications@idos-research.de)

<https://www.idos-research.de>

Printed on eco-friendly, certified paper.

The institutes of the Johannes-Rau-Forschungsgemeinschaft are institutionally funded by the state of NRW.

