

Mother Earth-Centric Actions within the International Biodiversity Protection Regime

Abstract

The loss of biodiversity is one of the three components of our age's triple planetary crisis, besides climate change and pollution. The valorisation of nature can open new pathways to address pressing challenges and may be considered a foundation of ecocentric approaches. The paper examines the international biodiversity regime, in which recognition of nature's intrinsic value is limited initially to a few preambular acknowledgements. However, the 2022 adoption of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework may change the tendency to disregard nature's own worth, as it introduces the concept of Mother Earth-centred actions within its resource mobilisation and financial goals. The paper analyses the occurrence of this concept and its impact on policy areas due to COP16 in 2024. Finally, it proposes the areas in which this concept can further strengthen the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.

Keywords: Mother Earth-centric actions, Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, Convention on Biological Diversity, Rights of Nature, biodiversity protection

I Introduction

The Convention on Biological Diversity¹ (hereinafter: CBD) serves as a fundamental international legal act intended to protect the Earth's ecosystem.² The adoption promotes the protection and improvement of biodiversity, but questions arise about the real motivation

* Vivien Köböl-Benda visiting lecturer, Pázmány Péter Catholic University (Budapest); Analyst, Institute for Energy Strategy.

¹ Convention on Biological Diversity, opened for signature 5 June 1992, 1760 UNTS 79 (entered into force 29 December 1993) art 1.

² CBD Article 2 defines the term 'ecosystem' as 'a dynamic complex of plant, animal, and micro-organism communities and their non-living environment interacting as a functional unit'.

behind this goal. International law – as with law generally³ – can recognise the values that drive the implementation of certain acts. The UN Charter⁴ identifies several values, like peace, justice, human rights, tolerance, solidarity, and the sovereign equality of nations. In international environmental law, the selection of values can determine whether the legal act serves human purposes or also recognises the worth of nature and its elements. This is particularly relevant regarding the biodiversity regime, where the protected subject is nature itself.

This paper's central hypothesis is that recognising the intrinsic value of nature can improve the CBD's implementation, as the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) also affirmed.⁵ First, it should be explored which values are identified in the CBD, its Protocols, and the legally non-binding but influential decisions of the Conference of the Parties. It can be preliminarily stated that the CBD serves human-centred – economic, political, health, safety, recreational, etc. – goals, but adopting the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework⁶ can open the pathway for promoting ecocentric action. However, this approach is limited to a specific area involving financial issues, as it is only applied to decisions related to resource mobilisation and the Convention's financial mechanism, which will be discussed in a later section of this paper. Therefore, the main area that is examined in this paper will be the decisions made by the CBD COP15 in 2022 and COP16 in 2024 and 2025, where this aspect emerged in the resource mobilisation and financial mechanism agenda items.

II Nature as a value associated with the context of the CBD

The CBD's Preamble recognises the intrinsic value of biological diversity.⁷ It also acknowledges its ecological, genetic, social, economic, scientific, cultural, recreational, and aesthetic significance. It is not unfamiliar from the point of view of international

³ For further information on the relationship between law and moral values, see Jerome E. Bickenbach, 'Law and Morality' (1989) 8 (3) Law and Philosophy 291.

⁴ United Nations, *Charter of the United Nations*, signed 26 June 1945, 1 UNTS XVI.

⁵ P Balvanera, U Pascual, M Christie, B Baptiste and D González-Jiménez (eds), *Methodological Assessment Report on the Diverse Values and Valuation of Nature of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services* (IPBES secretariat 2022, Bonn) DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6522522>. Hereinafter: IPBES Values Assessment.

⁶ Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, Fifteenth Meeting – Part II, Montreal, Canada, 7–19 December 2022, Decision adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity – 15/4 Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, UN Doc CBD/COP/DEC/15/4 (19 December 2022). Hereinafter: KM-GBF.

⁷ CBD Article 2 defines the term 'biological diversity' in the following way: 'means the variability among living organisms from all sources, including, inter alia, terrestrial, marine and other aquatic ecosystems and the ecological complexes of which they are part; this includes diversity within species, between species and of ecosystems'.

environmental law that various sets of values are recognised that can serve ecological, economic, political, or social goals that may also be intertwined. Anna Deplazes-Zemp highlights the two determining aspects of environmental values in the empirical conservation and environmental policy literature: intrinsic and instrumental. While the first concept acknowledges nature's value in its own right, the latter positions this as a means of achieving other goals, for example, financial or social. The two concepts can be interpreted as ecocentric and anthropocentric, respectively. Later, a third concept of value emerged in the context of the international biodiversity protection regime: 'relational value', which focuses on the relationship between humankind and the environment from which humans' responsibility for nature can also be derived.⁸

The difference between anthropocentric and non-anthropocentric, or ecocentric, approaches can be traced to the two corresponding concepts of preservationalism and conservationalism. According to the first, nature should remain untouched by humans, while the second aims to balance environmental protection with the human need to use natural resources.⁹ The CBD applies the latter, which is a more realistic concept and poses no problem as long as nature is utilised sustainably. Moreover, economic and social gain can be a source of motivation for protecting nature. Further, addressing the intrinsic value of the environment can align with this concept as it is.

The Dasgupta Review – an independent evaluation of the economics of biodiversity – identifies the root of nature's intrinsic value in the culture of humanity, because perhaps all societies have respected nature as sacred at some point in their history. However, this transcendence is being challenged today in both developed and developing countries, where economic justifications and development needs can override ecological interests. Recognising the intrinsic value of nature can support more environmentally friendly economic practices, as economic goals are not entirely invalid in this respect.¹⁰

Despite the Preamble's declarative principle, the operational paragraphs refrain from further elaboration of the practical aspects and content of such intrinsic value. For example, Article 2 defines 'biological resources' as organisms or parts thereof, populations or any other biotic components of ecosystems that have a use or value *for humanity*. Genetic resources are also considered biological resources, thus similarly serving humankind's needs. Other references to the value of biological diversity in the operative part¹¹ cannot be found. However, Article 7(a) obliges the Parties to identify the components of biodiversity essential for its protection or sustainable use, as set out in the indicative list in Annex I. The

⁸ Anna Deplazes-Zemp, 'Beyond Intrinsic and Instrumental: Third-Category Value in Environmental Ethics and Environmental Policy' (2023) 27 (2) *Ethics, Policy & Environment* 166–188, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/21550085.2023.2166341>

⁹ Ben A. Minteer, Elizabeth A. Corley, 'Conservation or preservation? A qualitative study of the conceptual foundations of natural resource management' (2007) 20 *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 307–308, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10806-007-9040-2>

¹⁰ Partha Dasgupta, *The Economics of Biodiversity: The Dasgupta Review* (HM Treasury 2021, London) 307–308.

¹¹ The operative part is the section of a decision that follows the Preamble.

appendix lists the factors that should be identified and monitored: ecosystems and habitats; species and communities; and genomes and genes. There is a restrictive formulation in para 2, as it can be read as those species and communities should come under this indicative list that are threatened, wild or domesticated or cultivated, have *medical, agricultural or other economic* value or *social, scientific or cultural* importance, or *serve research purposes* such as being indicator species.

Two Protocols complement the CBD. The Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety¹² is grounded by the precautionary principle and intended to protect humans and the environment from living modified organisms. Directly, it only refers to values in the socioeconomic context related to the sustainable use of biodiversity, considering its value to indigenous peoples and local communities.¹³ The Nagoya Protocol¹⁴ regulates access to genetic resources and creates a framework for fair and equitable benefit-sharing associated with their utilisation. Its Preamble recognises the economic value of biodiversity and ecosystems related to benefit-sharing.

The CBD recognises the intrinsic value of biological diversity, but its Protocols do not contain such a reference. The Convention does not elaborate on how this recognition can influence further policy actions, help realise goals, or which provisions are the most relevant in this context. Without these further details, the reference can be considered merely symbolic, not a fundamental guiding principle that will have a real influence on implementation. I share the view of Joanna Miller Smallwood and Jérémie Gilbert: according to them, this represents an anthropocentric approach whereby nature's worth to humans is at the centre, not its intrinsic value. The authors point out that this approach can be seen in subsequent documents, as no COP decision made before 2022 goes into detail on nature's intrinsic value.¹⁵ After examining global assessments concerning the recognition of values related to biodiversity and nature, the paper continues with an analysis of 2022 and post-2022 CBD documents.

¹² Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity, opened for signature 29 January 2000, 2226 UNTS 208 (entered into force 11 September 2003).

¹³ Ibid, Art. 26(1).

¹⁴ Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilisation to the Convention on Biological Diversity, opened for signature 29 October 2010, 3008 UNTS 3 (entered into force: 12 October 2014).

¹⁵ Joanna Miller Smallwood, Jérémie Gilbert, Can the global framework on biodiversity truly deliver on respecting nature's intrinsic value? A call for COP 16 to implement non-market approaches to the global biodiversity targets, EJIL:Talk! Blog of the European Journal of International Law <<https://www.ejiltalk.org/can-the-global-framework-on-biodiversity-truly-deliver-on-respecting-natures-intrinsic-value-a-call-for-cop-16-to-implement-non-market-approaches-to-the-global-biodiversity-targets/>> accessed 31 October 2025.

III About the IPBES Diverse Values Assessment

The Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES)¹⁶ published a comprehensive assessment of the diverse values of nature, concluding that the loss of biodiversity is strongly driven by the undervaluation of nature in political and economic decision-making. The assessment highlights the underrepresentation of indigenous peoples' and local communities'¹⁷ value systems in decision-making processes and finds that the current system often prioritises market-based values over those that acknowledge nature's contribution to our lives.¹⁸ There are more than fifty valuation methods based on the analysis of nature's proportions and contribution to our lives (nature-based valuation), stated preference methods about nature (statement-based valuation), assessments of how people value nature (behaviour-based valuation) and various syntheses of these methods (integrated valuation). However, the IPBES states that fewer than 5% of existing scientific assessments are integrated into any public policy decisions – based on the scientific literature on this topic between 1990 and 2020.¹⁹ This tendency is liable to reinforce the unsustainable use and unequal distribution of nature's benefits, and achieving the global biodiversity goals requires transformative change that reflects such diverse values.²⁰

The assessment categorises the policy instruments into three groups based on how strongly they can contribute to this transformative change:

- more transformative: co-management regimes, eliminating harmful subsidies, payments for ecosystem services, and other effective area-based conservation measures that acknowledge the 'Rights of Nature';
- less transformative: certification schemes, environmental accounting, and legally protected areas;
- business as usual: biodiversity offsets, trade bans.²¹

¹⁶ The IPBES was established by 94 governments in 2012, Resolution on the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, Adopted by the second session of the plenary meeting to determine the modalities and institutional arrangements for IPBES (16–21 April 2012). It is an independent scientific intergovernmental organisation that assesses and determines factors related to the protection and restoration of biodiversity and ecosystem services administered by the UN Environment Programme (UNEP). The IPBES is formally independent from the CBD but supports its decision-making process with scientific advice. The CBD COP provides guidance for this process.

¹⁷ The term 'indigenous peoples and local communities' aligns with the agreed language of the latest relevant COP decision. Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, Sixteenth Meeting, Cali, Colombia, 21 October – 1 November 2024, decision adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity on 30 October 2024 – 16/4 Programme of Work on Article 8(j) and Other Provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity Related to Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities to 2030, UN Doc CBD/COP/DEC/16/4 (30 October 2024).

¹⁸ IPBES Values Assessment, Summary for policymakers, XIV.

¹⁹ IPBES Values Assessment, Chapter 4, 254.

²⁰ Ibid, 255.

²¹ Ibid, XLIV.

One of these policy instruments is the Rights of Nature, a globally growing rights-based concept that also recognises nature's intrinsic value.²² According to the IPBES, this approach represents living in harmony with nature and often builds on the worldview of indigenous peoples and local communities. It can also be used to empower these communities and support them in operationalising their values regarding nature.²³ The paper aims to identify recognition of this concept or something similar in the context of the CBD. The IPBES report provides a comprehensive review of various value systems, identifying the most determining concepts. The report distinguishes the diverse concepts and their incorporation into policy instruments. This is significant because, while the concepts often share a similar core – respect for nature – they also differ in terms of their origins, efficiency, and scope. However, the report does not explicitly use the term 'Mother-Earth-centric actions' but identifies the basis of the concept in the form of living in harmony with nature. It also helps to distinguish the concept of Rights of Nature. Regarding the paper's analysis, these distinctions are determining, while the report also demonstrates that examining these concepts is crucial for biodiversity protection instruments.

IV The representation of nature's value within the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework

In 2022, the CBD COP15 adopted an ambitious agenda – the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (KM-GBF) – with four goals to 2050, to be achieved through 23 action-oriented targets by 2030. The instrument states that biodiversity is an essential element of human well-being, is fundamental to a healthy planet, and contributes to the economic prosperity of all people. This can be connected to the concept of living well in balance and harmony with Mother Earth, as our food, medicine, and energy, as well as clean air and water, and security from natural disasters, depend on the state of nature, which also has recreational and cultural value.²⁴ The KM-GBF aspires to catalyse transformative actions by governments and other authorities, with the involvement of all relevant actors in society, to end biodiversity loss and promote the three goals of the CBD – the protection and sustainable use of biodiversity, and fair and equitable benefit-sharing for the use of genetic resources. To this end, the KM-GBF has a long-term vision for 2050, by which time we will be living in harmony with nature. To achieve this, it identifies four goals. Goal A is to substantially maintain, enhance, and restore all ecosystems, halt the human-

²² For a further comprehensive analysis of the concept of Rights of Nature and examples of its legal recognition at the domestic and international level, see: Ágnes Tahyné Kovács, 'On the Phenomenon of the Rights of Nature' (2024) 12 (1) Hungarian Yearbook of International Law and European Law 305, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5771/9783748946526-305>

²³ IPBES Values Assessment, 40.

²⁴ KM-GBF Annex para 1.

driven extinction of threatened species, and safeguard genetic diversity. Goal B promotes the sustainable use and management of nature. Goal C aims to create a fair and equitable benefit-sharing mechanism for the use and benefit of digital sequence information (DSI). Finally, Goal D considers the appropriate means of implementation, including financial resources, capacity-building, cooperation, and technology transfer. It also states that the biodiversity finance gap of 700 billion USD per year should be progressively closed by 2050.²⁵

The framework references the Rights of Nature concept and the diverse value systems, identifying nature's intrinsic values in the context of those countries that recognise them. For these countries, it can facilitate the implementation of the KM-GBF, but it does not consider nature's intrinsic value in a broader context.²⁶ The KM-GBF also introduces the concept of 'Mother Earth-centric actions', which can be regarded as progress compared to the previous approach within the CBD, its protocols and COP decisions. These are ecocentric and rights-based actions that strive to promote a harmonious, complementary relationship between people and nature, grounded in the continuity of all living beings and their communities, while safeguarding the non-commodification of Mother Earth's environmental functions.²⁷ This reference is placed within the context of the agenda's resource mobilisation target (T19), which aims to mobilise 200 billion USD per year for the protection and restoration of biodiversity from all sources. This includes promoting collective action, including this concept and other non-market-based approaches. Target 16 on sustainable consumption does not mention this concept but aims to significantly reduce overconsumption and waste generation to ensure living well in harmony with Mother Earth.²⁸

The COP15 also adopted decision 15/7, dedicated to the resource mobilisation target, with a strategy for resource mobilisation for the intermediate phase (2023-2024), which aims – among other objectives – to significantly increase domestic resources from all sources, including collective actions such as Mother Earth-centric actions.²⁹ The other finance-related decision concerning the financial mechanism³⁰ does not include such a reference, which is relevant because Decision 15/7 is intended only for a specific time period (by 2030), while Decision 15/15 is the general – though still interim – financial mechanism of the CBD under the Global Environment Facility (GEF).

It should be stressed that Mother Earth-centric actions are not equivalent to the recognition of the Rights of Nature, which concept considers nature a rights-holder and entails stronger obligations for states and, sometimes, procedural rights as well. Mother Earth-

²⁵ Ibid, Annex, para 12.

²⁶ KM-GBF, Annex, para 7.

²⁷ Ibid, Annex, para 13, target 19 subpara (f).

²⁸ Ibid, Annex, para 13, target 16.

²⁹ Ibid, Annex I, para 4 (f).

³⁰ Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, Fifteenth Meeting – Part II, Montreal, Canada, 7–19 December 2022, Decision adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity – 15/15 Financial mechanism, UN Doc CBD/COP/DEC/15/15 (19 December 2022). Hereinafter: Decision 15/15.

centric actions, by contrast, are a strategic concept, a guiding tool intended to help realise the financial commitments under the KM-GBF. It would be beneficial if other CBD agenda items also integrated the concept. For example, this could involve enhancing cooperation among the Rio Conventions, providing a new direction for updated national targets, national biodiversity strategies and plans, and offering alternative ways to implement conservation targets, while strengthening the representation of relevant worldviews and the valuation of traditional knowledge. This is particularly important as the IPBES Transformative Change Assessment (2024)³¹ emphasised that the recognition of human-nature interconnectedness and nature's contribution to our lives can be strengthened by promoting views and values that emphasise living in harmony with nature, such as Mother Earth-centric actions.

Marlene Payva Almonte praises the 'explicit adoption of an ecocentric approach', which may be a step towards broader recognition, but future decision-making and the KM-GBF's implementation will determine whether it is a symbolic declaration or a driver of actual change.³² The following section reviews how this concept appeared in the COP16 decision-making process.

V The related outcomes of CBD COP16 negotiations

The CBD COP16 took place between October 21 and November 1 in Cali, Colombia, where delegates did not reach consensus on a couple of crucial issues, such as resource mobilisation and the financial mechanism, and the final plenary was suspended. Therefore, an additional meeting (COP16.2) was held in Rome between 25 and 27 February 2025.³³ During the resource mobilisation and related financial mechanism negotiations in Cali, Bolivia issued a proposal to recognise Mother Earth as a legal subject and integrate the concept of living well in harmony with nature into other policy areas while promoting dialogue between modern and ancestral knowledge systems to strengthen fair distribution, the role of indigenous peoples and local communities, and climate justice.³⁴

³¹ K O'Brien, L Garibaldi, A Agrawal, E Bennett, R Biggs, R Calderón Contreras, E Carr, N Frantzeskaki, H Gosnell, J Gurung, S Lambertucci, J Leventon, C Liao, V Reyes García, L Shannon, S Villasante, F Wickson, Y Zinngrebe and L Perianin (eds), *Summary for Policymakers of the Thematic Assessment Report on the Underlying Causes of Biodiversity Loss and the Determinants of Transformative Change and Options for Achieving the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services* (IPBES secretariat 2024, Bonn) DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11382230>

³² Marlene Payva Almonte, 'Interrogating International Environmental Law's Approach to Nature. An Arctic Indigenous model?' (2025) 17 (1) *Journal of Northern Studies* 7, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36368/jns.v17i1.1233>

³³ Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, Sixteenth meeting, Cali, Colombia, 21 October – 1 November 2024, Online, 3–6 December 2024, Rome, 25–27 February 2025, Report of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity on its sixteenth meeting, UN doc CBD/COP/16/13 (27 February 2025).

³⁴ Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, Sixteenth meeting, Cali, Colombia, 21 October – 1 November 2024, Submission from the Plurinational State of Bolivia regarding target 19, paragraph (f), of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.

The final resource mobilisation decision³⁵ updated the strategy for resource mobilisation for 2025–2030, and broadened the scope of Mother Earth-centric actions, which become part of other aspirations than domestic resource mobilisation.³⁶ This includes increasing international biodiversity-related financial flows from all sources to provide new and additional resources.³⁷ It is also considered a concept that can ensure community engagement by enhancing the accessibility, effectiveness, efficiency, and transparency of international financial resources.³⁸ It also refers to the concept in a broader sense in relation to the improvement of domestic resources, explicitly naming the goal of enhancing different value systems, including the living well concept and the Rights of Nature and Mother Earth, for the signatory countries.³⁹

The 15/7 decision established a new dedicated fund to mobilise the desired resources. The Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework Fund (GBFF) started to operate under the GEF, but several countries – predominantly from the Global South – plan to establish a new dedicated global fund independent from the GEF.⁴⁰ As a compromise, the decision includes provisions for a potentially new financial instrument, one of the criteria for which is the promotion of collective action, such as Mother Earth-centric actions.⁴¹

Compared to the outcome of the COP15, the financial mechanism decision adopted at COP16.2 refers to the living well principle in its Preamble. It requests that the GEF and its Council consider how to integrate Mother Earth-centric actions into the programming directions of the GEF and the new GBFF.⁴²

³⁵ Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, Sixteenth meeting, Cali, Colombia, 21 October – 1 November 2024, Online, 3–6 December 2024, Rome, 25–27 February 2025, Report of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity on its sixteenth meeting, decision adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity – 16/34 Resource mobilisation, UN doc CBD/COP/DEC/16/34 (27 February 2025). Hereinafter: Decision 16/34.

³⁶ Ibid, Annex I, III. Objectives and actions, Section B, para 1 subpara (e).

³⁷ Ibid, Annex I, III. Objectives and actions, Section A, para 1, subpara 2(e).

³⁸ Ibid, Annex I, III. Objectives and actions, Section A, para 3, subpara 9(e).

³⁹ Ibid, Annex I, III. Objectives and actions, Section B, para 1 subpara (e) (iii), (iv).

⁴⁰ Earth Negotiations Bulletin (2024) 9 (855) 5–6, <<https://enb.iisd.org/sites/default/files/2024-11/enb09855e.pdf>> accessed 31 October 2025.

⁴¹ Decision 16/34, Annex II, para 19.

⁴² Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, Sixteenth meeting, Cali, Colombia, 21 October – 1 November 2024, Online, 3–6 December 2024, Rome, 25–27 February 2025, Report of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity on its sixteenth meeting, Decision adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity – 16/33 Financial mechanism, UN doc CBD/COP/DEC/16/33 (27 February 2025), para 10. Hereinafter: Decision 16/33.

VI Conclusions

The Convention on Biological Diversity initially recognises the intrinsic value of biodiversity, but no operative provision provides further detail on these statements. Neither its two Protocols nor the COP decisions prior to 2022 elaborate on this issue, but COP decision 15/7 introduces a new concept: Mother Earth-centric action. It also defines the approach's main features, like an ecocentric, rights-based, and non-market-based approach, but the language allows too much room for interpretation. For example, there is no agreed CBD language on what ecocentric means, which is particularly relevant as the relational value of nature is still emerging. It does not specify the exact actions that can be considered within this category. For this purpose, establishing a working group or a subsidiary body within the CBD would be beneficial. This could be designed similarly to the Glasgow Committee on Non-market Approaches, interpreting Article 6(8) of the Paris Agreement.⁴³

Mother Earth-centric actions and the concept of living well in harmony with nature have a strong economic emphasis, as references are made to resource mobilisation, financial mechanisms, and sustainable consumption decisions. According to the agreed definition, Mother Earth-centric action represents a rights-based approach. However, the relevant decisions do not include provisions connecting the concept to specific human rights. Nevertheless, the specific reference to its ecocentric nature can be regarded as a beginning of a new, non-anthropocentric interpretation of the CBD. Its actual realisation depends on further actions defined by the COP and their implementation. As we can see, the application of Mother Earth-centric action has been widened, but only in terms of financial decisions. It is welcome that the general financial mechanism decision proposed that the GEF reconsider the concept during the design of the programming directions, as this could facilitate access for vulnerable groups, such as indigenous peoples and local communities. However, other policy areas are silent about this concept, and Bolivia's proposal to strengthen the ecocentric approach within the CBD was not regarded as meritorious. The COP also missed the opportunity to take a step toward elaborating on the concept's further content – for example, by establishing a specialised working group on the issue. A partially positive sign in this regard is that some strengthening can be observed in the financial goals, especially considering the specialised programme window under the GEF, which may lead to actual financial support for the projects implementing this concept. However, whether the GEF and its Council will go beyond mere consideration and decide to integrate Mother Earth-centric actions into upcoming programming directions – the GEF's fundamental strategic document – is a question for the future. This may be groundbreaking because such a decision could simplify indigenous peoples' and local communities' access to funding.

⁴³ Paris Agreement, Paris, 12 December 2015, 3156 UNTS 79 (entered into force 4 November 2016).