

# Life as Commerce:

## The Impact of Market-based Conservation Mechanisms on Women<sup>1</sup>



Photo:Walhi West Kalimantan

### Adapting Women to the Economy or Adapting Economies to Women's Needs?

Women form 70% of the world's poor. Due to the fact that they spend a lot of their time on unpaid household and caretaking activities, and because they are still discriminated against in terms of pay and labor conditions, women's estimated earned income in comparison to men is 57% in industrialized countries, 40% in Latin America and South Asia and just 30% in the Middle East and North Africa.<sup>2</sup>

Women also own far less land than men, partly because they are excluded from inheritance in many traditional legal systems. Even in a country like Brazil, where they are not formally discriminated against in a legal sense, they still own only 11% of private land.<sup>3</sup> In some traditional cultures in other parts of the world, married women cannot own their own land and property at all. Because of this, they have less money and fewer capital assets. They are thus disadvantaged in market economies.

The conventional development response has been to try to adapt and integrate women into the market economy. But whilst efforts such as micro-financing schemes are well-intended, they have not been able to solve the fundamental inequities that persist. Women start off at a disadvantage in an increasingly competitive society, in part as a consequence of their reproductive roles, which cause them to spend more time on unpaid labor than men. There has been little or no interest in trying to adapt mainstream economies to the needs of women (for example, by promoting policies that recognize the economic value of women's unpaid labor in the household.)

1. For more information please contact: Simone Lovera, [simone.lovera@globalforestoalition.org](mailto:simone.lovera@globalforestoalition.org). The author would like to thank the Global Forest Coalition gender task force, Jessica Dempsey and Yifat Susskind for their feedback.

2. UNICEF, "State of the World's Children 2007, Women and Children, the Double Dividend of Gender Equality",

3. UNICEF, 2006, UNICEF, 2006, *ibid*.

## Adapting Biodiversity to the Economy or Economies to Biodiversity's Needs?

In 1987, the Brundtland Commission made the link between environment and development objectives. Since then it has become increasingly fashionable to approach biodiversity conservation from an economic perspective. By looking at biodiversity conservation through economists' eyes, the biodiversity conservation community hoped it would gather the capacity to influence economic policies and incentive schemes and adapt them to the needs of biodiversity conservation. However, instead of adapting economics to the imperative of conserving our planet's biodiversity, there has been an increasing tendency to adapt biodiversity conservation policies to mainstream economics.

The economic rationale is straightforward. If it is possible to give biodiversity and other environmental 'services' marketable asset prices, market forces will drive biodiversity conservation. This approach has resulted in the promotion of 'environmental services' markets, based on market-based conservation mechanisms like carbon trading, biodiversity offsets, certification, trade in genetic resources and related knowledge, and 'eco'tourism.

Nevertheless, it is suggested that market-based conservation mechanisms like these will only lead to equitable outcomes:

- if all biodiversity values are properly accounted for;
- if these values are privatized and equitably distributed to the proper 'owners' who can subsequently 'sell' them;
- if there is a level playing field, so that all potential sellers and buyers can participate equitably;
- if the market is properly regulated, including through respect for the rights of traditional landholders; and
- if those regulations are effectively enforced.

Most of these criteria have important gender dimensions; and it should be emphasized that many of these gender dimensions are even more relevant for Indigenous women. Indigenous Peoples are amongst the most disadvantaged groups in society (in monetary terms at least) and tend to be highly dependent upon free access to forests and other ecosystems for their livelihoods. For that reason, many of the impacts of market-based conservation mechanisms on women are similar to but even more significant than the impacts of market-based conservation mechanisms on Indigenous Peoples in general.



Photo: Mina Susana Setra



Photo: Simone Lovera

## Valuation of Biodiversity: Gender-neutral?

Most analyses of the value of biodiversity are almost shockingly ignorant of the fact that the socio-economic value of biodiversity for those groups in society that depend on it for their livelihoods, as many Indigenous women do, is much higher than the socio-economic value of biodiversity for, say, a group of trophy-hunters, or an energy company looking for a forest to offset its carbon emissions.<sup>4</sup>

Classical biodiversity valuation methodologies, such as 'willingness to pay', and those based on market rates for carbon and genetic resources, result in policies that prioritize the needs of economically wealthy actors that have the ability to pay for biodiversity in the first place. Using this approach, protected areas, for example, are seen as delivering more benefits to Northern consumers who visit them as 'eco'tourists and carbon traders (including

conservation organizations), all of whom can pay substantial amounts of money to the small elite running the parks and related tourist facilities. Indigenous Peoples and local communities, on the other hand, living in and around these areas, may find their livelihoods completely undermined due to increasingly restricted access to resources in the area, yet see few returns.

Because of their relatively low or even non-existent monetary income, women are far more dependent upon free access to the non-monetary benefits provided by biodiversity. This is particularly so for rural women in developing countries who are especially dependent upon free access to resources like fuelwood, medicinal plants, fodder, and edible fruits and nuts. As Lucy Mulenkei of the African Indigenous Women's Organisation states, in relation to East African indigenous and local communities, "Biodiversity is everything to them, it is the food they eat, the seeds, medicinal plants and wild fruits they collect."<sup>5</sup> Incorporating biodiversity into a market economy puts these women at a severe disadvantage. It makes them and their families more dependent upon the income of their husbands, and, in the worst cases, deprives them of essential resources that provide them with a nutritionally diverse diet, primary health care and energy. It is women who suffer most when areas are declared 'protected', or when they suddenly have to pay for resources like clean freshwater and fuelwood, which used to be available for free.

However, the relationship of rural women to biodiversity is not merely one of dependence, but of symbiosis. Because their livelihoods depend directly on access to biodiversity, rural women have developed highly sustainable methods of ecosystem stewardship. Women's management and maintenance of forests and waterways the world over is an invaluable

4. See for example Naidoo, R. and Ricketts, T.H., "Mapping the Economic Costs and Benefits of Conservation" in *PLoS Biology*, <http://biology.plosjournals.org/periserv/?request=get-document&doi=10.1371/journal.pbio.0040360&ct=1>

5. Mulenkei, L., The role of biodiversity in poverty alleviation - culture, rights and biodiversity, in Sandlund, O.T. & Saksgard, L. (eds) 2008. Proceedings of the Norway/UN Conference on Ecosystems and People - Biodiversity for Development - The road to 2010 and beyond. Directorate for Nature

contribution to biodiversity conservation. Yet, too often, policymakers look at rural women and see only impoverished, illiterate victims of gender discrimination. Instead, rural women should be recognized as local experts in biodiversity and sustainable forest managers. Women's knowledge and especially traditional knowledge in the protection of natural resources should be developed and adapted as part of the response to the world's steadily deteriorating ecosystems. This requires the protection of women's rights within their families, their communities and beyond. It is also essential to guarantee women's access to education, health skills, training, technology and economic resources. Their role in sustainable development should be fully recognized.

### **Inequitable Privatization and the Commodification of 'Environmental' Services**

Women do not only lose out as 'buyers' of 'environmental services', they also lose out as 'sellers'. Most market-based conservation mechanisms consider land ownership to be the most important criterion when biodiversity values are privatized and distributed to individual 'owners' in order to be sold. Because women have far less formal land title than men, they are per definition disadvantaged when it comes to establishing a right to 'sell' biodiversity values.

Even those systems that try to reward the people who are actually managing a resource, rather than the formal owners of the land, often underestimate the disadvantageous position that women have when money is at stake. Forests or other resources, for example, which are traditionally managed by women, may suddenly be taken over by the men in a village when it turns out that there is money to be earned through a payment for environmental services system.

Selling 'environmental services' can also lead to serious local governance problems if it is not clear whether the leader of a village has the right or the mandate to undertake certain legal transactions. Women are again likely to suffer most, as their rights and interests are more likely to be overlooked in commercial transactions normally closed by men. Likewise, it is often women who possess valuable traditional knowledge related to biodiversity, while a small group of male elders may be mandated to negotiate on behalf of the community when a potentially profitable Access and Benefit Sharing contract is in sight.

### **A Highly Inequitable Playing Field**

In real life, there is no 'level playing field' in the environmental services market. In many of the countries targeted by the promoters of environmental services markets, especially in Latin America, inequitable distribution of land is one of the biggest social challenges. In a country like Paraguay, for example, just 1% of the population owns 80% of the land. Women are in an even more disadvantageous position. Again, using Paraguay as an example, they own just 27% of the private land<sup>6</sup>. But even when they have title over the land, it is not easy for them to compete in a really free market. In a truly competitive market one needs economies of scale, and women seldom manage large projects or own large pieces of land.

Furthermore, many women lack marketing skills and even the necessary language skills.

---

Management, Trondheim, <http://www.cbd.int/doc/external/external-meetings/trondheim-05-37-mulenkjel-en.pdf>

6. UNICEF, 2006, *ibid*.

The latter disadvantage is also a severe constraint to the equitable participation of Indigenous Peoples in markets for environmental services: many Indigenous Peoples have a native language other than the formal language of the country, which is the one most likely to be used for commercial transactions.

Women also have, on average, lower levels of formal education than men. Despite significant progress since 2000, there are still more boys enrolled in school than girls in developing countries, and illiteracy amongst older generations of women is still astonishingly high (28%)<sup>7</sup>. Furthermore, the relationship between rural poverty and education is linear and most Indigenous women speak a native, non-official language, putting them at a severe disadvantage. Of course there are exceptions where successful Indigenous and non-Indigenous women have been able to sell carbon offsets or other 'environmental services' but overall it is fair to say that there is no level playing field in these markets.

### **REDD: The Pay the Polluters Principle**

The market will be even more inequitable if some of the proposals to compensate countries, communities and/or individuals for Reducing Emissions from Deforestation in Developing countries (REDD), that are currently on the negotiating table within the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), are accepted.

Per definition, there is a major conflict between effectiveness and equity in such proposals. As CIFOR<sup>8</sup> itself concludes, the most effective payments will not target actors like women and Indigenous Peoples, who traditionally conserve forests. Instead it will focus on those actors who are responsible for significant levels of deforestation and can be convinced, through a relatively minor compensation, to refrain from further deforestation.

Indigenous Peoples and other forest peoples who have traditionally conserved large forest areas can be expected to lose out in this system, as they have no deforestation to reduce. Furthermore, women will not be an attractive target group for commercial REDD projects: they are seldom or never responsible for large-scale deforestation activities. Instead, most forest management undertaken by women typically involves small-scale forms of sustainable management such as tree planting and sustainable fuelwood gathering. These

activities are very valuable from a climate change perspective, as they contribute to forest conservation and restoration. Nevertheless, they fall outside the scope of initiatives to reduce emissions from deforestation.

The latter are being pushed by countries and actors who are currently responsible for massive deforestation. These countries and



Photo: Mina Susana Setra

7. UNICEF, 2006, *ibid.* Wunder, S. 2007. "The Efficiency of Payments for Environmental Services in Tropical

8. Conservation", *Conservation Biology* Volume 21, No. 1. 48 - 58, Society for Conservation Biology, <http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2006.00559.x>



actors are also seen as the most attractive partners by institutions like the World Bank, which has set up a Forest Carbon Partnership Facility to promote the integration of REDD projects into carbon trade. One of the main criteria for receiving funding from this facility is that a country has been responsible for massive deforestation in the recent past.

Moreover, in some of the countries that are currently establishing compensation for REDD and/or Payment for Environmental Services (PES) schemes, like Paraguay, one can detect a negative impact on land disputes. Large land owners now seem to be far less inclined to accept Indigenous land claims or land reform proposals. Instead, there is a trend to set up private nature reserves, including on officially recognized Indigenous lands, in order to profit from potential carbon markets.<sup>9</sup>

In summary, most current proposals that are on the table concerning REDD and the climate regime can be classified as 'the Pay the Polluters Principle'.

### **Financing forest conservation and other biodiversity initiatives**

It should be noted that the discussion about REDD has been blurred by experiences in the current voluntary market for carbon offsets, which includes quite a number of projects to compensate communities for avoiding deforestation, or even restoring forests.

Many of these projects are either funded by corporations as part of their 'green' marketing policies, which have received a boost from recent consumer concerns about climate change, or by conservation NGOs or institutions like the World Bank, as part of their campaigns to convince governments to include such projects in the carbon market. As the inclusion of such projects into a commercial market will require economies of scale, it is the big conservation organizations and the World Bank itself who will undoubtedly be most competitive in such markets. The World Bank in particular is already gearing up to make millions as a broker in the carbon offset market. Communities interested in participating in any REDD projects will, at the very least, need to be very well informed of the processes relating to and the consequences of those projects (both for themselves and others), enabling them to decide for themselves whether or not to proceed.

It is true that some pilot projects have included a few relatively positive initiatives, including examples of women-driven forest restoration initiatives that received some funding from the carbon offset market. The Green Belt Movement is one such example. However, these examples are not genuine commercial carbon offset projects and cannot therefore be seen as being exemplary. Ninety

---

9. Lovera, S. 2007. "The Impact of Market-based Convention Mechanisms on Indigenous Peoples and Women.", in Sandlund, O.T. & Saksgard, L. (eds) 2008. Proceedings of the Norway/UN Conference on Ecosystems and people - Biodiversity for development - The road to 2010 and beyond. \_Directorate for Nature Management, Trondheim, also [Http://www.cbd.int/doc/external/external-meetings/trondheim-05-31-lovera-en.pdf](http://www.cbd.int/doc/external/external-meetings/trondheim-05-31-lovera-en.pdf)



Photo: Mina Susana Setra

per cent of the funding for the Green Belt Movement (GBM), for example, came from a World Bank grant. At the 12th Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC in Nairobi, GBM representatives openly stated that their project would never have been able to obtain funding through the commercial carbon market. Likewise, of the 264 examples of 'environmental services markets' that the International Institute for Environment and Development analyzed in 2002<sup>10</sup>, hardly any could be considered as purely commercial (the exception being a few 'eco'tourism projects with dubious impacts on biodiversity and local communities). Most projects were rather conventional schemes that support community-based biodiversity conservation initiatives with public funding.

Meanwhile, other purely commercial voluntary carbon offset projects, like the Mount Elgon Park project in Uganda, which is funded through the Forests Absorbing Carbon Emissions (FACE) foundation, have had devastating impacts on women. Such projects often prevent local people from accessing the protected area, thus depriving them of fuelwood and other forest resources.<sup>11</sup> The Mount Elgon project has also led to increased poverty and subsequent prostitution amongst the affected communities, which has in turn resulted in an increasing prevalence of HIV/AIDS amongst local women.

These dynamics underscore the ways in which commercial interests are diametrically opposed to the logic of conservation. Profit, after all, is based on converting natural resources into commodities at the fastest rate possible. Projects that are effective in protecting both natural resources and human rights are unlikely to be deemed commercially sound as long as profit generation is entirely dependent upon rates of resource consumption.

### **Other Market-based Conservation Mechanisms: Certification, Trade in Genetic Resources and 'Eco'tourism**

It is often stated that market-based conservation mechanisms like certification, trade in genetic resources and 'eco'tourism will provide significant incentives for biodiversity conservation, but there is little evidence to support this. There seems, for example, to be little proof that the increase in certified timber products has led to a decrease in the consumption of unsustainably produced timber, and thus a reduction in deforestation. Furthermore, the majority of certification schemes have been sharply criticized, as the criteria used to award certificates are not stringent enough to protect biodiversity effectively.

In many South American countries, for example, up to 100% of Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) certified timber is derived from monoculture tree plantations that have negative impacts on biodiversity and local communities<sup>12</sup>. Moreover, women often find that their own forest management initiatives fail to qualify for certification, even though they are socially, economically and environmentally sustainable. Certification has proven to require significant economies of scale and a major complaint from small producers, in relation to the FSC and other certification schemes, has been that the costs of obtaining certification

---

<sup>10</sup> Landell-Mills, N. and I.T. Porras, 2002. "Silver bullet or fool's gold? A global review of markets for forest environmental services and their impacts on the poor". International Institute for Environmental and Development, London, <http://www.iied.org/pubs/display.php?o=90661IED>

<sup>11</sup> Lang, C. and Byakola, T., "A funny place to store carbon". UWA-FACE Foundation's tree planting project in Mount Elgon National Park, Uganda, World Rainforest Movement, Montevideo, <http://www.wrm.org.uy/countries/Uganda/book.html>

<sup>12</sup> See for example: <http://www.wrm.org.uy/actors/FSC/uncertifiable.html>

are far too high to allow the entrance of small-scale projects.<sup>13</sup> As stated above, women seldom manage large projects, so they are clearly disadvantaged in this respect.

At the time the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) was adopted, in 1992, trade in genetic resources was presented by some as a promising financial incentive for biodiversity conservation. But again, there is little evidence backing this up. The only large-scale experiment - the sale of genetic resources by the National Biodiversity Institute in Costa Rica - has been anything but a financial success<sup>14</sup>, and is severely criticized for its lack of respect for Indigenous Peoples' rights.

In general, due to a lack of public control over access and benefit sharing, biopiracy is a persistent, worldwide problem. As a result, the rights-holders of genetic resources and related traditional knowledge, many of whom are (indigenous) women, seldom receive any benefits in return for access to these resources. Patents and other intellectual property rights systems are designed to benefit Northern corporations, and both female and male holders of traditional knowledge and genetic resources find it extremely difficult to handle the financial and bureaucratic hurdles involved in applying for intellectual property rights. Furthermore, most holders of traditional knowledge reject the very concept of privatizing or commodifying their traditional knowledge and genetic resources through intellectual property rights. The Indigenous Women's Biodiversity Network and female peasant movements like the women of Via Campesina, for example, have frequently expressed their strong opposition to the privatization and commercialization of biodiversity through intellectual property rights and genetic resources trade.

To make things worse, the negotiations on the regime on Access and Benefit Sharing, currently underway in the CBD, squarely ignore the role of women as traditional seed-savers and the main holders of biodiversity-related traditional knowledge.

The lack of a clear definition of 'eco'tourism has permitted many unsuitable tourism projects to market themselves as ecotourism projects, even though they simply use nature as a resource, and have little or no commitment to improving the social and environmental sustainability of their operations. Even worse, because these tourism operations target biodiversity-rich areas, they tend to have more negative impacts upon biodiversity than other forms of tourism such as city trips. The remoteness of biodiversity-rich areas also tends to lead to increased carbon emissions from transport.

Furthermore, while some 'eco'tourism initiatives have made an effort to involve local people



Photo: Cameroon Bell

13. Counsell, S. and Loraas, K.T. (ed.), 2002, "Trading in Credibility, The Myth and reality of the Forest Stewardship Council", The Rainforest Foundation, London, <http://www.rainforestfoundationuk.org/s-Trading%20in%20Credibility-%20Myth%20and%20Reality%20of%20the%20FSC>

14. See <http://www.globalforestcoalition.org/img/userpics/File/publications/thenewmarkets2Sellingourgenesandknowledge.pdf>





Photo: Mina Susana Setra

in their economic activities by providing them with jobs, results tend to be quite meager. For example, a review of a nature-based tourism initiative in the Arabuko Sokoke Forest and Mida Creek near the Kenyan coasts, cautioned that one should not raise too many expectations amongst local communities about the potential benefits of ecotourism. Despite good intentions and substantial non-commercial donor support, this project only managed to provide 27 permanent jobs for the local population in the forest area targeted by the project, in a region visited by 250,000 tourists per year.<sup>15</sup> Also, many ecotourism facilities prefer to hire skilled urban employees instead of local people, leaving the lowest paid, least attractive jobs for local employees. Thus while local women can sometimes benefit from some additional income through the sale of handicrafts, or by acquiring work indirectly, as a cleaner or maid, they are seldom offered the best-paid jobs in 'eco'tourism facilities. Their income is minimal compared with the benefits derived by the, often

foreign, tourism operators themselves.

An additional risk for local women is caused by forms of 'eco'tourism that attract predominantly male tourists, like trophy hunting and fishing. Such 'eco'tourism often triggers prostitution amongst neighboring communities, with associated risks of unwanted pregnancies and sexually transmitted diseases like HIV/AIDS. This risk is particularly high when the tourism takes place amongst money-poor Indigenous communities unaccustomed to the risks of sexual exploitation by wealthy men.

### **Rewarding Women for their Biodiversity Stewardship**

It is often assumed that Payments for Environmental Services (PES) systems will benefit the poor, as many of the most precious ecosystems on the planet are inhabited by Indigenous Peoples or other money-poor local communities. But even in situations where there are no problems with corruption, the bureaucratic know-how required to sell an environmental service is a significant hurdle for local women who are unlikely to possess the necessary legal skills and may not be able to read or write in the official language of the country. Having a handful of representatives or community representatives with higher education and/or legal skills can definitely put Indigenous and other rural women in a better position to negotiate environmental services contracts, should they wish to, but it would be naive to overlook their generally disadvantageous position. In addition to these practical obstacles, there is the further difficulty that many women do not have formal title over their land or traditional knowledge. While this situation is slowly improving, thanks to the struggle of women's movements and other social movements, PES systems will continue to lead to

15. Schroeder, W., "Can Nature Conservation benefit from Package-Tourism?" video presentation at the International Expert Workshop "Linking Nature Conservation and Poverty Reduction, 2-4 November 2006, Vilm, Germany, <http://www.bfn.de/fileadmin/MDB/documents/service/skript190.pdf>

inequitable outcomes as long as land rights and other resource rights are not equitably distributed.

In practice, conservation NGOs have often played the role of broker in individual PES contracts. Their intentions may be laudable, but it would be inadvisable to turn these private, often foreign organizations into formal actors responsible for the implementation of national public policy conservation. Aside from legitimate fears about the risk of 'conservation colonialism' these organizations simply do not have the scope or capacity to help all local community and Indigenous Peoples in any given country in an equitable fashion. Moreover, these organizations seldom have Indigenous rights, women's livelihoods or national social development as their primary mission. Most foreign conservation organizations represent the interests of their own constituencies: Northern consumers that are willing to pay for nature conservation in developing countries, especially when they can use it to offset their own carbon emissions and generally unsustainable lifestyles.

There does, however, seem to be a growing consensus amongst biodiversity policy makers that market-based mechanisms do need to be strictly regulated and effectively enforced. However, few seem to realize the inherent contradiction in this approach: if regulations are so essential, perhaps it is more appropriate to focus on promoting the regulations themselves, rather than the market-based aspect of the schemes? Furthermore, weak law enforcement, corruption and bad governance will permit the abuse of such schemes and is likely to increase the violation of the land rights and other human rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities.

Experience so far shows that most 'PES' schemes that benefit women are actually conventional subsidy or integrated poverty and development projects. Re-baptizing them as PES was supposed to mobilize political will to improve biodiversity conservation amongst economically powerful sectors, but there is little evidence that this happened. Nevertheless, it should not be overlooked that corporations' primary concern is to make a profit. Corporations are unlikely to consider principles of conservation, democracy and social justice, unless adherence to those principles help to generate profit through favorable public relations, or is required by law. In contrast, the great advantage of public governance systems is that they can be shaped in a manner that directly benefits the most marginal groups in society, including women and Indigenous Peoples.

As long ago as 1992, the principle of rewarding the so-called 'incremental costs' of providing global environmental benefits was acknowledged and adopted by international law. Both the CBD and the UNFCCC, that were signed that year, oblige all governments to conserve forests, as well as requiring developed countries to contribute new and additional financial resources to reward developing countries for the incremental costs of providing global environmental benefits by reducing deforestation and improving other biodiversity conservation measures. The fact that the overwhelming majority of developed countries have not complied with these legally binding agreements does not imply that they do not exist anymore. Governments need to remember that PES schemes are not the only option.

Furthermore, an independent monitoring project by the Global Forest Coalition, looking at the implementation of the Expanded Programme of Work on Forest Biodiversity in 22

different countries<sup>16</sup>, revealed that the most successful forest conservation experiences can be found on recognized Indigenous lands and territories. The promotion of these communities' rights over their territories, as enshrined in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, is thus critical to the implementation of effective and equitable biodiversity conservation policies. The Declaration needs to be put into practice.

In addition, women's involvement in these successes, along with their fundamental role in saving seeds, nurturing trees and other forms of biodiversity management, needs to be properly and effectively acknowledged. In this respect, there is a clear need to ensure the effective enforcement of the UN Convention for the Elimination of All forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), including through:

- the prohibition of discrimination (Article 1);
- the recognition of women's rights to agricultural credit and loans, marketing facilities, appropriate technology and equal treatment in land and agrarian reform as well as in resettlement schemes (Article 14(2)g);
- the establishment of equal property rights for women in relation to marriage, divorce and death (Article 16);
- taking into account the particular problems faced by rural women and the significant roles which rural women play in the economic survival of their families, including their work in the non-monetarized sectors of the economy (Article 14(1));
- ensuring that rural women have a right to participate in the elaboration and implementation of development planning at all levels, as well as a right to participate in all community activities (Article 14(2)).

In conclusion, new and additional financial resources should be provided to support the sustainable, democratic and well-enforced public governance of biodiversity, including through redirecting perverse incentives, banning deforestation, safeguarding Indigenous rights and promoting and supporting women's initiatives to alternative livelihoods and to conserve and nurture biodiversity.



Photo: Mina Susana Setra

---

<sup>16</sup>. Summary report of independent monitoring of the implementation of the Expanded Work Programme on forest biodiversity of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD POW), 2002-2007, <http://www.globalforestcoalition.org/img/userpics/File/publications/DraftsummaryIMRome.pdf>



This publication was made possible with the generous support of Swedbio and the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of our donors.



Photo: Mina Susana Setra