

# Avoiding an impending collision in international conservation

**Lovemore Sibanda**<sup>1,2,3</sup>  | **Amy Dickman**<sup>1,2</sup>  | **Courtney Hughes**<sup>2,4</sup>  | **Jessica Tacey**<sup>1,2</sup>  |  
**Emily Madsen**<sup>1,2</sup>  | **Lessah Mandoloma**<sup>1,5</sup>  | **Moreangels M. Mbizah**<sup>6</sup>  |  
**Yolanda Mutinhima**<sup>7</sup>  | **Betty Rono**<sup>8,9</sup>  | **Salum Kulunge**<sup>10,11</sup>  | **David Kimaili**<sup>12</sup>  |  
**Trisha Bhujle**<sup>13</sup>  | **David W. Macdonald**<sup>1,2</sup>  | **Darragh Hare**<sup>1,2,13</sup> 

<sup>1</sup>Department of Biology, Oxford University, Oxford, UK

<sup>2</sup>Wildlife Conservation Research Unit, The Recanati-Kaplan Centre, Department of Biology, Oxford University, Tubney, UK

<sup>3</sup>Cheetah Conservation Project Zimbabwe, Dete, Zimbabwe

<sup>4</sup>Forestry & Parks, Government of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

<sup>5</sup>Department of Environmental Science and Natural Resources Management, Lilongwe University of Agriculture and Natural Resources (LUANAR), Lilongwe, Malawi

<sup>6</sup>Wildlife Conservation Action, Harare, Zimbabwe

<sup>7</sup>Department of Wildlife, Ecology and Conservation, Chinhoyi University of Technology, Chinhoyi, Zimbabwe

<sup>8</sup>Department of Zoology and Entomology, Rhodes University, Grahamstown, South Africa

<sup>9</sup>NARE, Egerton University, Njoro, Kenya

<sup>10</sup>Tanzania Wildlife Management Authority, Morogoro, Tanzania

<sup>11</sup>Department of Wildlife Management, Sokoine University of Agriculture, Morogoro, Tanzania

<sup>12</sup>Department of Sociology and Anthropology, South-Eastern Kenya University, Kitui, Kenya

<sup>13</sup>Department of Natural Resources and the Environment, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, USA

## Correspondence

Lovemore Sibanda, Wildlife Conservation Research Unit, The Recanati-Kaplan Centre, Department of Biology, Oxford University, OX13 5QL, UK.  
Email: [lovemore.sibanda@biology.ox.ac.uk](mailto:lovemore.sibanda@biology.ox.ac.uk)

## KEYWORDS

30×30, inclusive conservation, IPLCS, Protected and Conserved Areas, Protected-Area governance

There are long-standing tensions between 2 major movements in international conservation: one emphasizes increasing the area set aside for conservation and the other emphasizes an inclusive, people-centered approach to conservation. The degree to which these movements harmonize or contradict depends largely on how decision makers balance strictly protected areas (PAs) with flexible other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs).

The United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity's Kunming–Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) embodies elements of both movements. Target 3 (30×30) sets ambitious targets to protect 30% of inland water, land, and marine ecosystems by 2030 through a combination of PAs and

OECMs while respecting the rights of Indigenous People and local communities (IPLCs) (CBD, 2022). The final wording is

Ensure and enable that by 2030 at least 30 per cent of terrestrial, inland water, and of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem functions and services, are effectively conserved and managed through ecologically representative, well-connected and equitably governed systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, recognizing indigenous and traditional territories where applicable, and

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2025 The Author(s). *Conservation Biology* published by Wiley Periodicals LLC on behalf of Society for Conservation Biology.



integrated into wider landscapes, seascapes and the ocean, while ensuring that any sustainable use, where appropriate in such areas, is fully consistent with conservation outcomes, recognizing and respecting the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities, including over their traditional territories.

Over 190 countries have ratified the CBD and committed to the GBF (WWF & IUCN WCPA, 2023), but opinions regarding the motivations for and implications of 30×30 are mixed. Proponents are optimistic that it will deliver substantial positive impacts for biodiversity (Waldron et al., 2020; Wolff et al., 2023), whereas critics argue that it risks prioritizing the goals and interests of people living far from biodiversity-rich areas over those of marginalized IPLCs (Green Economy Coalition, 2021; Rudd et al., 2021).

The discourse illuminates tensions between traditional area-based conservation via formal PAs and calls for more inclusive, people-centered approaches (Bakarr, 2023; IUCN Africa Protected Areas Congress, 2022). The people-centered approach, or inclusive conservation, contends that conservation has traditionally excluded IPLCs from PAs, for example, by preventing sustainable access to and use of wildlife resources (Lo & Jang, 2022). Therefore, the people-centered approach seeks to simultaneously conserve biodiversity and improve outcomes for IPLCs who have been or continue to be marginalized by area-based conservation (Raymond et al., 2022).

As conservation researchers and practitioners working in multiple landscapes, we have seen how global conservation movements influence decisions that affect PAs and OECM management and, therefore, IPLCs. We appreciate that 30×30 recognizes OECMs and formal PAs (Cook, 2024), but we are concerned that achieving inclusive conservation under 30×30 will depend on how decision makers define and interpret PAs and OECMs. If new PAs and OECMs are designated following traditional exclusionary methods or if PA and OECM management strategies are defined without fully incorporating the rights, values, needs, and concerns of IPLCs, efforts to deliver 30×30 might unintentionally reproduce historical inequalities and reinforce power imbalances associated with colonial forms of conservation (Rudd et al., 2021; Willow, 2016).

We therefore see an impending collision at the heart of 30×30. To avoid this collision, the voices of IPLCs must be included in ongoing debates and decision-making about how and where to conserve biodiversity (Sandbrook et al., 2023). This could involve establishing, supporting, and expanding comanagement models to ensure conservation measures are aligned with IPLCs' knowledge and needs (Rocha et al., 2017). One example is Yaigojé Apaporis National Park in Colombia, which was created at the request of Indigenous Peoples and managed in collaboration with them (Huaiquimilla-Guerrero et al., 2023).

Conservation efforts (including PAs and OECMs) can better reflect local interests by implementing governance models that decentralize power dynamics (Cebríán-Piqueras et al., 2023).

Without meaningful collaborative decision-making with IPLCs, local resentment and opposition to conservation are likely and could result in neither biodiversity conservation nor social justice (Bennett et al., 2019; Sandbrook et al., 2023). This risk challenges conservation scientists, practitioners, and decision makers to better define *effective conservation* and evaluate effectiveness over time (Lee & Abdullah, 2019).

To meet commitments under target 3, national decision makers must find a balance between strict PAs and more flexible OECMs. They must also create a delicate balance among the needs, interests, and concerns of people living in high-biodiversity areas and those living elsewhere in a country (Dawson et al., 2024). Doing so could help ensure that 30×30 produces practical area-based solutions to the worldwide biodiversity crisis without further marginalizing IPLCs (IUCN Africa Protected Areas Congress, 2022). This should also involve recognizing and respecting IPLCs' expertise and ability to effectively conserve biodiversity outside formal PAs (ICCA Consortium, 2021) and respecting IPLCs' agency via shared leadership, as opposed to treating IPLCs as convenient partners in delivering a vision for area-based conservation defined by others (Busck-Lumholt et al., 2024; Dawson et al., 2024).

Realistically, the costs of delivering 30×30 will largely fall on IPLCs living near biodiversity-rich areas, even though more powerful—often distant—actors in the Global North champion the target (Earsom, 2023). Therefore, to avoid 30×30 reproducing colonial inequalities, such as displacing and further marginalizing IPLCs, politicians, businesses, nongovernmental organizations, and funding organizations could provide more direct financial support to IPLCs (Sangha, 2020). Such financial support could empower IPLCs to manage and preserve their natural resources effectively, according to their own cultures and values (Jeanty, 2021).

Although IPLCs receive financial support from multiple sources (approximately US\$270 million per year over the last 10 years [United Nations Environment Programme, 2021]), there remains a huge gap between available funding and actual needs on the ground (Larson et al., 2022). Ensuring that IPLC conservation efforts receive adequate funding and that IPLCs are directly involved in decision-making could foster a more equitable and sustainable approach to global biodiversity conservation (Busck-Lumholt et al., 2024; Milner-Gulland, 2024).

The potential collision between expanding area-based conservation measures and inclusive conservation is avoidable. However, there is an urgent need to consider how expanding PAs and OECMs to achieve 30×30 can meet ethical aspirations for more inclusive conservation. This is especially pertinent for IPLCs, who are most directly affected by conservation policies and programs but whose voices are seldom accounted for in global decisions (Martinelli & Martinelli, 2024). Respecting IPLCs' perspectives and incorporating them meaningfully into decisions on expanding PAs will help ensure national and international conservation efforts are equitable and effective and do not perpetuate historical injustices.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful for funding that enabled the conversations that inspired this article, from: the Inclusivity Accelerator, supported by the Robertson Foundation, and the Morally Contested Conservation Research project, supported by Jamma International, WWF Germany, the BAND Foundation, and the Luc Hoffmann Institute (now Unearthodox), both held at the Wildlife Conservation Research Unit, University of Oxford.

## ORCID

*Lovemore Sibanda*  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4960-9242>  
*Amy Dickman*  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7879-415X>  
*Courtney Hughes*  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2462-5633>  
*Jessica Tacey*  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4827-5815>  
*Emily Madsen*  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4108-6608>  
*Lessah Mandoloma*  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5421-9620>  
*Moreangels M. Mbizah*  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6868-052X>  
*Yolanda Mutinhima*  <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-2823-9224>  
*Betty Rono*  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7886-1511>  
*Salum Kulunge*  <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-4951-9364>  
*David Kimaili*  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4936-3032>  
*Trisha Bhujel*  <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-0917-8530>  
*David W. Macdonald*  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0607-9373>  
*Darragh Hare*  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4418-9637>

## REFERENCES

Bakarr, M. I. (2023). Reimagining protected and conserved areas in Africa: Perspectives from the first Africa Protected Areas Congress. *Conservation Letters*, 16(2), Article e12944. <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12944>

Bennett, N. J., Di Franco, A., Calò, A., Nethery, E., Niccolini, F., Milazzo, M., & Guidetti, P. (2019). Local support for conservation is associated with perceptions of good governance, social impacts, and ecological effectiveness. *Conservation Letters*, 12(4), Article e12640.

Busck-Lumholt, L. M., Corbera, E., & Mertz, O. (2024). Why target communities remain subjects rather than partners of development agencies in integrated conservation and development projects in Latin America. *The European Journal of Development Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41287-024-00658-5>

Cebrián-Piqueras, M., Palomo, I., Lo, V., López-Rodríguez, M. D., Filyushkina, A., Fischborn, M., Raymond, C., & Plieninger, T. (2023). Leverage points and levers of inclusive conservation in protected areas. *Ecology and Society*, 28(4), Article 7. <https://doi.org/10.5751/es-14366-280407>

Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). (2022). *Decision adopted by the conference of the parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity 15/4. Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework; 2022*. <https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-15/cop-15-dec-04-en.pdf>

Cook, C. N. (2024). Progress developing the concept of other effective area-based conservation measures. *Conservation Biology*, 38(1), Article e14106.

Dawson, N. M., Coolsaet, B., Bhardwaj, A., Booker, F., Brown, D., Lliso, B., Loos, J., Martin, A., Oliva, M., Pascual, U., Sherpa, P., & Worsdell, T. (2024). Is it just conservation? A typology of Indigenous peoples' and local communities' roles in conserving biodiversity. *One Earth*, 7(6), 1007–1021. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2024.05.001>

Earson, J. (2023). It's not as simple as copy/paste: The EU's remobilisation of the High Ambition Coalition in international climate governance. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, 23(1), 27–42.

Green Economy Coalition. (2021). *30×30 – A brave new dawn or a failure to protect people and nature?* <https://www.greeneconomycoalition.org/news-and-resources/30x30-a-brave-new-dawn-or-a-failure-to-protect-people-and-nature>

Huaiquimilla-Guerrero, K., Moscote-Guerra, J., Ramírez-Rivera, S., Duhalde-Correa, L. A., Peralta-Scholz, M. J., Silva, F. O., Plaza, V., Barrera, A. S., Squeo, F. A., & Gaymer, C. F. (2023). Dispossession and governance: The invisible role of indigenous peoples in protected natural areas in Chile. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 150, Article 103587.

ICCA Consortium. (2021). Territories of life: 2021 report. ICCA Consortium: worldwide. <https://report.territoriesoflife.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/ICCA-Territories-of-Life-2021-Report-FULL-150dpi-ENG.pdf>

IUCN Africa Protected Areas Congress. (2022). *Kigali Call to Action for People and Nature*. International Union for Conservation of Nature. [https://www.iucn.org/sites/default/files/2022-07/apac-kigali-call-to-action-final\\_0.pdf](https://www.iucn.org/sites/default/files/2022-07/apac-kigali-call-to-action-final_0.pdf)

Jeanty, J. (2021). *Indigenous-led conservation: A pathway towards 30×30*. <https://www.dataforprogress.org/memos/indigenous-led-conservation-a-pathway-towards-30x30>

Larson, A. M., Barletti, J. P. S., & Vigil, N. H. (2022). A place at the table is not enough: Accountability for Indigenous Peoples and local communities in multi-stakeholder platforms. *World Development*, 155, Article 105907.

Lee, W. H., & Abdullah, S. A. (2019). Framework to develop a consolidated index model to evaluate the conservation effectiveness of protected areas. *Ecological Indicators*, 102, 131–144.

Lo, V., & Jang, N. (2022). *The Global Biodiversity Framework's "30×30" Target: Catchy slogan or effective conservation goal?* The International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD). <https://www.iisd.org/articles/insight/global-biodiversity-framework-30x30-target>

Martinelli, Y. R., & Martinelli, B. M. (2024). 2030 Agenda for Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs): Representation, participation, and rights in global sustainability. In T. G. Galvao & H. Z. de Menezes (Eds.), *The Quest for the Sustainable Development Goals: Living experiences in territorializing the 2030 Agenda in Brazil* (pp. 263–282). Springer.

Milner-Gulland, E. J. (2024). Now is the time for conservationists to stand up for social justice. *PLoS Biology*, 22(6), Article e3002657. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3002657>

Raymond, C. M., Cebrián-Piqueras, M. A. C., Andersson, E., Andrade, R., Schnell, A. A., Romanelli, B. B., Filyushkina, A., Goodson, D. J., Horceau-Milcu, A., Johnson, D. N., Keller, R., Kuiper, J. J., Lo, V., López-Rodríguez, M. D., March, H., Metzger, M., Oteros-Rozas, E., Salcido, E., Sellberg, M., ... Wiedermann, M. M. (2022). Inclusive conservation and the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework: Tensions and prospects. *One Earth*, 5(3), 252–264. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2022.02.008>

Rocha, T. T., Tavares-Martins, A. C. C., & Lucas, F. C. A. (2017). Traditional populations in environmentally protected areas: An ethnobotanical study in the Soure Marine Extractive Reserve of Brazil. *Boletín Latinoamericano y del Caribe de Plantas Medicinales y Aromáticas*, 16(4), 410–427.

Rudd, L. F., Allred, S., Bright Ross, J. G., Hare, D., Nkomo, M. N., Shanker, K., Allen, T., Biggs, D., Dickman, A., Dunaway, M., Ghosh, R., Gonzalez, N. T., Kepe, T., Mbizah, M. M., Middleton, S. L., Oommen, M. A., Paudel, K., Sillero-Zubiri, C., & Davalos, A. (2021). Overcoming racism in the twin spheres of conservation science and practice. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 288(1962), Article 20211871. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2021.1871>

Sandbrook, C., Albury-Smith, S., Allan, J. R., Bhola, N., Bingham, H. C., Brockington, D., Byaruhanga, A. B., Fajardo, J., Fitzsimons, J., Franks, P., Fleischman, F., Frechette, A., Kakuyo, K., Kaptoyo, E., Kuemmerle, T., Kalunda, P. N., Nuvunga, M., O'Donnell, B., Onyai, F., ... Zaehringer, J. G. (2023). Social considerations are crucial to success in implementing the 30×30 global conservation target. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 7(6), 784–785. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-023-02048-2>

Sangha, K. K. (2020). Global importance of indigenous and local communities' managed lands: Building a case for stewardship schemes. *Sustainability*, 12(19), Article 7839.

United Nations Environment Programme. (2021). *State of Finance for Nature 2021*. United Nations.

Waldron, A., Adams, V., Allan, J., Arnett, A., Asner, G., Atkinson, S., Baccini, A., Baillie, J., Balmford, A., & Austin Beau, J. (2020). *Protecting 30% of the planet for nature: Costs, benefits and economic implications*. Campaign for Nature.

Willow, A. (2016). Boreal forest prospects and politics: Paradoxes of first nations participation in multi-sector conservation. *Conservation and Society*, 14(2), 86–99. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0972-4923.186333>



Wolff, N. H., Visconti, P., Kujala, H., Santini, L., Hilbers, J. P., Possingham, H. P., Oakleaf, J. R., Kennedy, C. M., Kiesecker, J., & Fargione, J. (2023). Prioritizing global land protection for population persistence can double the efficiency of habitat protection for reducing mammal extinction risk. *One Earth*, 6(11), 1564–1575.

World Wildlife Fund (WWF), & IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA). (2023). *30x30: A guide to inclusive, equitable and effective implementation of target 3 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework*. World Wildlife Fund and IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas. <https://iucn.org/sites/default/files/2023-09/30x30-target-framework.pdf>

**How to cite this article:** Sibanda, L., Dickman, A., Hughes, C., Tacey, J., Madsen, E., Mandoloma, L., Mbizah, M. M., Mutinhima, Y., Rono, B., Kulunge, S., Kimaili, D., Bhujle, T., Macdonald, D. W., & Hare, D. (2025). Avoiding an impending collision in international conservation. *Conservation Biology*, 39, e14450. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.14450>