Executive Summary

The 2022 Global Biodiversity Framework shows the importance of the area, quality, and connectivity of green and blue spaces within urban areas but does not recognize the role of urban land expansion as a driver of habitat loss.

Over 90% of the cities in the world’s 36 biodiversity hotspots are expanding in direct conflict with biodiversity and climate risk. The conversion of natural habitat for human habitation is accelerating, with 290,000 sq km of natural habitat likely to be lost to urban growth between 2000 and 2030.

These trends are further compounded by the ‘land greedy’ nature of contemporary urban expansion patterns, yielding a land consumption growth rate (4.84% per year) double that of urban population growth (2.18% per year); land continues to be consumed even in countries where the urban population is not increasing at all.

Yet action to prevent or even mitigate this loss remains elusive. Restoration cannot keep up with the pace of land degradation, so we need more preservation and conservation at the interface between cities and nature, particularly in biodiversity hotspots (Figure 1).

Cities are recognizing the need to protect landscapes in their vicinity, with approaches such as extending ecological corridors and connecting green patches for biodiversity protection and climate resilience, and the knock-on benefits of ecotourism, air purification, etc.

However, we need to shift to systematic, effective and properly targeted interventions of biodiversity preservation and conservation in the face of urban expansion, both present and future.

Most existing spatial planning processes treat built and natural habitats as binary and static, while they are both in constant flux. The two also have complex interactions, exacerbated by climate change, with either negative or positive feedback loops that affect cities.

Caring for nature would not only prevent the sixth extinction of non-human species but also prevent the collapse of human settlements whose infrastructure fundamentally depends on the ecosystem services that biodiversity provides.

The United Nations system has adopted a common approach to biodiversity that includes a joint commitment to improve the quality of urbanization and limit encroachment, recognizing the importance of nature in cities and the protective role of spatial planning.

Pro-biodiversity interventions within and beyond cities include not only direct nature-based solutions but also indirect land-sparing measures that prevent the destruction of natural habitat in the first place (Figure 1).

Many high-profile nature-based solutions have been applied at limited site-based scales, as retrofits to relatively wealthy, mature urban environments. This leaves a gap in preservation-related efforts, particularly in fast-growing, resource-constrained contexts.

Several critical challenges remain:

• A dichotomic conception of the natural and built
• Lack of clarity on where degradation is occurring
• Inability to predict future conversion
• Difficulty of assigning the full value of biodiversity
• Resistance to cooperating across jurisdictions
• Failure to slow degradation at the peri-urban edge

We need these overarching shifts in our work as urban and ecological policymakers and practitioners:

• Spatializing challenges to understand where change occurs and how urban systems interact
• Working telescopically between all relevant scales, acting at the most appropriate and linking to others
• Working transversally across silos, sectors, disciplines, jurisdictions, and stakeholders
• Anticipating and guiding change through informed decisions on where and how to develop

UN-Habitat proposes four spatial actions to support the preservation of biodiversity in and around cities:

• Project spatial growth over a specific timeframe to proactively guide urban expansion
• Predict land use conflict zones where urbanization and climate change are at odds with biodiversity in real space to pre-emptively intervene
• Prioritize areas of most suitability/least harm by preserving natural areas of highest value and directing compact growth to areas of less harm
• Prevent wasteful and dangerous land conversion that degrades natural habitat at the peri-urban edge

Sustainable development that proactively looks at safeguarding biodiversity hotspots is critical. Local officials need to be empowered with decision-making tools that make these benefits explicit and easier to implement.

Multidisciplinary mapping is a cost-effective means of equipping governments to make educated decisions about where to conserve or convert habitat. Here it has been conceived with light data requirements, for nimble deployment in data-scarce cities and modular pairing with other planning tools.

Potential benefits include assessment of broad environmental impact, catalyzing or revising master plans, studying land use conflict zones, promoting successful metropolitan planning models, developing a ‘stoplight raster’, and studying the trade-offs and co-benefits of nature-based vs form-based solutions for biodiversity.

Preventing mistakes before they are visible and too expensive to correct will require unprecedented effort. 44% of the global gross domestic product in cities is at risk due to the loss of nature, so biodiversity preservation at the peri-urban edge must be incentivized and accelerated.

Spatial planning and design also require adequate regulations and financing to deliver the change we need. Taken together, they can help preserve biodiversity in and around cities, with transferability hinging on region, scale, timeframe, and champion (Annex 2).

Cities have enormous potential for biodiversity. Often, they are in important biodiversity hotspots near waterways, ecozone transitions, and migration paths. While we have collectively done little to strengthen the interface between cities and nature, applying proactive effort now would be extraordinarily productive.

Figure 1 Pro-biodiversity interventions exist along a preserve-conserve-restore-create spectrum that responds to varying states of natural habitat around and within cities.
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Cities and nature have many interlinkages. This paper focuses on what the evidence suggests are the biggest addressable gaps for delivering global-scale impact on biodiversity, i.e., evolving urban form. Industrial agriculture is the biggest driver by area of habitat loss (Ritchie and Roser, 2021). However, the changes wrought by urban development have greater fixity that are more difficult and expensive to change. According to the old Roman axiom, a street lasts 1,000 years. Direct land consumption is not the only negative impact of cities—the International Panel on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) reminds us that ‘[p]redicting the distant effects of local human-nature interactions and actions, i.e., telecoupling...is critical’ (IPBES, 2019). Recent workstreams are elaborating on these ideas (UN-Habitat, 2022). ‘However, planetary scale scenarios and models that assess complex local and regional scale tele-interactions do not exist yet’ (IPBES, 2019).

Meanwhile, the mistakes of wasteful and dangerous land conversion near cities continue to be replicated at ever greater scales. Sawyer et al (2021) frame this as ‘bypass urbanism’ that ‘usually does not emanate from a coherent planning initiative...but...emerges through a convergence of interests over large areas of land at the geographical periphery of urban regions’. ‘[H]ighways, gated communities, condominium towers, luxury residences and other real estate projects...have been rapidly built in the past decades over huge areas that once were sparsely settled agricultural lands, wetlands, nature reserves, terrains vagues or even contaminated areas.’ Improving the impact of cities on biodiversity will require shaping the constantly shifting peri-urban frontier, especially in developing countries (ibid).

As cities grow, it is critical to preserve and conserve natural habitat at both local (within the city) and peri-urban (just outside the city) scales before expensive if not irreversible damage is done. This paper focuses on the direct impact of urban form on land-use change and habitat loss, which is a significant gap that demands early, coordinated action. It underscores the importance of both location and quality, i.e. avoiding expansion into areas of highest ecological value and vulnerability while still building in a compact, connected manner in areas of least harm including on smaller sites within the city.

There have been several inspiring examples of nature-based solutions in resourced, slow-growing cities. For example, the moss swales in the UK (Mohamed, 2022a), pollinating roofs in the Netherlands (Weston, 2022), highway underpasses in Australia (Goldingay, 2022), and harbour reoystering (Mindock, 2022) in the USA. However, most have been applied as site-based retrofits in relatively mature, wealthy, slow-growing urban environments. Uncritical application in inappropriate contexts can create expensive lock-in and other suboptimal outcomes (Simon 2022). Very few of them have been catalogued to facilitate appropriateness in other contexts or towards prevention in areas of rapid change. They evidence the biggest gap in the practice of preservation-related efforts at city and regional scales. In response, this paper begins to catalogue pro-biodiversity interventions by context, focusing on a narrower band of activity i.e., preservation at the smaller contextual scales.

Given the scope, the paper is directed towards urbanists and ecologists in policy and practice who work at the subnational scale. For policymakers, the narrative outlines six challenges and four principles for overcoming them to curtail biodiversity loss in and around cities. For practitioners, the paper concretizes those principles into four action-based approaches, supplemented by a global catalogue of preventative measures undertaken. For those interested in catalyzing positive change, the paper offers a new mapping methodology that can help cities—even data-scarce ones—make educated decisions about where and how to develop with minimal impact on nature and people. Lastly, the paper provides a catalogue of contextualized pro-biodiversity interventions that focus on preservation near cities.
Figure 2 50 cities with pro-biodiversity interventions in different freshwater ecoregions of the world, studied by UN-Habitat (McInnes, 2013).

Figure 3 Ranked environmental pressures in the 50 cities with pro-biodiversity interventions studied by UN-Habitat, showing that habitat loss due to urban expansion on top in four out of six regional groupings of those cities (McInnes, 2013).
1. Challenges

Planet Earth is approaching a sixth wave of extinction as the conversion of natural habitats is accelerating (Ceballos, Ehrlich, and Dirzo, 2017). Ten years ago, in 2012, the Cities and Biodiversity Outlook projected that 60% of the area expected to be urban by 2030 had not yet been built (CBD Secretariat, 2012). This implied that the human spatial footprint would more than double, much faster than human population, with natural habitat the size of South Africa newly transformed for permanent human habitation. A current-day assessment is pending, though the projection has since been extended to 2050: the urban footprint will increase by 78%–171% over 2015 (Huang et al., 2019). The change of land to urban use is relatively permanent, with streets and other urban infrastructure having great fixity. Retrofitting them is difficult and expensive. Habitat restoration is possible and desirable, but at a global scale it cannot keep up with destruction. Furthermore, restoration will be too expensive when damage is extensive and entrenched, and too late after species go extinct. Preservation is critical, but it remains elusive (Swilling, 2016).

To date, the literature mostly pays insufficient attention to the quality of urbanization driving growth, as opposed to merely the quantity. Most characterizes urbanization uniformly, with little to no regard for the configuration of streets, density of residents or buildings, predominant modes of transportation, or distribution of land uses. And the CBD’s Aichi Targets did not directly recognize urban land expansion as a driver of habitat loss (Simkin et al., 2022). Unfortunately, too often expansion replicates the low-density, land-hungry, use-segregated suburban model of 20th century North America (Güneralp et al., 2020; UN-Habitat, 2020). The relationship between land use change and biodiversity is complex (IPBES, 2019). The diversity of humans and human preferences in cities results in a correspondingly diverse patchwork of parks and gardens do often support increased biodiversity, though usually with less abundance and more richness of certain species (e.g., urban adapters over urban avoiders).

Fortunately, funding for the preservation and conservation (The Nature Conservancy, 2022) of natural habitat appears to be accelerating (World Climate Foundation, 2022). So far, much of this funding focuses on ‘high value’ forest habitat (e.g., the Congo basin, the last rainforest that absorbs more carbon than it releases), which is more susceptible to agriculture and extraction than urban expansion. Still, commendable efforts to preserve urban stepping stones and other remnant patches are creating ecological corridors that connect with larger, intact forest habitat are increasing (Spotswood et al., 2019). Such projects offer the twin benefits of protecting biodiversity against encroachment and protecting humans against the effects of climate change.

A parallel analysis by UN-Habitat in 2012 analyzed 50 case studies, all in different watersheds, of local-scale, urban-led strategies, policies, and plans intended to improve the city-biodiversity interface (Figure 2). It concluded that habitat loss due to land-use change for human settlement was the most significant direct environmental pressure at the interface between cities and natural systems for cities in four of the six major world regions (Figure 3) (McInnes, 2013). It is not only the increasing conversion of swaths of land for human purposes but also the forms that such expansions take that are having far-reaching impacts across sectors. Much of this conversion is unplanned; where has been planned, much has been badly planned yielding both unnecessary sprawl and inappropriate segregation.

Figure 4  Linear regression analysis of planned and serendipitous ecosystem services through pro-biodiversity interventions in 50 cities revealed four outliers (i.e. pollination; nutrient storage, recycling, and processing; carbon storage; and accumulation of organic matter) that were least frequently acknowledged despite being delivered ‘for free’ (McInnes, 2013).
The land-wasteful models of the 20th century developed world are being replicated in the 21st century developing world. Conversion of natural habitat for human settlements is not a direct function of population growth, but rather lack of planning and/or unsustainable planning. Urban expansion is accelerating even where population growth is decelerating, meaning that per capita consumption of land is increasing and the average density of cities is decreasing. Unless we are able to reverse this trend with more sensitively-located, appropriately-compact development, new urban areas will be locked into highly resource-inefficient, emissions-intensive patterns.

The Hotspot Cities project (Figure 5) by the McHarg Center for Urbanism and Ecology at the University of Pennsylvania studied 463 cities with populations of 300,000 or more in the world’s 36 biodiversity hotspots (Weller et al., 2021). Though the intact natural habitats of these hotspots cover only 2.5% of the earth’s surface, it supports approximately half of its endemic plant and animal species (“Biodiversity Hotspots”, 2006). Cities cover a similar area and accommodate more than half of the world’s human species, but they are expanding at the expense of hotspots’ decline. By superimposing their 2030 spatial growth projections onto mappings of endangered species’ habitat ranges, the project identified that over 90% of the cities studied put biodiversity and urbanization in direct conflict. Cities are sprawling directly into biodiverse habitats and climate risk zones.

As UN-Habitat argued at the Stockholm+50 conference, most existing spatial planning processes treat built and natural habitats as binary and static (UN Web TV, 2022 & 2022a). By ignoring the accelerating replacement of the natural by the built, sprawl is accelerating along with unsustainable feedback loops. It is critical that we change this trajectory and embrace development models that spare land for nature and nature-based solutions. To phrase it crassly in the most anthropocentric terms, failure to do so will put 44% of the global GDP in cities at risk (Mejía and Amaya-Espinol, 2022).

As a community of living organisms (e.g., plants and animals) interacting with the non-living components of their environment (e.g., water and soil), the ecosystem is the broadest scale of biodiversity. The services it provides underlie all human life, from the provision of food to the regulation of air and water to culture and recreation to support of the soil. The ecosystem is the leverage point that simultaneously connects biodiversity, climate impacts, and urbanization. Depending on its health, it can result in either positive or negative feedback loops. For human communities, particularly vulnerable ones who may lack adaptive capacity, nature-based solutions and ecosystem-based adaptation can ease these intertwined issues. Yet many of the ‘co-benefits’ provided by nature-positive interventions are unacknowledged or ‘serendipitous’ by planners, decision makers, and residents. The UN-Habitat study (Figure 4)
also showed that the ecosystem services least likely to be acknowledged (but that nature was already providing ‘for free’ were (1) pollination, (2) nutrient recycling, (3) carbon storage, and (4) organic accumulation (McInnes, 2013). This fuller anthropocentric view still falls short of the ethical imperative of caring for nature for its own sake (Vucetich et al., 2015).

Since 2010, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) has provided essential recognition of the role of sub-national governments (CBD, 2010) and of peri-urban land use planning (CBD, 2014). The UN system has also adopted a common approach to biodiversity that includes a joint commitment to, inter alia, improve the quality of urbanization and limit encroachment (UNEP, UNDP and HLCP Biodiversity Task Team, 2021). As the Aichi Targets expired in 2020, the 2022 Global Biodiversity Framework brings welcome focus to urban space and multidisciplinary action (CBD, 2021). At the time of writing, one of the Framework’s targets (currently #12) underlines the importance of the total area, quality, and connectivity of green and blue spaces in urban areas, such as pocket parks, roadside verges, street trees, or other elements whose contributions to biodiversity are small but potentially ‘add up’. However, neither this target nor the Framework address ‘in-between’ spaces or their rapid conversion, essentially ignoring (as the Aichi Targets did) the role of urban land expansion as a driver of habitat loss (Simkin et al., 2022). Still, there is some indirect attention through other targets that prioritize restoration and conservation (currently #2 and 3), respectively, and incentivize interlinkages with climate (#8), developing with nature-based solutions (#11), and policies based on multi-level governance (#14).

Avoiding a sixth extinction requires preventing making the mistakes of the 20th century, which are now being replicated at a much bigger scale in the context of more severely depleted biodiversity. There will not be a second chance to get things right. In many low-density places, particularly where population growth is relatively slow, this will mean sparing and preserving natural habitat through compact urban development. This could involve the contextually appropriate densification and/or infill of underutilized land fragments of relatively low ecological value. Where densities are too high for infrastructural carrying capacity, cities will still need to expand. In such places it is essential that policymakers and planners understand the inherent risks and vulnerabilities of biodiversity to people and of people to climate so they can choose locations of the least potential damage. Complicating this is that—for historical and administrative reasons—the urban fringe is often outside the jurisdictional boundary of the city where development is usually managed by smaller, less-equipped local authorities. We must act now to recraft urban planning philosophies, practices, and tools so that biodiversity loss is curtailed. Several critical challenges urgently require solutions.

**Figure 5** Cities of 300,000 or more people (in yellow) projected to sprawl into remnant habitats (in dark green) in the world’s biological hotspots (Credits: Weller R, McHarg Center for Urbanism and Ecology, University of Pennsylvania).
Unhelpful, often inaccurate dichotomies between natural and built (Matheswaran, Winowiecki, and Park, 2015), and rural and urban (Doernberg and Weith, 2021), fail to get to grips with the rapid and/or subtle transitions between the two.

Lack of clarity about where at the local scale habitat degradation and destruction are occurring—particularly at the less-regulated peri-urban edge—makes them difficult to mitigate concretely (McDonald et al. 2018).

The widespread inability to predict where and when land-use change is most likely to happen makes anticipating risk difficult (McDonald et al., 2018).

The difficulty of assigning the full economic and cultural value of biodiversity and lack of awareness of more “mundane” ecosystem services privileges iconic species over habitat extent and quality and creates data gaps in places of relatively low institutional capacity (Seto, Parnell and Elmqvist, 2013).

The resistance to cooperating across jurisdictional boundaries and disciplinary silos impedes the widespread action required for ecosystem health (Rudd, 2012; Scarlett and McKinney, 2016).

The lack of and/or limited application of sound planning options for accommodating population growth, often at the ‘no-man’s-land’ frontier just beyond a city’s administrative boundaries, that would otherwise slow habitat degradation and local extirpations that undermine both ecosystem integrity and human livability (Bókony et al, 2018).
Overcoming the previous six challenges requires a shift in thinking. Several targets of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) situate biodiversity and urbanization in the same frame of reference. Target 11.3 aims to mitigate urban sprawl, target 11.7 to increase green public space, and target 11.a to support regional development planning. Target 15.9 calls for integrating ecosystem and biodiversity values into national and local planning and development processes (UN, 2015). Urban-Rural Linkages: Guiding Principles and Framework for Action recommend a multi-sectoral, multi-level and multi-stakeholder governance framework and state that ‘integrated territorial development along the urban-rural continuum should prioritize protecting, sustaining and expanding areas that are important to biodiversity and ecosystem services’ (UN-Habitat, 2019).

Managing Urban-Rural Linkages for Biodiversity: an Integrated Territorial Approach (UN-Habitat, 2022) calls on policymakers to consider the effects of their decisions on both distant and proximate territories. As methodologies are currently only available for assessing the latter (IPBES 2019), this paper focuses on proximate effects.

Getting to grips with the rapid eclipse of the natural by the built requires incorporating the following overarching shifts in our work as policymakers:

• Spatializing challenges
• Working telescopically (i.e. between scales)
• Working transversally (i.e. across silos)
• Anticipating and guiding change

2. Principles

2.1 Spatializing Challenges

In a physical world, it is only through mapping where challenges exist that we can ascertain how to address them, by whom, and with what measures. Very often the impacts of a decision or policy are hypothetical until they are spatialized. Humans shape physical places, and at the same time, physical places reinforce human behaviour because of their fixity, or relative permanence. This also helps to identify the interaction within city layers, neglecting any single one of which often leads to problems in other layers (ISO, 2019; WEF, 2022). For example, a lack of green space can not only degrade the environmental layer (e.g., a city’s air quality), but also a city’s societal layer (e.g., public safety). Similarly, a lack of natural, permeable surfaces can exacerbate flooding that environmental layers are less equipped to mitigate, leading to a snowball effect. Understanding where these occur is critical for understanding how they interact and impact one another. A 2007 study of the impact of transport infrastructure and urbanization on landscape fragmentation in the German state of Baden-Württemberg mapped its remaining green patches and calculated their effective mesh size (Figure 6), revealing development impact and providing a baseline for monitoring (Jaeger et al. 2007). In 2021, UNDP and the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre launched the UN Biodiversity Lab 2.0 and Maps of Hope Project; together, they aim to build the capacity of national governments to use spatial data and explore where the protection, management, and restoration of nature are needed (UNDP, 2022).

Figure 6 Jaeger et al (2007) studied the impact of transport infrastructure and urbanization on landscape fragmentation in Baden-Württemberg, Germany. Credits: Institute of Landscape Planning & Ecology, University of Stuttgart.
2.2 Working Telescopically (i.e. between scales)

Many planning and development decisions take place at the site or, at best, neighbourhood scale, while the actual functioning of city-regions for humans takes place across the metropolitan scale. Ecosystems (e.g., watersheds) function and are impacted at an even wider regional scale. Similarly, decisions affecting transportation and conservation often take place at higher scales of government, i.e., provincial, or national. Effective action for biodiversity needs to ‘telescope’ across all these scales, acting at the most appropriate one and linking back to all the others (WEF, 2022). It may also need to account for and reconcile political motivations that diverge between scales. Likewise, political self-interest and competition often impede this. One bright exception is the Greater Sydney Region which requires of its constituent local authorities district plans that align with the priorities of the higher scale of government (Figure 7). They ensure alignment across scales in aspects such as open space proximity and connectivity measures that ultimately contribute to landscape protection (Greater Sydney Commission, 2018). Successful implementation of biodiversity and conservation plans often needs to span even wider scales. For example, National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and only occasionally in Local Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (LBSAPs) require synchronized coordination of planning, implementation, and regular monitoring and reporting across all levels of government (CBD, 2017).

Figure 7 The Greater Sydney Commission requires its five district-scale master plans including their several landscape management strategies to align with the Greater Sydney Region Plan. Credits: Greater Sydney Commission (2018).
2.3 Working Transversally (i.e. across silos)

Alignment across governmental sectors, contiguous municipalities, professional disciplines, and diverse stakeholders is critical for nature-positive outcomes. Competing human interests—whether sectoral or territorial—can jeopardize the continuity and function of ecosystems. BiodiverCities 2030 provides a collaborative framework for subnational actors to achieve people-centric, science-based, actionable targets in Colombia (whose government has championed it). Its activities have inspired pro-nature urban management, governance for nature-based solutions, enhanced urban-rural linkages, biodiversity conservation, and, with potential application in rapidly densifying contexts outside of Colombia (Mejía and Amaya-Espinel, 2022). Local Action for Biodiversity (LAB) works with local and regional authorities around the world to improve and enhance ecosystem management at the local level, facilitating networking and lesson sharing between them. By ensuring this alignment, the interaction between the systems (i.e., environment, agriculture, urban development, healthcare) can optimize achievement of the broader plan and avoid phenomena such as landscape fragmentation (WEF, 2022).

A New Pattern Language for Growing Regions, the first update of the 1973 original outlines a collection of modular, replicable patterns, whether place-, network-, or process-oriented (Mehaffy et al, 2020). Each pattern links explicitly to other patterns in the collection, demonstrating how better landscape design can forge transversal connections (Figure 8).

Figure 8 Excerpts from A New Pattern Language for Growing Regions: Places, Networks, Processes underline the need for polycentric governance that offers linkages across seemingly disconnected silos.
2.4 Anticipating and Guiding Change

The mapping of urban expansion alone is not enough to fully account for the indirect effects of development, particularly on distant areas, but it is a critical first step, particularly on land near protected areas. The spatial form adopted in a plan (i.e., street patterns, lot sizes, land use zoning) is highly predictive of the amount of space people consume, the distances they travel, and emissions they produce. Land-use change models can illustrate complexity and inform policymakers’ decisions about where and how to develop. More than ever before, urbanization strategies must prioritize the protection of biodiversity. They may also need to backcast from desired states (e.g., landscape connectivity), particularly where large, expensive, and enduring infrastructure will be built. Having already predicted where the destruction of biodiversity will likely occur, cities can assess the sensitivity of proposed plans, explore costs and mitigation measures, and consider alternatives, and shift plans based on a more holistic understanding of the inherent incentives. With most future urban expansion taking place in developing countries, research on the relationship between urbanization and biodiversity needs to be readily accessible to them (Elmqvist et al. 2013).

Following proposals to drain and develop the Nakivubo Swamp in Kampala, Uganda, a study estimated that it was providing USD 1 million per year in terms of expenditures that would be required to mitigate the effects of wetland loss. As a result, municipal decision makers reversed course and designated Nakivubo as part of the city’s greenbelt zone (Figure 9) (IUCN, 2003). In India, the state of Kerala mandates and incentivizes the coordination of environmental planning between different levels of government for biodiversity management. This approach has resulted in the prioritization of nature-vulnerable areas. In Brazil, the Atlantic Forest biome cuts across multiple states but benefits from a federal-level designation. That designation establishes conservation frameworks that vertically align territorial and strategic development planning with national conservation efforts. Natural habitat loss has been stemmed, though lack of enforcement capacity and upstream challenges from an undesignated biome are undercutting this. See Annex 1 for more detail on Kerala and the Atlantic Forest.

Together, the examples of the Nakivubo Swamp, Kerala state, and the Atlantic Forest biome constitute multiple facets of integrating cities and biodiversity. Each contains elements of inspiration, though none are entirely complete. The implementation of a plan always requires complementary legislation and adequate finance. Any can serve as an entry point, though all are necessary in varying degrees. See Annex 2 for a contextualized catalogue of preservation-oriented projects and their regulatory, design-, and finance-related components.
3. Actions

Achieving impact requires putting principles into action. Pro-biodiversity actions within and beyond cities include not only direct nature-based solutions such as green infrastructure, but also indirect ‘nature-sparing’ or form-based solutions within and at the fringe of the city that prevent the degradation and destruction of nearby natural habitat in the first place.

UN-Habitat reviewed widely-available compendia of nature-based and form-based solutions published by intergovernmental organizations and NGOs. From these it compiled more than 100 case studies from more than 50 countries and distilled them into 35 unique intervention typologies. Each has its merits but may not always be optimal or even feasible in any given context, whether because of physical or temporal constraints.

For that reason, five overlapping parameters were used to filter and classify the interventions (Figure 10):

- Spatial scale, along a continuum of neighborhood-city-region
- Time frame for implementation, whether less or more than two years
- Frequency of intervention, whether one-off or sustained
- Type of action, whether preserve, conserve, restore, or create
- Density of urban environment, along a continuum of high-medium-low

**Figure 10** UN-Habitat compiled more than 100 nature-based and form-based solutions and distilled them into 35 unique intervention typologies and then categorized them roughly into types (vertical axis) and spatial scale (horizontal axis).
Having plotted the interventions with more nuance, according to type, spatial scale, and timeframe (Figure 11), several patterns are noticeable:

- Development/creation interventions proliferate at the smaller neighbourhood-to-city scale, while preservation and restoration interventions are mostly applicable at the larger city-to-regional scale.

- The frequency of intervention also changes between spatial scales, with more one-off interventions at the neighbourhood-city scale and more ‘sustained’ interventions at the city-region scale.

- A similar pattern is visible in the temporal dimension; development/creation interventions are short term actions, while most restoration and preservation interventions are long term.

- There are more creation-oriented interventions than those aimed at preservation and restoration, particularly in high-density environments.

One clear gap is the absence of long-term preservation interventions at the neighbourhood and city scales, especially in high density environments. This can stem from any of the challenges mentioned earlier in this paper, ranging from a failure to acknowledge the complex interactions between urban and natural systems to the lack of prior planning for growth within and adjacent to existing urban areas. It calls for taking a strategic approach in planning urban expansion that recognizes the importance of green infrastructure across the scales in contributing to urban biodiversity.

Sustainable development that proactively looks at preserving / protecting / safeguarding biodiversity hotspots that provide valuable ecosystem services whilst also increasing resilience to natural disasters is more critical now and going ahead than it ever was in the past. Local officials need to be empowered with decision-making tools that make these benefits explicit, making decision-makers understand why and where to prioritize preservation. Accordingly, UN-Habitat and partners are proposing the following actions:

- Project spatial growth
- Predict land use conflict zones
- Prioritize areas of least harm
- Prevent replication of mistakes
3.1 Project Spatial Growth

We must project future growth according to various possible scenarios to be able to proactively guide it. This will help the international development community catch up with the scale and speed at which private developers are already operating. Such development also often excludes populations of lesser means, who may have little choice but to settle informally in areas of high vulnerability to themselves and non-human species. Research suggests that more than 70% of the forecasted loss of the range of suitable habitat for heavily impacted species will be driven by one-third of the total forecasted new urban land that extends from a limited number of urban clusters (Simkin et al., 2022). In other words, we can locate the parts of cities whose expansion will be most damaging to non-human species and thus target urban preservation and conservation efforts accordingly.

In Figure 12, the first cartogram adjusts the size of the eight world regions according to how much they are currently sprawling (i.e., per capita land consumption of the entire urban population), indicating the ongoing tendency of land-rich regions to convert more natural habitat than necessary for human settlements. The second adjusts size for projected urban population growth, highlighting regions that are at high risk of replicating the wasteful urban patterns of the land-rich ones (UN-Habitat, 2018). The example in 3.2 shows how urban expansion can be projected for individual cities at the local scale.

Figure 12. Cartograms show per capita urban land consumption rates by region (top) and urban growth rates by region (bottom). Credits: UN-Habitat, 2018.
3.2 Predicting Land Use Conflict Zones

We must be able to predict how business-as-usual development and climate change will impact biodiversity in real space. Only then can we intervene to avoid land use conflict before it occurs, either by making alternative or corrective choices about where and how to develop. The most immediate impact of urban expansion on biodiversity is often at the peri-urban frontier, whereas the impact of climate on urban is often along coastlines and rivers. At a global level, the McHarg Center for Urbanism and Ecology at the University of Pennsylvania superimposed 2030 spatial growth projections for the largest cities in each of the world’s 33 most biodiversity-rich hotspots onto mappings of endangered species (Figure 13). It then identified and graded land use conflict zones at the peri-urban edges of those cities (Figure 14) (Weller et al. 2021).

Figure 13 (lower) Venn representation of the overlapping conflict zones between urban growth and remnant vegetation. Credits: Weller. R, McHarg Center for Urbanism and Ecology, University of Pennsylvania.

Figure 14 (upper) Mapped projection of the extents of overlap between urban expansion and threatened species’ habitat at the metropolitan scale for Sao Paulo. Credits: Weller. R, McHarg Center for Urbanism and Ecology, University of Pennsylvania.
Local budgets are often constrained, and political bandwidth is limited. Comprehensive studies—where they have been undertaken—can thus be overwhelming. In UN-Habitat’s experience, governments—particularly local—wish to prioritize interventions in a ‘sequence-able’ manner that allows them to deploy resources as they come online. Municipal governments need to know the trade-offs between different developmental options and to have alternatives that balance a minimization of ecological harm with a maximization of growth. The Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT) undertook such a study of the metropolitan area of Melbourne, aggregating the natural habitat of potential value to a selected group of key species. Their resulting plan rated the peri-urban areas outside the urban growth boundary and indicated which land should and should not be developed (Figure 15) (Gordon et al. 2009).

Combined with more traditional planning mapping, which tends to focus on land accessibility and connectivity as well as infrastructure proximity, this type of mapping adds the dimension of biodiversity preservation for more holistically informed decision making. Future iterations of this methodology might incorporate quantified economic value of biodiversity, though with the possible trade-off of diminished replicability in resource- and data-scarce environments.

Figure 15 RMIT Study assigns spatial development options for Melbourne based on biodiversity value (Gordon et al. 2009).
3.4 Prevent Replication of Mistakes

To date, much of the literature and investment around cities and biodiversity has been on restoring degraded ecosystems in and around mature, well-resourced urban areas. Simon (2022) warns against the uncritical application of urban sustainability solutions in contexts that may be inappropriate. We currently lack concrete, transferable methods for preventing further degradation and destruction of natural habitat at the peri-urban edge where change is happening fastest (while retrofitting where needed inside cities). More importantly, many cities and other levels of subnational government need to be able to act immediately based on limited data to hand. Following its identification of a gap around preservation efforts at the local scale (Figure 11), UN-Habitat compiled a catalogue of 50 prevention-oriented interventions and analyzed them according to the following factors:

- Spatial scale, along a continuum of neighborhood-city-region
- Region, according to eight groupings
- Timeframe for implementation, between 2000-2032
- Status, whether proposed, adopted, in progress, or fully implemented
- Implementing agency, whether local government, non-governmental organization (NGO), or United Nations (UN) agency

Despite their relative scarcity in the literature, there is inspiring evidence of prevention-oriented interventions at the scale of the city (and smaller) that have been attempted in a variety of contexts. Figure 16 highlights several findings:

- Spatial scale runs the gamut from metropolitan down to neighborhood, despite their relative scarcity in high-profile compendiums,
- Subnational governments (especially municipalities) were the most prevalent implementers, followed by NGOs.
- Duration and progress status varies widely.
- Regionally, southeast Asia has the ‘oldest’, most completed initiatives, though with nothing recent of note. Europe has the highest proportion of recent initiatives as well as most led by municipalities. Sub-Saharan Africa has the highest proportion of proposed initiatives, as well as those led by NGOs.
- In general, larger-scale initiatives tend to be more municipality-led and less fully implemented, while smaller-scale are more NGO-led and more fully implemented.

The 167 national governments that signed the New Urban Agenda, which guides sustainable urban development through 2036, ‘committed’ themselves to promoting sustainable land use, combining urban extensions with adequate densities and compactness to prevent and contain urban sprawl, as well as preventing unnecessary land-use change and the loss of productive land and fragile and important ecosystems (United Nations 2017). McDonald et al. (in press) argue that compact urban development spares habitat conversion at the periphery of cities while offering liveability and climate benefits (i.e. walkability) within cities. Though this density often comes with the tradeoff of less green space within the city, the paper highlights several ‘brightspot’ neighborhoods that manage to balance both density and green space, along with a table of green urban interventions appropriate for different urban formal typologies.
Figure 16 UN-Habitat compiled 50 examples of prevention-oriented interventions, with particular focus on city and neighbourhood scales. (See Annex 2 for details on all 50 examples.)
4. Tools

Based on the evidence and identified gaps, UN-Habitat with the McHarg Center at the University of Pennsylvania, and One Architecture and Urbanism have worked to develop a methodology of analysis and intervention across the urban development, biodiversity, and climate fields (working transversally as described in 2.3). At its core is a multi-disciplinary mapping methodology. Tested in three cities over five months, it sequences the previously discussed actions (i.e. project, predict, prioritize, and prevent) into an iterative and replicable methodology that simultaneously analyzes biodiversity loss, climate risks and urban expansion. By anticipating and guiding change (described in 2.4) the methodology enhances urban development planning to deliver stronger outcomes in terms of biodiversity protection and climate adaptation. Here we elaborate on the methodology as applied in one of the cities, Honiara, Solomon Islands.

4.1 Projection through Multidisciplinary Mapping

We investigated each context via desktop research, stakeholder workshops and on-site data collection to identify key physical features, climate change risks, natural habitats at both local and regional scales, urban land-use types and jurisdictional boundaries (Figure 17). Open-source global and regional data sets were compiled into high-resolution maps which characterize land based on present quality of biodiversity, climate risk, and urban expansion. Sourcing of data sets was standardized across the cities to ensure replicability of the methodology in other data-scarce places. The team then projected urban expansion, biodiversity loss, and climate risk to 2050, using a ‘business as usual’ growth scenario based on high population growth, resource-intensive consumption, and limited regulation of land-use change (Figure 18) (Seto, Güneralp, and Hutyra, 2012).

Figure 17 The peri-urban map of Honiara, Solomon Islands identifies key geographical features, the municipal boundary (thick dashed line), the non-administrative Greater Honiara Area comprising the city and two adjacent wards (thin dashed line), and significant infrastructure.
Figure 18 (from top to bottom) Maps of biodiversity loss, urbanization, and climate risks projected to 2050.
4.2 Prediction through Multidisciplinary Mapping

A spatial overlap-based workflow was used to generate an integrated vulnerability hotspots map that predicts overlapping regions of highest risk (Figure 19). Working transversally in anticipation of change, this workflow integrated information across silos to predict the future intersectional impacts of climate risk, biodiversity loss, and urban expansion. The maps produced therefrom were then discussed with local stakeholders to troubleshoot and verify the accuracy of the findings with on-the-ground reality.

![Figure 19](image-url)
4.3 Prioritization through Multidisciplinary Mapping

In each context, the city’s strategic development plan was combined with findings from the integrated vulnerability hotspots maps to produce strategic intervention maps (Figure 20). Given the inter-scalar nature of the issues considered—see ‘working telescopically’ in 2.2—these maps focused on (1) the resource-shed or regional scale (Figure 21), (2) the peri-urban scale (Figure 22), and (3) the city scale (Figure 23). Their proposals are both ‘nature-based’ and ‘form-based’ and have been recommended to each of the cities for consideration and prioritization based on land ownership, jurisdictional control, available resources, and other factors.

Honiara’s 2018 urban development strategy promotes densification, infill, and mixed use within the city and designation of riverine areas as floodplains. It also establishes the Greater Honiara Area (GHA), a non-administrative entity comprising the city and two adjacent peri-urban wards of Guadalcanal Province. The GHA aims to integrate planning, and the peri-urban areas its strategy has identified for residential expansion avoid existing nature parks. However, there is little mention of the ‘no-man’s-land’ in between them, and none of biodiversity preservation or conservation. The following proposals for strategic interventions aim to complement this.

Figure 20 Existing planning documents were combined with findings from the multidisciplinary mapping to inform the strategic proposals.
The Forest Act of the Solomon Islands designates all land above 400m as protected, though demand for timber exports have provoked logging there regardless. The country's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan sought to reverse this trend and adopted a ‘ridge-to-reef’ concept of integrated forest, water, and coastal management. Accordingly, our proposals for regional-scale strategic interventions on Guadalcanal Island would require national, provincial, and municipal government involvement in the following:

**Protecting the forest:**
- Consider more effective means of enforcing the protected area above 400m that prohibits logging (e.g. community conservation on customary land) and would effectively conserve 40% of the terrestrial area of the island
- Designate and incentivize forest management control areas between 200 and 400 metres that require the use of sustainable logging methods

**Strengthening riverine corridors:**
- Construct flood protection and limit uses within floodplains to crop and range land
- Manage waste and pollution more proactively, particularly in upstream informal settlements
- Make better, more flexible use of existing water bodies as buffers against flooding and drought

**Reconfiguring urban areas:**
- Designate areas of higher biodiversity near cities for preservation
- Prioritize urban expansion across the island into areas of lower biodiversity to limit impact on ecosystems
- Bundle new infrastructure such as roads to limit fragmentation of natural habitat

**Protecting the coast:**
- Construct a layered living flood protection system in all urban areas (e.g. offshore constructed reefs and aquaculture, seagrass restoration, mangrove conservation and restoration, protected fishing areas)
- Plant a green berm of mangroves in all peri-urban agricultural areas to buffer and mitigate coastal disasters
In the periphery of Honiara, the threats to biodiversity in terms of land use conflict appeared the sharpest (Figure 19), due both to logging of land and urban expansion (formal and informal) on the south side of the city. Speculative, sprawling, often gated residential development is converting large swaths of land within and beyond the municipal boundary. Proposals for peri-urban scale strategic interventions in the Greater Honiara Area (Honiara and two adjacent wards in Guadalcanal Province) include:

**Protecting the forest:**
- Coordinate with national government on a potential forest management control area between 200 and 400 metres requiring sustainable logging

**Strengthening riverine corridors:**
- Decrease flood risk along the Lungga River to the east of the city through construction of flood protection and limiting of and uses within the floodplain to crop and range land
- Manage waste and pollution, particularly in peripheral informal settlements
- Make better use of existing or new water bodies as buffers against flooding and drought

**Reconfiguring urban areas:**
- Designate areas of higher biodiversity for preservation priority, e.g. to the south of the city, where biodiversity is relatively high (dark red areas on Figure 19) to discourage speculative residential development
- Prioritize and incentivize consolidated urban expansion into areas of lower biodiversity, e.g. to the far west of the city and east of the airport, in non-city peri-urban wards of the Greater Honiara Area (light areas on Figure 19)
- Assess the quantity and quality of open public spaces in the city (e.g. with UN-Habitat’s City-Wide Public Space Assessment\(^\text{12}\)) and explore previously-unconsidered conservation and restoration options
- Stabilize slopes in and around the city through reforestation and terraced agriculture

**Protecting the coast:**
- Construct a layered living flood protection system on the coast to the west of Honiara, including offshore reefs and a protected fishing area
- Plant a green berm of mangroves along the coastal agricultural area to the east of Honiara
In the centre of Honiara threats to human residents from climate change appeared most acute (Figure 19), especially in the land use conflict zone along the Matanik River. This is a floodplain with high population density, much of it informal, and increasing water pollution issues. Additionally, most coastal areas along the northern edge of the city lack natural or artificial defenses from storm surges and tropical cyclones. Proposals for city-scale strategic interventions within the municipality of Honiara include:

**Strengthening Riverine Corridors:**
- Rearrange land uses and employ nature-based solutions along the Matanik River floodplain to mitigate flood risk and water pollution
- Establish a multifunctional blue- and green-way that provides stepping stones for biodiversity traveling between ridge and reef
- Generate a baseline of the quantity and quality of biodiversity (e.g. with the Singapore Index on Cities’ Biodiversity) and monitor change over time

**Reconfiguring the city centre:**
- Protect and invest in publicly-owned green patches of higher biodiversity value
- Rehabilitate degraded open spaces into parks, community gardens, or recreation space
- Consider ‘leapfrogged’ open space of lower biodiversity value for infill development as preventative of expansion at the peri-urban edge
- Guide the development of new settlements (particularly informal ones) into less risk-prone areas

**Protecting the coast:**
- Implement localized nature-based solutions such as seagrass, mangrove, and reef restoration
- Build a hard, engineered waterfront in the port area, including harbour breakwaters, area to block the flow of sediment, filter water, reduce wave action, and stabilize the shore
- Plant soft and layered vegetated barriers along the commercial coast of the city centre to mitigate the effects of extreme weather, provide breeding grounds and habitats for fishery species, and facilitate tourism
4.4 Prevention with the Multidisciplinary Mapping Methodology and Other Tools

Having implemented their respective plans of action, the cities will then be able to effectively prevent the projected risks from materializing. Additionally, catalogues of pro-biodiversity interventions (Figure 8 and Figure 13) provided an inexhaustive list of precedents based on scale and time frame of action among others to enable city leaders to make better-informed decisions.

The aim of this methodology is to equip cities with an evidence base to make better decisions about how and where to develop; fundamental decisions that collectively constitute the fate of nature. As its data requirements are light, it has the potential to serve as a troubleshooting guide, a precursor or revision to a city plan, or pre-investment suitability screening aid. Actors in any urban planning process can conduct the scenario building (i.e. projection and prediction) and prioritization steps and benefit from their insights. Future iterations will test the addition of economic valuation of biodiversity to the mean species analysis employed in this initial phase. However, the relative difficulty of such valuations may compromise the replicability of this methodology in data-scarce, low-resource urban environments.

Because it is modular, this methodology can also plug into existing tools and benchmarks for better integration with local environmental planning processes or other municipal agendas. For example, it can help characterize the presence and quality of biodiverse habitats identified using the Singapore Index on Cities’ Biodiversity (Chan et al., 2021). This pioneering set of 28 indicators covers native biodiversity, ecosystem services, and the governance and management of biodiversity. It serves as a baseline against which progress can be measured and helps cities build their capabilities in biodiversity conservation. The mapping methodology described above can catalyze the findings from this baseline by helping set preservation/conservation priorities and allocate more strategic budgets (Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, 2021).

UN-Habitat’s City-wide and Green Public Space Assessment is a well-tested spatial asset inventory that would strongly benefit the methodology by ground-truthing its recommendations and suggesting where a city might most feasibly take action. Its survey uses open-source technology and has been tested in more than 30 cities; covering open space ownership, use, conditions, and public perception, and it can be customized thematically to include biodiversity-relevant layers including vegetative characteristics, perviousness, and presence of key species. A primary advantage of the tool is its ability to help cities prioritize where they can intervene based on an accurate understanding of the places over which they have jurisdiction. One serendipitous advantage is the galvanizing effect it can have on residents (often students) whose deployment to spaces often generates momentum for action once a public space strategy is developed and adopted.

There are also synergies with UN-Habitat’s Our City Plans Toolbox. The toolbox uses a participatory and incremental methodology that is adaptable to local contexts and guides and supports local governments and urban actors to better understand, customize, and undertake inclusive and integrated urban planning processes. The mapping methodology described in this paper could significantly enrich plan formulation steps during the initial assessment phase of the toolbox. Transdisciplinary co-production is another promising methodology for mobilizing stakeholders early in the planning process and testing innovative solutions in diverse contexts (Simon 2022). Beyond avoiding expensive lock-ins and path dependencies, it can also help prevent the dispossession of indigenous people and other local populations of land and livelihoods (Counsell 2022). As local needs often include persistent or escalating environmental problems, informed indications about how and where to develop and prevent further biodiversity loss are critical.

Once policymakers or practitioners in a city have used these tools to map and highlight potential land use conflicts and options, they need to decide on the location and quality of development they will pursue. Several different paths are possible, including (1) retrofitting existing plans to reduce the need for expansion (e.g. through densification, regeneration, and infill), (2) deliberate location of unavoidable expansion away from high-value biodiversity areas and protection of those areas (e.g. through regulations and incentives), and (3) sensitive design of the expansion itself to integrate and support biodiversity within those converted areas (e.g. through compact urban form, greening, and the incorporation of other nature-based solutions). Many local contexts will optimize sustainable outcomes with some combination of the three.
5. Next Steps

It is usually more politically attractive and often less expensive—in the short term—to solve obvious problems than prevent ones from happening in the first place. This is largely the case because there is more visibility and profit in correcting mistakes. One famous commercial example is a bio-based odour-neutralizing product that never found mass appeal until the problem being solved (‘disappearing’ the unwanted scent) was ‘marked’ with an additional perceived benefit (an added scent) (Duhigg, 2014). Preventing mistakes before they are visible (i.e., habitat loss before it is too late for a sixth mass extinction) will require unprecedented will and effort. Biodiversity preservation and conservation within and at the edge of cities must be incentivized and accelerated.

Cities have enormous potential for biodiversity. Often, they are in important biodiversity hotspots near waterways, ecozone transitions, and migration paths. The operating space within which humanity can safely live is defined by nine planetary boundaries, four of which—including land use change and biodiversity loss—have already been exceeded (United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification 2022). While we have collectively done little to strengthen the interface between cities and nature, applying proactive effort now would be extraordinarily productive.

Additional funding for and partnership around this workstream should prioritize the following activities:

• Testing multidisciplinary mapping as a potential screening methodology for a diversity of urban projects and investments—and in particular for banks, lenders, and other funders—for early rapid assessment of broad environmental impact for large scale proposals and/or smaller ones beyond the scale of the site; under this stream, the full range of economic benefits and financial analysis could be further developed as well

• Catalyzing new master plans and development strategies and revising existing ones on the basis of multidisciplinary mapping that reconciles areas of imminent land use conflict, and supporting planning and environment professionals in the implementation of improved development and land use and controls including ecological corridors and networks

• Studying land use conflict zones in depth to jointly identify and troubleshoot specific environmental challenges (e.g., intensified effects of climate change), design and implement demonstration projects with key stakeholders, and link local solutions to national priorities and global funding

• Analyzing further prevention-oriented interventions (e.g. the 50 catalogued in Annex 2) to identify and promote successful planning models and multilevel governance arrangements that guide development within priority corridors, incentivize collaborative watershed management, and facilitate inter-municipal and other multilevel cooperation on ecosystems

• Liaising with state-of-the-art technicians measuring built and natural habitats at higher resolutions to advance the development of a ‘stoplight raster’ that reconciles/synthesizes all spatialized data points into a unified map of locations of most and least environmental harm and guides, inter alia, appropriate areas for new housing

• Researching further the trade-offs and co-benefits of different nature-based and form-based urban solutions (e.g., compact development, mixed-use configurations) for biodiversity, including balancing density (e.g., for increased housing provision) and greening (e.g., for increased climate resilience and other SDG-related benefits)
1. BiodiverCities 2030, convened by the Government of Colombia with the Alexander von Humboldt Biological Resources Research Institute and the World Economic Forum was established to inspire, motivate, and assist city governments, businesses, and people in cities to thrive in harmony with nature by 2030.

2. Local Action for Biodiversity is run by ICLEI-Local Governments for Sustainability and the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN).

3. Consequences include, inter alia, expensive technological lock-ins and path dependencies. Simon (2022) proceeds to recommend transdisciplinary co-production, which is mentioned in this paper at the end of Section 4.

4. The eight world regions used in this paper are: Europe & Japan (E&J), East Asia and Pacific (EAP), Latin America and Caribbean (LAC), Land-Rich Developed Countries (LRDC), South and Central Asia (SCA), South East Asia (SEA), Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), West and North Africa (WANA).

5. To date, this multidimensional mapping methodology has been tested in Honiara, Solomon Islands; Lilongwe, Malawi; and Morondava, Madagascar.

6. Quality of biodiversity habitat is measured using Mean Species Abundance (MSA) which covers land use change, road disturbance, habitat fragmentation, hunting, and nitrogen deposition.

7. Climate risks include regional trends of temperature and precipitation; local patterns of sea level rise, riverine flood risk zones, extreme heat, cyclone paths and desertification.

8. The aggregate amount of urban expansion, calculated through GDP and population growth, was applied spatially based on a suitability analysis that considered population density, slope, distance to roads and land cover.

9. Biodiversity, Climate Risk & Urban Expansion 2022-2050, Shared Socio-Economic Pathway 3 (SSP3) and Representative Concentration Pathway 6.0 (RCP6.0). SSP3, ‘regional rivalry’, is characterized by high population growth, resource-intensive consumption, low agricultural productivity, and limited regulation of land-use change, leading to continued deforestation; arguably ‘business as usual’ in relation to prevailing urbanization trends. RCP6.0 is one of the two intermediate scenarios (along with RCP4.5) described by the IPCC.
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Conservation – Actions to manage human interactions with ecosystems to provide maximum benefits to the present generation while maintaining their potential to meet the needs of future generations (WRI, 1992)

Ecosystem - A community of living organisms (plants, animals, fungi and various microbes) in conjunction with the non-living components of their environment (such as energy, air, water and mineral soil), all interacting as a system.

Encroachment - Encroachment is the spread of humans, transportation systems, utilities, buildings, and other development into natural areas. Encroachment leads to loss of habitat or changes in the natural ecology for plants, animals, fish, and other living organisms that live in the area (Habitat Encroachment, 2008).

Full Value of Biodiversity - The values of nature encompass the different layers of the values typology, including worldviews, underpinning knowledge systems, languages and cultures, indicators, and preferences. In addition to instrumental values, the values of nature include reciprocal values and perspectives of nature where nature and people are not seen as separate, and where intrinsic values are acknowledged on a par with values of nature’s benefits to people (Coscieme et al., 2020, Diaz et al., 2015)

Land Degradation – The many processes that drive the decline or loss in biodiversity, ecosystem functions or their benefits to people and includes the degradation of all terrestrial ecosystems.

Land-Use Change / Conversion - The modification or management of natural environments into human dominated environments, such as settlements, semi-natural and agricultural areas.

Multidisciplinary Mapping Methodology - The paper introduces a novel methodology that maps current and future biodiversity loss, climate risks and urbanization using open-source data in any given context. It measures and spatializes the interlinkages between the three disciplines comprehensively to provide a near-reality scenario that can benefit local partners in future-proofing urban master plans.

Natural Habitat - Areas composed of viable assemblages of plant and/or animal species of largely native origin and/or where human activity had not essentially modified an area’s primary ecological functions and species composition (UNEP-WCMC, 2014).

Peri-Urban - The often neglected, ever-expanding regions that arise upon reclassification of rural villages to statutory towns. The region is characterized by a juxtaposition of rural and urban activities along with institutional ambiguity, unplanned growth, environmental degradation, with formal schemes aimed at improving aspects of the environment being exclusionary (Marshall & Randhawa, 2017).

Preservation - Actions undertaken to maintain areas that are so far untouched by humans in their pristine, existing condition. Often regarded as a deeper form of environmentalism, or ecocentrism, preservation supports the worldview that ecosystems should be preserved regardless of their benefits (Wealth, 2018)

Restoration - Any intentional activity that initiates or accelerates the recovery of an ecosystem from a degraded state.

Telescopic - Zooming across multiple scales, acting at the most appropriate one, and linking back to all the others

Urban Growth / Urbanization - The increase in the proportion of a population living in urban areas; the process by which a large number of people becomes permanently concentrated in relatively small areas, forming cities (IPBES, 2019)
Case Study 1: Kerala, India

The Western Ghats (Montane Rain Forest ecoregion), older than the great Himalayan Mountain chain, is a global biodiversity hotspot covers 140,000 sq km and traverses the Indian states of Kerala, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Goa, Maharashtra, and Gujarat (Mittermeier et al., 2005). Kerala alone manages 9,400 sq km of effective forest area (Forest Statistics, 2008). The state's protected area constitutes a wide range of biomes, extending from the salt marshes, mangroves and beaches of the Arabian Sea to the moist deciduous and montane rain forests of the Western Ghats (Kerala Forest and Wildlife Department, 2008). However, Kerala’s biodiversity is threatened by improper land use, an expanding transport network and unplanned tourism development (Kerala Forest Research Institute, 2003). Additionally, Kerala’s population density of 859 persons per sq km, more than twice the Indian average of 382 (Kerala State Planning Board), may be challenging conservation and restoration efforts (Chaudhary et al, 2022).

The state aims to better integrate sustainable development goals into policymaking, and to catalyze community-oriented strategies for biodiversity protection. In practice this means decentralized administration, collaboration and alignment between the state, NGOs and civic movements. Kerala was the first state in India to set up a Biodiversity Management Committees (BMCs) in all local bodies (Suchitra, 2012) with specific duties to document local biodiversity and traditional knowledge. The State Biodiversity Strategy and Action plan developed by Kerala State Biodiversity Board outlines the strategies relating to conservation, sustainable use, equitable access, and shared benefits of biodiversity. As the largest and most populous metropolitan in Kerala, Kochi is the first Indian city to have developed a scientifically informed and participatory Local Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan. The state announced plans to extend the biodiversity action plan to panchayats i.e., peri-urban and rural context in the next financial year with the pilot project already implemented in Athirappilly, a panchayat 70 km northeast of Kochi.

People’s Biodiversity Register (PBR) is a community-involved, participatory exercise implemented by the local BMCs under state’s mandate as an effort to shift from welfare to participatory growth, and from top-down intervention to bottom-up planning. The register documents the community’s traditional knowledge and insight of the status, history, uses and forces driving changes on the biodiversity resources and further provides information on its economic benefits to the local communities (Kerala State Biodiversity Board, 2017).

To protect the mangrove forests situated on about 1,000 acres of private land, the state has introduced a scheme to award monetary incentives to landowners, while assessing how much of the land can be acquired (G, Sajith Kumar 2021).

Kerala and its constituent municipalities are partially aligned with the principles of this paper, particularly telescopic coordination between levels of government and transversal coordination between constituent jurisdictions. However, the administrative boundaries of multiple Indian states cut across the Western Ghats hotspot, threatening the continuity of this ecoregion. Though Kerala has offered conservation incentives to many municipalities and landowners, spatial coordination is lacking, and increasingly non-contiguous land uses are exacerbating landscape functionality.

The state is anticipating sea level rise and the flooding of the coastal cities of Kochi and Thiruvananthapuram, and beginning to explore various mitigation strategies. However, its attempt to improve environmental awareness and the accountability of communities, local bodies and NGOs in biodiversity preservation falls short in addressing climate change risks through an integrated approach (Balan and M. D, 2022). Kerala would benefit from investigating the interlinkages between biodiversity, climate change, and urbanization. Local governments—particularly those affected by climate change risks—could use the multidisciplinary mapping tool described in this paper to identify land use conflict zones. The integrated analysis it yields would help to formulate development and land use management strategies for holistic biodiversity preservation and climate change adaptation.

Endnotes

i. Kerala State Biodiversity Board (KSBB) is a statutory regulatory body under the State’s Department of Environment.

ii. In collaboration with ICLEI, South Asia and supported by the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU), Germany.

iii. Various mitigation strategies in the pipeline in Kerala State include the “Flood Mitigation Cluster Initiative” by the International Urban and Regional Cooperation, European Union.
Case Study 2: Atlantic Forest Biome, Brazil

The Atlantic Forest biome is a global biodiversity hotspot (Mittermeier et al., 2005). Located along the coastline of Brazil, it crosses 17 states and houses 70% of the country's population over 3,000 municipalities, including the major metropolitan areas of São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, and Belo Horizonte. These dense conurbations and their industrial base generate 60% of Brazilian GDP (Fundação SOS Mata Atlântica, 2021). Largely as a result of urban expansion, this biome has suffered a high degree of degradation (70%) and its native vegetation coverage has been reduced by more than 92% from its original extent (Mittermeier et al., 2005).

Fortunately, in 1988 the new Brazilian Constitution designated this biome as national heritage, and in 2006 the federal government adopted legislation protecting it. This legislation encourages municipalities fully or partially inside the biome to proactively protect, preserve, and restore native vegetation. It also established the creation of the Atlantic Forest Municipal Conservation and Recovery Plans (PMMAs) which, depending on the participating municipalities, and through both regulations and incentives, have preserved remnant habitat, expanded recovery zones, and mitigated growing pressures, including from climate change. The current guidelines call for these plans to align with local socio-economic development strategies and territorial plans, along with existing governing bodies' capacities (Ribeiro et al. 2013).

Complementing this, the National System of Nature's Protected Areas (PAs) along with the ecological fiscal transfers mechanisms (ICMS Ecológico), facilitate the creation and management of such zones at all levels. Incentives for securing accreditation to the system have especially mobilized municipal governments. The PA designations are aligned with the Brazilian Forestry Code, and though compliance has been slowed by the lack of capacity and enforcement, PMMAs have partly helped overcome this lack (de Oliveira e Aguiar and Steinmetz, 2013). Alignment with existing local strategies and plans has been an additional enabler, guiding public and private actions for conservation even when political will at other spheres of government was lacking (Brazil, Ministério do Meio Ambiente, 2017).

Over one decade, 40% of coastal municipalities in the biome created PAs (128 in total) and 12% developed PMMAs. Promisingly, this increased the marine protection area from 1.5% to 26%. Now there is a public-private initiative to develop PMMAs in another 35 municipalities by 2023 (Steinmetz 2022). Building on previous lessons (de Oliveira e Aguiar and Steinmetz, 2013), this initiative groups municipalities to partner with non-govern-mental organizations and state government bodies to build capacity and reach out to the public. In any case, federal-level legislation at the biome scale is achieving cross-state and cross-municipal coordination that likely would not otherwise happen, providing a check against uncontrolled peri-urban expansion.

The federal government of Brazil has spatialized the challenges and opportunities within the Atlantic Forest biome and prompted vertical (‘telescopic’ as described above) coordination. These have had the knock-on effect of both regulating and incentivizing horizontal coordination between policymakers within the constituent states. In other words, the principles described in this paper are all evident in the biome. However, the lack of federal designation or protective legislation in neighbouring biomes is resulting in negative spillover effects.

Of particular interest is Cerrado, another global biodiversity hotspot that has been experiencing a rapid acceleration of human development in the last decades. (Mittermeier et al., 2005). Cerrado's groundwater supply is critical for water levels downstream, and rising levels of deforestation and land conversion have hindered the functioning of hydropower plants in states in the Atlantic Forest (Fellet, 2021). In this sense, policymakers have begun to anticipate change. In terms of the actions described in this paper, they have also begun to predict some of the spatial conflicts that may arise from that change. Short of expanded federal intervention, municipal governments in both biomes could strengthen and accelerate their spatial planning with the multidisciplinary mapping methodology presented in this paper. The prevention of zones of conflicting land use may constitute a particularly appealing medium incentive for governments that are experiencing intensified droughts, wildfire, and flooding first hand.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Spatial scale</th>
<th>Time-frame (years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Conversion of pine monocultures to mixed deciduous forests</td>
<td>Podyjí National Park, Czech Republic</td>
<td>E&amp;J</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nagoya Biodiversity Report</td>
<td>Nagoya, Japan</td>
<td>E&amp;J</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Commitment to Biodiversity and Ecosystem Habitats</td>
<td>Zagreb, Croatia</td>
<td>E&amp;J</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>City &amp; Regional</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>StEPKlima - The ecological utility of green spaces in the context of climate change</td>
<td>Berlin, Germany</td>
<td>E&amp;J</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The London National Park city</td>
<td>London, UK</td>
<td>E&amp;J</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Striving towards sustainable development through a mosaic of land use patches and corridors</td>
<td>Hangzhou, China</td>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>In-progress</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Qunli National Urban Wetland</td>
<td>Qunli New Town, China</td>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>EbA in Lami Town</td>
<td>Lami Town, Fiji</td>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Donghu Greenway</td>
<td>Wuhan, China</td>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sinu river ecological corridor</td>
<td>Monteria, Colombia</td>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Action plan of the State of Sao Paulo</td>
<td>Sao Paolo, Brazil</td>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sweet city program</td>
<td>Curridabat, Costa Rica</td>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>In-progress</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Siuna Agroforestry</td>
<td>Siuna, Nicaragua</td>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>In-progress</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Belmopan Blue-Green Master Plan</td>
<td>Belmopan, Belize</td>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>In-progress</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Implementing Agency</td>
<td>Tools and mechanisms</td>
<td>Regulation, design and finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Municipality/ Council</td>
<td>Classification of the biodiversity, repeated assessment of changes and economic evaluation of the conversion measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Framework that helps researchers access genetic resources for biotechnology research, development and other activities, in return for a fair share of any benefits from their use. This provides the research &amp; development sector with the certainty they need to invest in biodiversity-based research.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Municipality/Council</td>
<td>Research and inventory, monitoring, mainstreaming biodiversity within city policies, awareness building, participatory approach, financial support and incentives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Municipality/Council</td>
<td>Evidence based demonstration of the significance of existing urban biodiversity pockets for the improvement of climatic conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Municipality/Council</td>
<td>Lateral coordination across local governments for a city-wide biodiversity management plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Municipality/Council</td>
<td>Using the green open system to support disaster prevention system for example flood control, protection against earthquake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Municipality/Council</td>
<td>Landscape architecture used as a tool to address climate change risks. Preserved green area equipped to act as a green sponge, cleansing and storing urban stormwater and integrated with other ecosystem services including the protection of native habitats, aquifer recharge and recreational use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Carried out cost-benefit analysis for climate change adaptation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Working at various scales effectively - setting strategic goals to achieve and extensive community engagement through an innovative participatory approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Municipality/ Council</td>
<td>Defining the spatial management and control scope of the river ecological corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>UN Agency</td>
<td>Incorporation of concepts of sustainability in other areas of the municipal public administration, considering that the actions related to the direct protection of biodiversity are still promoted, almost exclusively, by the environmental agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Municipality/Council</td>
<td>Mainstreaming conservation into urban planning, green spaces treated as infrastructure with accompanying ecosystem services that can be harnessed by local government and offered to residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Practice intercultural social responsibility with the indigenous communities neighboring preservation operation, through investment in the region's social capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>UN Agency</td>
<td>Recognizing biodiversity fragmentation and networking green space, vegetation restoration for flood resistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Spatial scale</td>
<td>Time-frame (years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Equity Park</td>
<td>Cancun, Mexico</td>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>In-progress</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The mountain ecosystem of Chile's central Mediterranean region</td>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Natural Area Management Plan</td>
<td>Calgary, Canada</td>
<td>LRDC</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Watershed management</td>
<td>New York City, USA</td>
<td>LRDC</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>LAB Biodiversity Action Plan</td>
<td>Waitakere, New Zealand</td>
<td>LRDC</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Collective Local Biodiversity Strategy</td>
<td>Bassendean, Australia</td>
<td>LRDC</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sensitive Ecosystem Inventory (SEI), Sensitive Habitat Inventory and Mapping (SHIM)</td>
<td>Kelowna, Canada</td>
<td>LRDC</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Portland’s Climate Action Plan, United States (US)</td>
<td>Portland, USA</td>
<td>LRDC</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>City &amp; Regional</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Water Smart Parks: Efficiently irrigating parks and gardens - Water Smart Parks strategy</td>
<td>Stirling, Australia</td>
<td>LRDC</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The Najvan &amp; Sofeh Parks Project in Isfahan, Iran</td>
<td>Isfahan, Iran</td>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Carbon Sequestration Potential of Trees in and around Pune City</td>
<td>Pune, India</td>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Anchunad UNDP Project</td>
<td>Kerala, India</td>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>People's Biodiversity Register</td>
<td>Kerala, India</td>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Kochi LBSAP</td>
<td>Kerala, India</td>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Implementing Agency</td>
<td>Tools and mechanisms</td>
<td>Regulation, design and finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Cross-sectoral lens applied to green space management - vegetation preservation and restoration for flood resistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Municipality/Council</td>
<td>Research to improve Biosystematic and biogeographic knowledge through several regional studies that evaluate patterns of alpha, beta, and gamma diversity in relation to environmental gradients.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Municipality/Council</td>
<td>Developed natural environment assessment, inventory, classification of habitat types, natural systems, areas and parks, guidelines based on park type, category of natural park, habitat type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Municipality/Council</td>
<td>Comprehensive watershed protection strategy, land conversion, land-use management, monitoring, remediation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Capacity building, research and monitoring, inventory of threatened species</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Municipality/Council</td>
<td>Increase the protection status of reserves, develop Local Planning Policy for biodiversity conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Inventory for scientific information on ecosystem, inventory and tracking of creeks within city limits, identification, inventory and mapping of wetlands and their habitat features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Municipality/Council</td>
<td>Land-use management through vulnerability assessment, monitoring and reporting framework for climate action plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Categorisation/zoning of parks and reserves - 'ecozones' or 'hydrozones', appropriate watering techniques, prioritising irrigation, integration with city's plan for central irrigation management system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Municipality/Council</td>
<td>Successfully addresses the land use conflict on the city's fringe by curbing the often illegally built urban sprawl through the establishment of a green corridor that links the city with its periphery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Municipality/Council</td>
<td>Assessment of standing biomass, carbon sequestration potential of trees, inventories of indigenous and exotic tree species</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>UN Agency</td>
<td>Mainstreaming of ecology and biodiversity considerations in plantations management and tourism operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Municipality/Council</td>
<td>Community involvement through innovative participatory approach to evaluate economic benefits to community through local knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Municipality/Council</td>
<td>Developed scientifically informed and participatory LBSAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Spatial scale</td>
<td>Time-frame (years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>East Kolkata Wetlands</td>
<td>Kerala, India</td>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Preserving mangrove on private land</td>
<td>Kerala, India</td>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Magat watershed</td>
<td>Nueva Vizcaya, Philippines</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Park development: Open spaces</td>
<td>Quezon City, Philippines</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Cheonggyecheon river restoration</td>
<td>Seoul, South Korea</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Mangrove conservation through partnership for multiple co-benefits</td>
<td>Surabaya, Indonesia</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Integrating Wetland Ecosystem Values into Urban Planning</td>
<td>Vientiane, Laos</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Urban Biodiversity towards Sustainable City and Climate Change Resilience project (UBD-SCCCR)</td>
<td>Chiang Rai, Thailand</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Urban development and biodiversity conservation in Trang - Klong Nam Jed Conservation (canal)</td>
<td>Trang, Thailand</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Community driven initiatives on urban biodiversity: Adopt-a-park, EcoWalk, Clean and Green program</td>
<td>Baguio, Philippines</td>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Durban’s closed-loop landfill site</td>
<td>Durban, South Africa</td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>LAB Walvis Bay Biodiversity Report</td>
<td>Walvis Bay, Namibia</td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Sustainable use of River and Riverbanks</td>
<td>Addis Ababa, Ethiopia</td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>An urban Biodiversity Network - The BioNet, 'Local Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan'</td>
<td>Cape Town, South Africa</td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Implementing Agency</td>
<td>Tools and mechanisms</td>
<td>Regulation, design and finance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Municipality/Council</td>
<td>Economic incentive to private landowners to preserve mangroves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Municipality/ Council</td>
<td>Mobilisation of local government units for conservation efforts, initiatives to encourage private sector participation, capacity building, enabling policy and institutional support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Park development program, network of open spaces, multi-stakeholder park management, rehabilitation of open space, ecological corridors, awareness building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Multi-stakeholder approach, awareness building, empowerment program, special zoning for conservation, support eco-tourism and develop research facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Economic assessment of goods and services, measurement of direct and indirect use values of wetland goods and services, measures for wetland and water resource management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Integrated approach of developing the city in a sustainable way by conserving its natural areas while using them as a carbon sink; understand the role biodiversity plays in the community by collecting local knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Identifying co-benefits through sustainable tourism promotion, awareness building, capacity building, biodiversity assessment and data collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Advocacy, awareness building and capacity building participatory approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Municipality/Council</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Assessment, containment, treatment and reuse of leachate - geomembranes, constructed wetlands, protection and restoration of indigenous vegetation - on-site nursery, removal of alien plants, education and awareness building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Developed Integrated Environmental Policy, Data Sharing Policy, Environmental Impact Assessment Guideline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>UN Agency</td>
<td>River restoration design, awareness building, capacity building, soil and water conservation structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Municipality/Council</td>
<td>Landscape-based approach, assessment, integration into policy and planning frameworks, promotion, awareness building and communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Spatial scale</td>
<td>Time-frame (years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Local Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan</td>
<td>Johanessburg, South Africa</td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Valuation of ecosystem services</td>
<td>Cape Town, South Africa</td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Zambia Wetland preservation Efforts</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Nairobi River Restoration Initiative</td>
<td>Nairobi, Kenya</td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Policy, institutional and legal framework of UPFG (urban and peri-urban forestry and greening) in Yerevan</td>
<td>Yerevan, Armenia</td>
<td>WANA</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Oroklini Wetland Management</td>
<td>Larnaca, Cyprus</td>
<td>WANA</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Integrated Coastal Zone Management</td>
<td>Moulaya, Morocco</td>
<td>WANA</td>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Translocation of coral communities during land reclamation for urban development</td>
<td>Jordan, EgyptTown, South Africa</td>
<td>WANA</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Integrated Coastal Zone Management

**Moulaya, Morocco**

- **Implementing Agency**: Municipality/Council
- **Tools and mechanisms**: Capacity building to enable the undertaking of technical activities, creation of Three Specific permanent Coastal Commissions at provincial levels acquire the knowledge needed to become effective and to conduct regular bi-annual meetings. Six communal development plans (including one spatial plan) incorporating local ICZM activities are prepared and/or revised. Public education material is prepared and distributed for use in the project area.

### Translocation of Coral Communities during Land Reclamation

**Jordan, Egypt Town, South Africa**

- **Implementing Agency**: UN Agency
- **Tools and mechanisms**: Scientific assessment of the donor site (to define the coral priority species to be relocated) and the receiving sites (to verify suitable environmental conditions); and identifying co-benefits of recreational activities like diving in the Aqaba Special Economic Zone (ASEZA).

### Local Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan

**Johannesburg, South Africa**

- **Implementing Agency**: Municipality/Council
- **Tools and mechanisms**: Assessment of urban ecological network, species conservation measures, awareness building, conducting education programs, coordinated governance systems and database creation.

### Valuation of Ecosystem Services

**Cape Town, South Africa**

- **Implementing Agency**: NGO
- **Tools and mechanisms**: Business case for increased budget allocations in natural assets, inventory and valuation of ecosystem goods and services, funding sources, knowledge dissemination.

### Zambia Wetland Preservation Efforts

**Zambia**

- **Implementing Agency**: NGO
- **Tools and mechanisms**: Marrying of public and business interests for the protection of groundwater in the collective stewardship of natural resources.

### Nairobi River Restoration Initiative

**Nairobi, Kenya**

- **Implementing Agency**: NGO
- **Tools and mechanisms**: Incentives awarded aimed at mobilizing youth teams to take responsibility for managing biodiversity.

### Policy, Institutional and Legal Framework of UPFG (Urban and Peri-Urban Forestry and Greening) in Yerevan

**Yerevan, Armenia**

- **Implementing Agency**: UN Agency
- **Tools and mechanisms**: Flexible but long-term policy planning, multi-level registers and policies, clarification of functions of management bodies and communities, cross-sectoral implementation, multi-level monitoring, UPFG guidelines, zoning, master plans, regulation on municipal forests, tree by-laws, park regulations, legal mechanisms for non-state stakeholder involvement, elimination of contradictions in acts, harmonisation of legal terminology.

### Proper Water Management with Small-Scale Measures

**Municipality/Council**

- **Tools and mechanisms**: Proper water management with small-scale measures to manage wetlands within urban areas for furthering nature conservation objectives such as wet grassland conditions for rare breeding birds; also offered minor flood protection.

### Capacity Building to Enable the Undertaking of Technical Activities

**Municipality/Council**

- **Tools and mechanisms**: Capacity building to enable the undertaking of technical activities, creation of Three Specific permanent Coastal Commissions at provincial levels acquire the knowledge needed to become effective and to conduct regular bi-annual meetings. Six communal development plans (including one spatial plan) incorporating local ICZM activities are prepared and/or revised. Public education material is prepared and distributed for use in the project area.

---
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