Article

North–South Dialogue on Territorial Policies and Discourses: Insights for the Future of Nature Conservation

Pamela E. Degele [1] and Belén Pedregal [2,*]

1   National Scientific and Technical Research Council (CONICET), CEII (FCPyS-UNCUYO), Centro Universitario UNCUYO s/n, Oficina 55 Ala Norte, Mendoza 5500, Argentina; pameladegele@conicet.gov.ar
2   Department of Human Geography, Universidad de Sevilla, C/ Doña María de Padilla, 41004 Seville, Spain
*   Correspondence: bpedregal@us.es

Abstract: Environmental issues such as the progressive loss of biodiversity on a global scale and climate change cannot be separated from other territorial problems caused by social injustice, economic inequality, access to natural resources, gender violence and the fight for human and nature's rights. The evaluation of biodiversity management strategies must by necessity draw on a retrospective look at the interpretation of the problem and the conceptual approach of the general territorial management policies in which they are framed. From a critical view, these approaches have different nuances depending on the historical journey, theories and main actors involved with territorial policies in different regions of the world. In this work, we apply qualitative content analysis to contrast the key concepts on which the main European territorial policies of recent decades have been based with the main guidelines of the emerging Latin American territorial perspectives. Thus, we seek to initiate a dialogue between the northern hemisphere's globally hegemonic notions of nature, territory, biodiversity and its management and new theories and proposals from the South, whilst simultaneously contrasting both with the content of the latest Convention on Biological Biodiversity Strategic Plan 2011–2020. We conclude with some recommendations aimed at building bridges and contributing to the construction of future global conservation strategies from a critical and territorial perspective that tends towards integrating sustainability with social and environmental justice.

Keywords: territorial policies; gender and indigenous perspectives; just transition; good living; territorial feminisms; post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework

1. Introduction

Currently, the capacity of natural systems is facing a dramatic challenge, with biodiversity loss at the centre of international debate. Despite the Convention on Biological Diversity (1992) having been ratified by 196 countries, general progress concerning the latest Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 has been considered very limited and even insufficient [1,2]. Thus, the objective of this work is to conduct a critical assessment of this recent global roadmap by applying a plural and critical territorial perspective to identify gaps, strengths and opportunities that contribute to fairer and more critical global strategies, such as the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, which will embody the collective direction of global biodiversity governance for the next ten years [3].

From the perspective of Critical Geography, territories are understood as a social construction with two determinant dimensions: one political, referring to the power relationships that define their control and management, and the other symbolic–cultural, linked to the memories, life experience and cosmovision of the actors who live in them [4–6]. In the final analysis, the concept of nature is built on the relationship between these various politically and culturally charged dimensions [7–11]. From the point of view of the global conservation frameworks, this critical perspective implies taking into account the following premises: (i) recognising territory's importance and the fact that it is at the heart of government conservation actions [12–14]; (ii) making the power relationships that determine the

dominance of some specific territorial and nature discourses over others visible on the national and international scale [15,16]; (iii) recognising the diversity of cosmovisions, actors and management models that exist in territories [17–19]; (iv) maintaining an integrated approach to environmental problems where strategies to deal with nature cannot be isolated from other territorial issues such as social justice, economic inequality and access to natural resources, gender violence and the fight for human and nature rights [20–23] and, lastly, (v) to gauge the importance of spatial planning, governance and coordination by level of government, the influence of foreign policy and the globalisation of these decisions [24–26].

In this sense, any evaluation of biodiversity management strategies must by necessity draw on a retrospective look at the interpretation of the problem and the conceptual approach of the general territorial management policies in which they are framed. Even though this need has been recognised for the past two decades [27–29], the linkage between spatial planning and territorial conservation is not yet robustly reflected in political practice [30–33].

With respect to scientific production, a technical approach to this relationship prevails, mainly aimed at identifying spatial relationships between different natural elements and land uses i.e., [34,35]. Additionally, we find many studies on the impacts or conflicts between agriculture or other human practices and conservation i.e., [36,37]. However, political approaches focusing on actors, discourses and interactions are less frequent [38]. From the latter perspective, we can highlight the work of Farinós Dasí [39], which analyses the issue in the European Union and identifies that one of the greatest challenges to strengthening the territorial perspective is the coordination of the different levels of government and sectoral policies and transcending the limitations of traditional administrative structures. So, we start from the hypothesis that one of the weaknesses that has triggered the ineffectiveness of the Convention on Biological Biodiversity's Strategic Plan 2011–2020 is the lack of a critical territorial perspective that enables a deeper, more complex and plural approach to be taken to conservation.

Therefore, in this paper we look to cross-fertilize the fields of nature conservation, land use and spatial planning from a critical approach by comparing and combining the political discourses of territorial management models originating in different geographical areas, starting with the 'discursive constructionism' that implies recognising the role of language in the construction of social reality [9]. To be specific, territorial models and focuses from the global North—the European territorial policies of recent decades—and from the global South—Latin American approaches, such as Buen Vivir (hereafter, Good Living)—and territorial feminism from the perspective of an awareness that global environmental agendas have often been dominated by the territorial priorities and concerns of affluent countries while other perspectives are frequently marginalised [40–43]. Thus, we aim to create a dialogue around the northern globally hegemonic notions of nature, territory, biodiversity and their management, and new theories and proposals from the South.

The following sections (i) compare the goals and notions of nature, territory, biodiversity and their management in selected political documents from Europe and Latin America through qualitative content analysis with support from the academic literature, (ii) contrast and discuss these results in the light of the Convention on Biological Biodiversity's (CBD) latest Strategic Plan 2011–2020, and (iii) assess the current challenges and potential benefits to strengthening the approach of nature conservation from a dialogical, critical and plural territorial perspective in the current framework of global environmental change.

2. Materials and Methods

The analytical framework for this study draws on a qualitative content analysis of policy documents complemented by a literature review. In particular, we followed Krippendorff's framework for discourse–content analysis [44]. This framework is especially suitable for developing research that starts from a research question that the analyst seeks to answer through inferences drawn from texts. In this case, we use the following as our

guiding question to distil inferences from texts: 'how are territory and nature represented and envisioned?'

Following this rationale, we developed a methodological approach suitable for unravelling and comparing territorial policies and perspectives from Europe and Latin America. For this, we worked in parallel with both academic and political documents referring to the two case studies.

On the one hand, we carried out a search, selection and analysis of the content of public policy documents and/or declarations or social manifestations of a relevant public nature to illustrate the focuses of the selected cases. Specifically, we selected territorial management agendas and management plans of national or international scope that explicitly express the vision of public policy, both in relation to the diagnosis of the current situation and the future sought by territories. In both cases, we chose documents with a wide regional (Europe) or national (Latin America) impact. In the latter case, since there is no political integration, we sought to represent diversity by selecting at least one plan from each country that has included the Good Living approach as a relevant aspiration in the policies of the last 20 years (Ecuador, Bolivia, El Salvador and Venezuela). We also selected women's agendas that have become products of meaningful social movements such as the Zapatista movement in Mexico [45] or that integrate numerous and diverse women's voices across the continent [46]. The materials that we selected are presented by case study in Table 1.

Table 1. List of documents analysed by case study.

Case Study	Year	Title	Scope	Abbreviation	Ref.
Europe	1999	European Spatial Development Perspective: Towards Balanced and Sustainable Development of the Territory of the European Union	European Union	ESDP 1999	[47]
	2007	Territorial Agenda of the European Union	European Union	TAEU 2007	[48]
	2008	Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion: Turning territorial diversity into strength	European Union	Green Paper 2008	[49]
	2011	Territorial Agenda of the European Union 2020: Towards an inclusive, smart and sustainable Europe of diverse regions	European Union	TAEU 2020	[50]
	2020	Territorial Agenda 2030: A future for all places	European Union	TAEU 2030	[51]
Latin America	2006	National Development Plan 2006–2011	Bolivia (Evo Morales Government)	Bolivia Plan 2006	[52]
	2009	National Plan for Good Living 2009–2013	Ecuador (Rafael Correa Government)	Ecuador Plan 2009	[53]
	2012	Patria Plan (2013–2019)	Venezuela (Hugo Chávez Government)	Venezuela Plan 2012	[54]
	2012	Political Agenda of Indigenous Mexican Women	Mexico (National Coordinator of Indigenous Women—CONAMI)	CONAMI 2012	[45]
	2015	Five-Year Development Plan 2015–2019	El Salvador (Salvador Sanchez Cerén Government)	El Salvador Plan 2015	[55]

Table 1. *Cont.*

Case Study	Year	Title	Scope	Abbreviation	Ref.
	2019	Latin American Women in Conservation Agenda	Latin America (Network of Women in Conservation of Latin America and the Caribbean)	WCN 2019	[46]
Global	2010	Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020	Global (Convention on Biological Biodiversity)	CBD 2010	[56]

In line with Sellberg et al. [57], we conducted a careful reading of the texts, of both their parts and the whole and its context, in order to highlight and make sense of the content that was relevant to our guiding question. In this sense, we applied critical and meaningful reading through the material while taking notes. In order to reinforce the validity of our results, we focused on keywords and strategies that were repeated throughout the material and that were clearly expressed in the texts.

In the case of the European study, the chosen keywords were: spatial development, spatial planning, territorial cohesion, and just transition. In the Latin American case, they were: Good Living and territorial feminisms. In both cases, the keywords were used in combination with: nature, territory, and biodiversity conservation, as global and paradigmatic concepts in discussion. Converging concepts and/or strategies were also identified in the European and Latin American documents, e.g., justice, cohesion and community, among others, and their differential nuances were discussed to generate a more complete proposal for the future of conservation from a territorial perspective.

In addition, we conducted a search of the bibliography and a selection of academic works that interpreted the content of the documents and focuses, drawing especially on reference authors in every case. The reviewed works are cited in the Sections 3 and 4, in line with good scientific practice.

Finally, the obtained results were then discussed against the content of the Convention on Biological Biodiversity's Strategic Plan 2011–2020, as an international guidance on nature conservation.

Citations in Spanish documents were translated into English, with the translations proofread by a native English speaker who is also fluent in Spanish.

3. Results

In the following sections, we present our results by case study according to the selected analysis framework. Firstly, we begin by defining the context of the policies and territorial perspectives that give meaning to the content analysis in each of the study cases. Secondly, we present the results structured by document and key perspective.

3.1. Territorial Perspectives of the European Union

3.1.1. Context: The European Integration Process

The origin of the European Union is based on the goal of bringing the frequent bloody conflicts between neighbouring countries that culminated in the Second World War to a halt. During this time, the European Coal and Steel Community was formed as the first step towards the progressive economic and political union of European countries to achieve stability and lasting peace (official EU website).

The European Union's territorial perspectives and policies can be traced back to the late 1940s, to the very beginning of the construction of the European 'Common Market'. Since then, a 'single market' has been pursued and envisioned as ' . . . an area without internal frontiers in which the free movement of goods, persons, services and capital are ensured' [58] (p. 4). Given this goal, regional disparities have been seen as barriers to

EU integration, and spatial and regional planning as a means to progressively eliminate economic and social disparities between states and regions.

Spatial planning is a 'Euro-English' term [59] (p. 57) usually defined as a strategic approach for the coordination of the spatial impacts of policy making, horizontally across policy sectors, vertically between different levels of government and geographically across administrative boundaries [26] (p. 178). It is important to note the strategic nature of the concept: spatial planning is intended to provide direction to policies, making them mutually consistent 'for an improved spatial coherence of Community Policies' (ESDP 1999).

In combination with regional planning, the concept of spatial planning has already figured in the European Regional/Spatial Planning Charter [60]. The Charter describes 'regional/spatial planning' as giving geographical expression to the various policies of society; giving direction to balanced regional development and the physical organization of space, according to an overall strategy [60] (p. X).

Activities related to spatial planning at the European level can be traced back to the early 1970s when the first session of the CEMAT issued Resolution No. 1 on the foundations of a European regional planning policy [61]. CEMAT is the acronym for Conférence Européenne des Ministres de l'Aménagement du Territoire (English: the European Conference of Ministers responsible for Regional Planning). However, from the early 1980s to the present day, European spatial planning has taken an important step forward both as an academic and a political sphere. From that time onward, different European planning organizations, journals, research institutions and networks have been founded, along with policy documents and agendas that, in conjunction, have significantly contributed to the formation of European spatial planning as a distinctive field of interaction for European spatial-planning practitioners and academics [26].

Of all the policy documents and agendas produced since then, those selected for their analysis in this work stand out (Table 1). What they all have in common is that they establish agreements produced on the occasion of the informal meetings of Ministers responsible for Spatial Planning and Territorial Development and/or Territorial Cohesion.

It is important to highlight that, as a European-level concept, spatial planning has not generally been concerned with the management or regulation of land use but with the coordination of the spatial impacts of sectoral policies [62]. Nonetheless, despite the lack of formal competence in land-use planning, the EU and its associated institutions play a significant role in piloting national planning policies [63]. In fact, the EU has the ability to influence national policies with territorial impact not only by guiding domestic spatial development policies through its spending policies (such as structural or cohesion funds) and regulations, but also through its central role in producing geographical knowledge within European spatial development issues [26].

A core component of the development of the European territorial perspective has been the creation of the ESPON observatory (European Territorial Observatory Network, formerly known as European Spatial Planning Observation Network), which is co-funded by the European Regional Development Fund and the countries participating in the programme. As its motto indicates, ESPON aims to 'Inspire Policy Making with Territorial Evidence', specifically by providing information on European territorial structures, trends, perspectives and policy impacts. ESPON also works as a significant agenda-setter for European planning research by sharing funding for academic research projects under its different cooperation programmes [64].

In the following, we analyse these policy documents' territorial discourses and vision of nature and its conservation, divided into two sections in terms of time. The first section is devoted to the document entitled the European Spatial Development Perspective (hereafter, ESDP), which develops the definition and objective of 'spatial development' for European Union territory as a whole. Then, the second section is devoted to the Territorial Agendas, which are focused on the objective of achieving territorial cohesion among the EU's various regions.

3.1.2. The European Spatial Development Perspective: Towards a Balanced and Sustainable Development of the Territory of the European Union

The ESDP conveys a vision of the future territory of the European Union drawn up by the Member States and the European Commission. It is a reference framework, agreed at the Informal Council of Ministers responsible for Spatial Planning in Potsdam, May 1999, which aims to provide policy guidelines for actions with a spatial impact taken by public and private decision makers.

In particular, the ESDP is based on the EU aim of achieving a balanced and sustainable development of the territory of the EU by strengthening economic and social cohesion. In the words of the ESDP: 'In accordance with the definition laid down in the United Nations Brundtland Report, sustainable development covers not only environmentally sound economic development which preserves present resources for use by future generations but also includes a balanced spatial development. This means (. . .) reconciling the social and economic claims for spatial development with the area's ecological and cultural functions and, hence, contributing to a sustainable, and at larger scale, balanced territorial development. The EU will therefore gradually develop, in line with safeguarding regional diversity, from an Economic Union into an Environmental Union and into a Social Union' (art. 17).

In order to achieve more spatially balanced development, three fundamental goals of European policy must be pursued simultaneously in all regions of the EU and their interactions taken into account: (i) economic and social cohesion, (ii) conservation and management of natural resources and the cultural heritage, and (iii) more balanced competitiveness of the European territory (art. 18). In this sense, achieving the balance of these goals is a key issue in this territorial perspective following the argument: 'The objectives of development, balance and protection must be reconciled. Policy aimed exclusively at balance would lead to weakening economically stronger regions and, simultaneously, increasing the dependency of less favoured regions. Development alone would favour an increase of regional disparities. An overemphasis on protection or preservation of spatial structures, on the other hand, bears the risk of stagnation since it might slow down modernisation trends' (art. 20). These objectives should be pursued by the European institutions and government and administrative authorities at the national, regional and local levels (art. 19).

At this point, it is worth noting that the ESDP reproduces the abovementioned idea of the European mosaic of 'areas with different development levels, [that] presents an enormous challenge' (art. 20). As Luukkonen [26] (p. 183) points out, the territory of the EU is represented as a singular entity composed of diverse regions which all have their own particular role in the totality. Another question to remark about this territorial perspective is the 'relational ontology of space', 'a network metaphor', which promotes Europe as an unbounded space of connectivity and mobility [65]. The ESDP envisioned Europe as a 'polycentric organism which consists of nodes and connecting corridors' [26] (p. 177).

When translated into nature conservation discourse, the ESDP envisioned a 'community-wide ecological network of protected areas' that could 'secure and develop the protection of valuable biotopes' (art. 136). Furthermore, '[t]here is a role to be played by links and corridors between protected areas, such as hedges, which can assist migration and the genetic exchange of plants and wild animals. In addition, a broader land-use policy can provide the context within which protected areas can thrive without being isolated, including, if necessary, the identification of buffer zones' (art. 136).

One further aspect that should be highlighted is that, despite the declaration in the document that 'nature conservation and the improvement of living conditions for people are taken into consideration equally' (art. 138), when it comes to reconciling spatial development and nature protection, the first objective prevails: 'Protection regulations and development restrictions should not be allowed to have a negative impact on the living conditions of the population' (art. 139). As other scholars have noted, this shows an unresolved tension between the pursuit of market-led solutions and active interventions

in favour of economic expansion and the achievement of sustainable development, social justice and solidarity [66,67].

Lastly, the concept of Spatial Sustainable Development stated at the 13th European Conference of Ministers responsible for Regional Planning [68] can be considered a transition point to the coming decades of territorial policies that seek to establish a better balance between the different dimensions of sustainable development (social, environmental, economic, cultural) and lead to the idea of socioecological relationships and an ecosystem services approach.

3.1.3. The European Territorial Agendas: Towards an Inclusive, Smart and Sustainable Europe of Diverse Regions

The first decade of 2000 brought a change in territorial discourse in EU politics. This is made clear in the different Territorial Agendas produced from this period (see Table 1), with each stating a clear objective in its subheading: 'Towards a more competitive and Sustainable Europe of Diverse Regions' (TAEU 2007); 'Towards an Inclusive, Smart and Sustainable Europe of Diverse Regions' (TAEU 2011); 'A future for all places' (TAEU 2020). Although the term spatial development is still in use, from then on, the main objectives of territorial strategies are based around the goal of 'territorial cohesion' [69].

TAEU 2020 declares territorial cohesion as 'a common goal for a more harmonious and balanced state of Europe' and defines it as 'a set of principles for harmonious, balanced, efficient, sustainable territorial development. It enables equal opportunities for citizens and enterprises, wherever they are located, to make the most of their territorial potentials. Territorial cohesion reinforces the principle of solidarity to promote convergence between the economies of better-off territories and those whose development is lagging behind' (TAEU 2011, art. 8).

The principle of territorial diversity as a capital asset is also further emphasised [70]. In the Green Paper's words: 'there has been growing awareness of the need to frame development strategies around the particular assets of territories, their physical, human and social capital as well as their natural resources' (p. 4). Territorial cohesion policy is subsequently defined as 'a means of transforming diversity into an asset that contributes to sustainable development of the entire EU' (p. 3). In the TAEU 2020, the diversity of territories and distinctive identities of local and regional communities in Europe is expressed as a 'potential for development' (TAEU 2011, art. 12).

Continuing with this idea, the latest Territorial Agenda 2030 once again describes nature, landscape and cultural heritage as: 'local and regional development assets that offer unique opportunities for development and high-quality living environments' (TAEU 2020, art. 41). In other words, the idea of a diversity of territories—including biodiversity—as a potential for development is maintained, thus stressing the concept of place-based development [71] whilst at the same time emphasising the anthropocentric focus of nature's ecosystemic services and highlighting the role that the environmental quality of territories has on their inhabitants' living conditions and health: 'Ecosystems, including agricultural, forest, grassland, fresh water and marine ecosystems, are fundamental to human existence and important for long-term sustainable development. It is a joint responsibility to ensure that they are sustainably accessible to the wider public, well-functioning, resilient, enhanced and healthy, and that they generate income for local populations and businesses. This helps mitigate climate change, combat the loss of biodiversity, ensure the provision of ecosystem services and raise public awareness of all the above' (art. 55).

The proposed territorial and conservation strategies include: (i) the integrated management of territories 'taking into consideration different geographical specificities'; (ii) 'the development of nature-based solutions as well as green and blue infrastructure networks that link ecosystems and protected areas in spatial planning, land management and other policies'; and, lastly, (iii) 'the development of new crisis management tools to increase places' safety and resilience' (art. 55).

Agenda 2030 has also brought two new discursive categories into the EU territorial perspective: the Just Transition and the Green New Deal. In fact, both ideas reinforce what some authors refer to as the 'myth' upon which the EU rests: cohesion, sustainability and competitiveness [67] (p. 297), but updated within the climate change context: 'The Green Deal links green and Just Transition objectives, as it aims at combating unevenly dispersed effects of the energy transition, reducing greenhouse gas emissions and the impact of climate change and other environmental challenges. It aims at turning climate and environmental challenges into opportunities for all places and making the transition just and inclusive for all' (art. 12).

The objectives and priorities of Agenda 2030 have been synthesised in Table 2, where what has been called the 'network metaphor' is still present in priorities 3 and 6, and the anthropocentric view of nature conservation related to human health can be inferred from priority 4.

Table 2. Territorial priorities of EU Territorial Agenda 2020.

Overarching Objectives	A Just Europe	A Green Europe
	That Offers Future Perspectives for All Places and People	That Protects Common Livelihoods and Shapes Societal Transition
Priorities	1. Balanced Europe	4. Healthy Environment
	Better balanced territorial development using Europe's diversity	Better ecological livelihoods, climate-neutral and resilient towns, cities and regions
	2. Functional Regions	5. Circular Economy
	Convergent local and regional development, less inequality between places	Strong and sustainable local economies in a globalised world
	3. Integration Beyond Borders	6. Sustainable Connections
	Easier living and working across national borders	Sustainable digital and physical connectivity of places

3.2. Emerging Latin American Focuses

3.2.1. Context: Extractivism, Popular Movements and Post-Development

Latin America has a long history beset with colonialism, the subjugation of indigenous and Afro-descendant populations, and a weak political position in the face of foreign interests that determine the current scenario of extractivism, crisis and social conflict over a variety of issues and on a variety of scales [22,72,73]. So-called 'Latin American historical–structural dependence' [73], which has persisted with fine distinctions up to today, is based on a particular type of perspective of nature, awareness and questioning of which is a key process for nature conservation processes in the region. Interpreted from a critical perspective, according to Composto and Navarro [74] (p. 42): 'The incorporation of Latin American nature into the capitalist system–world in a position of inferiority, simply as a resource to be exploited, was a substantive part of the logic of modernity/coloniality'.

This hegemonic perspective has been the basis for new advances in extractivism in the region in recent decades defined by three common characteristics: (i) the exploitation of natural resources (usually unprocessed), (ii) high volumes, and (iii) intended for export [75]. The most common examples of extractivism in Latin America are mega-mining, the expansion of monocultures and forestry exploitation. The socioenvironmental impacts of these processes have triggered the creation in the region of a platform composed of a range of social resistance movements that first became visible in the 1980s and is characterised by the growing relevance of peasant, indigenous and women populations [22,72,73,76–78].

Critical thinking and the demands of other types of knowledge and values in the Latin American region have spread to reflection on desired life models. Criticisms of the hegemonic development paradigm have emerged that can be grouped under the denomination of 'post-development' and that consist of questioning the modern Western

vision of the world and its aspiration to ongoing growth especially focused on the material field, the instrumentalisation of nature and the commodification of social relations [79,80].

Two of the focuses that have emerged from these movements are Good Living and the feminist territorial perspectives that slowly started to influence the political agendas of various countries in the region. This coincided with a particular time in Latin American history referred to as 'the 21st century left turn', characterised by the rise and presidential re-election of left-wing or centre-left leaders in various Latin American countries [81]. Among these can be mentioned Hugo Chavez in Venezuela (1999–2013), Evo Morales in Bolivia (2006–2019), Rafael Correa in Ecuador (2007–2017) and Salvador Sánchez Cerén in El Salvador (2014–2019), whose popular governments correspond to the plans selected for the analysis of the Good Living focus (Table 1). Despite the evident heterogeneity of programmes that support these leaderships, they all present certain lines in common, such as emerging out of neoliberalism, being based on popular movements (particularly peasants and the indigenous) and questioning hegemonic power by formulating and implementing new territorial measures and models such as Good Living, which in the case of Bolivia and Ecuador took on a constitutional status [82].

Concerning feminist territorial perspectives, these began to acquire greater relevance on the continent during the past decades and spearheaded by indigenous and peasant women [83,84], and they are also aligned with Good Living [85]. One of the flagship experiences was the Movement of Indigenous Zapatista Women in Mexico, framed in the Mexican National Zapatista Liberation Army (revolutionary organization) since the 1980s [86,87] (Padilla Garcia, 2018; Hilary, 2019). This resistance is strengthened in the region through self-managed organisations such as, for example, the Kaiowá and Guaraní Women's Assembly 'Kuñangue Aty Guasu' in Brazil [88]; the Critical View from the Perspective of Feminism Collective [89]; the Women in the Conservation of Latin America and the Caribbean network; and the National Coordinator of Indigenous Women (Spanish acronym, CONAMI) in Mexico. The policy agendas of the last two were those selected for content analysis.

3.2.2. Good Living: From Anthropocentrism to Biopluralism

Good Living has different names in the continent's various indigenous languages (Suma Kawsay, in Quechua; Suma Qamaña, in Aymara and Küme Mogen in Apuzungum) and refers to a heterogeneous set of ideas and knowledge with roots in the Andean indigenous vision of the world [90–92]. In recent decades, it has also taken on the form of a Latin American philosophical, political and territorial proposal promoted by left-wing governments that propose to 'bring back the experience of our peoples, bring back the Culture of Life and bring back a life in perfect harmony with and with mutual respect for mother nature, with Pachamama, where everything is life, where all [living beings] are uywas, born out of nature and the cosmos' [93] (p. 10) (current vice president of the State of Bolivia and member of the Aymara indigenous people).

This model is specially built on the transformation of the relationships between human beings and nature established in Western rationale. In Ecuador's National Plan for Good Living (2009–2013), for example, this is conceptualised as a move from 'anthropocentrism' to 'biopluralism'. In Bolivia, the same idea is transmitted in terms of fomenting 'cosmocentrism' over 'ethnocentrism' (Bolivia Plan 2006). This view implies understanding the human and the nonhuman as a political community, an idea that recasts nature as a subject of rights. This philosophy is also clear in the Venezuelan Homeland Plan 2013–2019, which includes among its objectives 'Driving and developing a vision of rights of Mother Earth as a representation of the rights of present and future generations, and also respect for other forms of life' (Venezuela Plan 2012, p. 107).

Nature, as it is understood in Good Living, also breaks with the passive and dichotomous vision of modernity, as it is regarded as a relational and multidimensional entity (biological, but also spiritual, cultural and political) that supports life and peoples' territorial identity [94]. From this point of view, defending nature from external interests is also

defending territories, a concept which, as such, takes on a meaning of decolonisation, of belonging, memory and resistance [19,95,96].

Based on these core feelings, the Good Living proposal develops a series of strategies in the economic, political and social sphere that compels decolonisation, with the analysed documents coinciding in attributing the main cause of the oppression of peoples and nature to neoliberalism. According to Ecuador's National Plan for Good Living (2009–2013), development is being sought 'that embodies the processes of accumulation and (re)distribution to the actors who have historically been excluded from the logics of the capitalist markets and the forms of production and reproduction based on different principles for each market's logic' (Venezuela Plan 2012, p. 6). This supposes achieving sovereignty on the international scale whilst also tending towards the integration and strengthening of the Latin American region in the face of world powers. On the intranational scale, it implies bottom-up decision processes that drive territorial autonomy through a 'process of participation, deliberation and emancipation in which communities and peoples determine the priorities, content and expectations for their future based on their cultural values and their social imaginary' (Bolivia Plan 2006). Regaining the community ties of solidarity and reciprocity, and the celebration of interculturality and diversity within territories is another of the cross-cutting themes in the four analysed plans. For example, El Salvador's Five-Year Development Plan (2014–2019) adopts the idea of 'diversity in unity' and highlights 'the importance of territory as a space for creation, reproduction, production and community co-existence' (El Salvador Plan 2015, p. 24).

As something that is essentially politically cross-scale, integrated and participative, territorial spatial planning appears in the context of Good Living with the meaning of decolonisation, with the ability to limit extractivism and private interests in order to foment objectives for the common good [97]. For example, the Bolivian National Development Plan states 'Planning seeks to manage development and strengthen the principle of the intrinsic relationships between Bolivian cultures and nature, as a nexus that generates visions of the world, interpretations of work, identities over time and their myths, the construction of territoriality and power' (Bolivia Plan 2006, p. 11).

3.2.3. Territorial Feminisms: Defending Body–Land–Territory

The second emerging perspective that we shall address here comes from what Ulloa (2016) has called 'territorial feminisms' to indicate the territorial–environmental struggles in Latin America and the Caribbean led by indigenous, Afro-descendant and peasant women. These views are aligned with Good Living: in fact, some authors interpret that the resistance to neoliberalism and extractivism initiated at the end of the 1980s progressed from an 'Indianist' to a 'feminist' period, adding rights of nature discourse concepts such as body–territory, the ethics of care and the affirmation of interdependence among all human and nonhuman beings to Good Living [85]. Content analysis supports this statement, as all the analysed national plans that adopt the Good Living philosophy emphasise gender equality and diversity as bases for the political proposal. For their part, the analysed feminist agendas explicitly refer to Good Living (WCN 2019, p. 14) or its precepts (CONAMI 2012, p. 36).

This resistance starts from the identification of a correspondence relationship between oppression and violence towards nature and women based on the gender inequality stressed in modernity and coloniality, and on the focus on dualities such as nature/culture and man/woman. So, in the context of predominantly patriarchal societies, nature is 'feminised', considered 'passive' and is 'violated' [22].

One of the main elements offered by gender perspectives is starting from a holistic focus that understands the body as territory and territory as the body, based on the statement that 'when the places that we inhabit are violated, our bodies are affected, and when our bodies are violated, the places that we inhabit are violated' [89] (p. 7). Bodies are presented as the first territory to be defended, a territory that extends to all nature, which supports them both biologically and in the cultural–community sense: 'I do not conceive this woman's body without a space on the Earth that dignifies my existence and

promotes my life in all its fullness' [98] (p. 23). In this way, extractivist processes and the advance over nature are interpreted as a violent exercise introduced by colonialism that especially affects women due to their traditionally acquired role of carer (for example, of the family, of crops and of animals). From this understanding, it is upheld that it will not be possible to conserve nature until the violence perpetrated on women and territories has been eradicated: '(...) we contend that free determination over territory and the ancestral rights that peoples have over it should be the inalienable condition for guaranteeing the permanence of everything that constitutes us' (CONAMI 2012, p. 36).

Female perspectives also emphasise that care roles and the value of aspects such as sympathy and empathy towards conservation should be made visible. For example, the Women in Conservation Agenda establishes that:

'We aspire to a future in which conservation is put into practice with a holistic focus, where people's faces are fundamental. A focus that embraces diversity, including elements such as empathy, affectivity and care. A future in which historical and social contexts are considered, that questions the resulting power relationships, and that incorporates a transformational and intersectional perspective of gender, with women's voices and experience being a part of its theoretical and material essence' (WCN 2019, p. 13).

The various feminist movements around the defence of territory–land–body share a territorial perspective that Ulloa calls the 'circulation of life' (2015). The five key points are: (i) the positioning of other relationships with the nonhumans (relational natures), (ii) horizontal and vertical territorial politics, (iii) relationship between men and women under other categories of gender, (iv) political dynamics based on autonomy and self-determination, and (v) life practices based on their knowledge [99].

In conclusion, the concept of territory and its defence is cross-cutting and the basis of the entire model in both Good Living and territorial feminisms. As such, national sovereignty, communities' autonomy over their territories and people's autonomy over their bodies are what enable nature to be cared for and life to be ongoing in all its dimensions. As Haesbaert [100] (p. 20) establishes, in this context 'it can be stated that defending life and defending territory—territory extends from our bodies to the "body of the Earth"—are actions that are inherent in each other'. In this sense, biodiversity is closely linked to ethnodiversity in what is beginning to be conceptualised in academic circles as 'biocultural diversity' [101]. This idea assumes an integrated and nondichotomous understanding of the multiple links between the human and the nonhuman, which are jointly transformed over time and in space [102–104]. In the words of Sonia Guajajaja, a member of the Assembly of Kaiowá and Guaraní Women 'the struggle for Mother Earth is the mother of all battles!' [89] (p. 44).

4. Discussion

4.1. Initiating a Dialogue between European–Latin American Perspectives and the Strategic Plan 2011–2020 of the Convention on Biological Biodiversity

The above results are discussed below and simultaneously contrasted with the CBD's Strategic Plan 2011–2020 to identify strengths and weaknesses from a critical territorial perspective. With this in mind, Table 3 synthesises both the objectives of the conservation policies as deduced from the analysed documents and the different conceptions of nature and territory in each of the case studies.

4.1.1. Nature and Development Discourses

As has been seen throughout the analysis of both regions' policy documents, nature has been embedded in a complex latticework of concepts, objectives and strategies with differing ultimate aims depending on the territorial political model and, in the final instance, of the philosophy adopted. The main and most evident difference between the European and Latin American focuses is marked by the vision or end purpose: sustainable development in the European case and Good Living in the Latin American case. Although the idea of development is included in the plans' Good Living framework, this is not the

ultimate goal, but rather it is subjected to far-reaching, philosophical and ethical principles and ends. These positions rest on two visions of nature that are difficult to reconcile: while in the European case, nature is conceived as an economic resource at the service of human beings, in the Latin American case, nature integrates a political community with people and is turned into a subject of rights (Table 3). Other authors, especially authors of political ecology, have made these differences evident [79,80].

Table 3. Synthesis of nature and territorial perspectives of EU policies, Latin American approaches and CBD Plan 2010–2020.

	Latin America	European Union	CBD Plan 2010–2020
Mission/goals	To preserve the autonomy, integrity and defence of territory in the face of foreign interests; To recover community life in harmony with nature	To promote territorial cohesion and achieve a balanced and sustainable development between EU regions	Vision: 'living in harmony with nature' Goals: 1—Biodiversity conservation; 2—Sustainable use; 3—Equitable distribution of benefits of genetic resources
Conception of nature	Nature as a political subject with its own rights; Degradation of nature understood as violence	Nature as a service provider; Degradation of nature understood as severe risks to ecosystems and population's quality of life	Nature as a service provider; One mention of the word 'nature' (convention motto); Preferential use of biodiversity and ecosystems
Conception of territory	Territory with a decolonial sense of community, identity and resistance.	Territory as capital assets and its diversity as a strength for potential development	No mention of the concept of territory; Depoliticised approach to conservation; Origin of the concept of OECMs (other effective area-based conservation measures)

The content analysis of the CBD Plan 2011–2020 shows that it reflects the purpose of sustainable development and it particularly aligns with the 'Millennium Development Goals' (art. 13, 16e, Annex I 3, 8). As in the European case, this development, with special economic emphasis, seeks to be balanced and highlights especially the objective of eradicating poverty over other issues (e.g., art. 3d, Annex I 3, 4, 9, III 12, IV 13). It can also be observed that it reflects the same anthropocentric and utilitarian perspective of nature as in European policies, in as much as 'Biological diversity underpins ecosystem functioning and the provision of ecosystem services essential for human well-being' (Annex I 3), with one of its three general goals being the sustainable use of biodiversity (Table 3). This approach corresponds to what is known as the 'ecosystemic focus', which implies economic justification for conservation based on the services that it contributes to people and sustainable growth [105]. This focus first emerged in developed countries as a way of fomenting citizen support for conservation [106–108] and was adopted by the CBD from its launch in 1999 [105]. Despite this being a step forward from the view of the preceding decades which saw conservation as something with no links to social spheres [28,109], it has been suggested at the current time that advances have to be made towards a 'biocultural diversity' focus, as is proposed from the emerging Latin American perspectives that promote a horizontal and integrated understanding between the human and the nonhuman.

In synthesis, the reference to development and its substantiation based on ecosystemic services suggest an anthropocentric positioning and an instrumental vision of nature in the CBD Plan consistent with the needs and aspirations of developed countries, which are assumed to be natural and universally shared. That is, with no recognition that other priorities and understandings of nature exist in the world, as have been developed with Good Living and the territorial feminisms, for example. As has been seen, in Latin America, conservation is conceived first and foremost as a popular demand rather than an obstacle

to development; and it is not so much related to achieving consumer sustainability as regaining and guaranteeing the rights of both human and nonhuman communities. In this context, prioritising economic justifications is not necessarily empathetic with the whole affective and historical component that peoples put in jeopardy every day in defence of their territories [110,111], among others.

These basic positionings remain in the draft of the post-2020 plan [112], despite member countries such as Bolivia criticising the green economy model in agreement with other allied countries and attempting to negotiate a change of focus that 'is not based on the expansion of capitalism towards nature, but rather on the expansion of the rights of Mother Earth and of peoples' [113]. The only section that enables a glimpse of change in the future is the Convention's motto: living in harmony with nature. It is interesting to point out that this is the only point in the Plan 2011–2020 where the concept of 'nature' is mentioned as such; subsequently, the references are to biodiversity, species and ecosystems. This motto, whose concept of 'harmony' invokes the thinking of Good Living (Table 3), has been the result of negotiations with indigenous organisations in the world, thus bringing back an intercultural meaning [112]. So, it is turned into what might be a gateway to a more integrated approach to biodiversity and the relationships between the human and the nonhuman, despite this idea not being reflected in the rest of the plan 2011–2020 and not even the post-2020 draft, which is currently under review [112].

4.1.2. Territorial Perspectives

The differential conceptions of nature in Europe and Latin America are closely linked to the understanding of territory that exists in each case and in which the management goals are definitively framed.

Various academics have noticed that when territory is spoken of in different parts of the world, it is not the same thing that is being referred to [13,19]. Our analysis showed that the historical context of regional problems was fundamental in this differential approach. As we have seen, in Latin America, resistance to colonialism, cultural oppression and extractivism have been and continue to be the main landmarks that define territories and the way that they are addressed. In Europe, however, history has been marked by the armed conflicts that characterised the two World Wars and that sparked the need to cooperate in order to recover and maintain peace and the economy; and this in a territory which is understood to be a whole made up of diverse regions, each of which must fulfil its function on the path to integration and economic growth and in which none must lag behind. The previously explained concept of territorial cohesion summarises this idea. Thus, as a result, on the one hand, in Latin America we have territory understood as identity, belonging and resistance, with its roots in small scales such as the body and local communities; on the other, there is the European conception of a widespread space of diverse territories to be articulated as the basis for development capital (Table 3).

In both cases, the category of territory is essential and inextricably includes natural aspects, albeit from the perspective of different concepts. This has consequences for understanding its degradation: whereas in Europe nature must be preserved because it is one more element that contributes to the diversity of territories and their capital and its degradation affects the well-being and development of their populations, in the analysed Latin American focuses nature is territory and territory is also people and, in the final analysis, its degradation is understood as the exercise of violence.

Looking at the CBD 2011–2020, we observe that it does not reflect a territorial focus of either of these two characteristics with any great intensity. Firstly, it is relevant to mention that this plan makes no mention at all concerning the concept of 'territory'. Considering that this category has become a meeting point for multiple disciplines and is a key and common factor in the approach to complex 21st-century problems [12–14] its absence is, therefore, striking. We consider this to be one of the main weaknesses as it not only implies the omission of intrinsic aspects of territorial management such as power relationships and cultural identities, both of which are core aspects for addressing the causes, consequences

and possible solutions to the degradation of nature that it is being attempted to contain. The opportunity to delve further into processes such as territorial governance is also lost as, despite the plan establishing participation as a relevant mechanism at all governmental levels and in all social sectors (CBD 2010, art. 2a; Annex IV 13 -Target 18-, V 14, 16), this is done through the reiterated and merely nominal mention of constructs such as 'indigenous, local and women's communities', which is repeated throughout the plan in a role that is more passive than active. In other words, these groups' cosmovisions and concerns (for example, nature as a subject and territorial violence) are not really integrated into the rationale of the document, which persists with the hegemonic discourse on biodiversity.

In other regards, the only mention made of the differences between developed and developing countries can be found in the recommendations of the former's financial solidarity with the latter, in order to comply with the plan and capacity development (art. 10, 12, Annex VI 20). Notwithstanding, no alert is given about the neocolonial usurpation relationships that have historically infringed the countries of the South, all of which limits their capacity for action, precisely.

The lack of a critical territorial perspective is particularly evident in strategic objectives A: '[to] Address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss by mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society' (p. 8) and B: '[to] Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use' (p. 8). The goals associated with each of these objectives make general depoliticised recommendations such as raising people's awareness of biodiversity, reducing economic incentives for harmful actions and achieving sustainable use, which conceals from sight, for example, extractivist processes and the responsibilities of companies and the States that carry them out or authorise them, which, in light of the Latin American context, are the primordial causes of socioenvironmental problems.

The tendency towards the depoliticisation of nature and its management, which renders nature as something 'politically mute and socially neutral' [114] (p. 44), is, precisely, one of the criticisms made of the hegemonic environmental discourse and that our work upholds from a territorial focus. In this sense, the adoption of objectives inspired by the concepts of the European territorial objectives—territorial cohesion, just territorial transition—would at least be a step towards achieving the targets of social, environmental and territorial justice that communities demand.

Other geographical categories such as space and place are also missing from the plan apart from the concept of territory. The exception is the category of landscape, which is included in Aichi Target 11, which aspires to 17% of terrestrial areas and 10% of marine areas being 'conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscape and seascape' by 2020 (p. 9).

It is important to highlight that precisely this target, which is the only point in the plan where a spatial/territorial perspective of biodiversity is visualised, has inspired a new line of work worldwide, even understood as a new paradigm [115–117], with its reference to 'other effective area-based conservation measures' (known as OECMs). In contrast to the need to operationalise this target to evaluate their results, OECMs were subsequently defined as geographically delimited areas that are not protected areas but contribute to the in situ conservation effectiveness of biological diversity and are governed and managed in ways that achieve positive and sustained long-term outcomes (CBD/COP/DEC/14/8, 2018). The broadness of this definition encompasses local, private and community measures that are not state-declared protected areas and might have a main goal other than conservation, such as municipal parks, indigenous territories, private reserves and Ramsar sites, among others. So, the idea of OECMs opened the door to the possibility of recognising conservation and alternative management mechanisms, making the discussion and exercise of the Convention visible to a wide diversity of local actors that had, up to then, been rendered invisible. In this sense, OECMs have been considered the next step for much more just and participative conservation [115,118]. From the integrated landscape view, the repercussion of Target 11 on innovation and the promotion of local governance serves,

for example, as an antecedent and cornerstone for strengthening the territorial perspective in global conservation frameworks.

4.2. Key Commonalities: Bridges and Possible Contributions of the European–Latin American Territorial Dialogue to the Future of Conservation

We stated that the main differences between the European and Latin American focuses are the broader categories of nature, territory and end goals. However, the dialogue between the two has shown that there are four shared concepts with differential nuances that deepen the understanding of territorial dynamics and nature management: (i) relational spatial/temporal thinking, (ii) the active political search for justice and equality, (iii) the construction of cohesion, integration and community as goals, and (iv) multiscale territorial/spatial planning as a key instrument to attain them. As we identified these as a weak territorial perspective in the CBD Plan, this might mean that they can contribute to the definition of future strategies.

One of the most auspicious encounters in European and Latin American focuses is relational thinking. As mentioned above, the European focus applies what authors have conceptualised as a 'relational ontology of space, which makes an essential contribution to thinking on networks and flows through geographical space' [26]. This focus, which has enabled thinking about far-reaching strategies in conservation such as the Natura 2000 network, represents a major step forward in ecological connectivity, which is a perspective oriented at maintaining the free movement of species and the flow of natural processes that sustain life on Earth [119,120].

We find that this aspect is complemented by Latin American focuses, in as much as the understanding of relational is temporal rather than spatial. Relationships are interwoven in what has been called 'circular' time; history and ancestral memory are what give meaning to daily practice and future goals [100,121,122]. As has been seen previously, the understanding of what is relational from the perspective of Good Living and feminism transcends the physical or material dimensions and includes various dimensional layers in one and the same space (material, spiritual, emotional) that coincide in time and space and 'interdetermine' each other.

In both the European and Latin American focuses, it is the diversities that are connected: when attention is turned to the interconnections, knowledge and an appreciation of diversity emerge in both national territories [123] and in the interior of these same territories, with notions such as pluriculturality and plurinationality (Bolivia Plan 2006; Ecuador Plan 2009).

In synthesis, both connectivity and diversity in all their aspects, not just ecological, are a contribution made by territorial thinking and they are positioned as a key factor in the contemporary debate on conservation [124,125]. In this sense, it is suggested that these aspects should be strengthened in future global conservation strategies and recommendations such as the post-2020 Biodiversity Global Framework [126]

Another strength of the territorial perspective is that it does not address these complex connections between diversities abstractly, but positions them in the context of some specific political and geographical relationships, which enable identification of inequalities and incorporate the idea of justice. This is the second convergent point that we have identified in European and Latin American focuses.

In the European case, the idea of inequality is associated with the imbalance between territories' development, with a search for strategies sought to guarantee integration and the same opportunities for all, which is the basis for the objective of territorial cohesion. More recently, in relation to the environmental aspect, the 'just transition' towards climatically neutral economies refers to a series of measurements that address the economic and social aspects of the transition to a low-carbon economy in order that it might be equal for all countries and regions [127]. This reveals an emphasis on the spatial and distributional dimension of justice that is usually prevalent in environmental justice frameworks [128]. For their part, Good Living and territorial feminisms also emphasise a historical vision of

justice by highlighting the violence suffered by cultures, genders and nature in relation to colonialism and extractivism. In this sense, these perspectives motivate the need to respect territorial autonomies and assign responsibilities to address the historical violation of rights, as is made explicit by the Bolivian government, for example [111]. This idea is directly related to the ongoing international debate around the penalisation of environmental crime and the inclusion of ecocide as a fifth category of international crime [128–130]. The linking of environmental degradation to universal human rights is another area under debate [131,132]. In conclusion, in Latin America, importance is given to other dimensions of justice that are usually absent from or marginalised in environmental discourse such as restorative justice (i.e., taking measures to recover from historical social traumas), procedural justice (making decision-making processes inclusive and participative) and recognitional justice (showing respect for different values and identities and allowing people to express themselves through their own concepts) [127,133]. Thus, the idea of justice is a key point that can be considered complementary between Latin American and European focuses to deepen and widen their perspective in global conservation frameworks.

The third convergent point between the Latin American and European focuses is related to those above: the aspiration to social and territorial cohesion and regional integration, which are underpinned by a feeling of solidarity and community from the local to the regional scale. The local scale, particularly, has acquired compelling strength for participation and governance. In relation to conservation, the Latin American—and particularly feminist thinking—premises identified in the documents were clear: re-evaluating the roles of care and bottom-up initiatives visible on small scales is a priority, as is respecting bodies–territories and freeing them from violence (WCN 2019). Meanwhile, in Europe, Agenda 2030 incorporates and highlights the idea of place-based management 'which is considered to take better account of place-specific conditions and problems by drawing on local assets and capacities' [71] (p. 2). Boosting the feeling of cohesion and community is relevant on the local scale, whereas matters such as biodiversity loss and climate change motivate large-scale strategies that, while necessary, can lose sight of the political, social and cultural meaning that these processes acquire on medium and small scales, where policies effectively materialise and make an impact [134–136].

Lastly, land use and spatial planning are seen as a key means for achieving the two regions' respective goals of development and Good Living. This instrument basically contributes the integrated perspective and the search for the common good and social, environmental and territorial justice to conservation by reassessing the role of public policies and their coordination [38]. If this instrument is thought of as an opportunity to not only coordinate land uses but also provide a common sense and direction to space/territory, then strengthening its articulation with international conservation strategies is appropriate.

5. Final Remarks

International organisations' recommendations for the post-2020 conservation era have suggested that the CBD Plan 2011–2020 should be continued with a focus on including new topics such as soil biodiversity, underwater noise, telecoupling and synthetic biology [137]. They have also indicated the need to increase the size of protected and preserved areas, restore ecosystems, protect some specific species and improve the capture of funds [138]. These recommendations have been accompanied by a proliferating discussion on the scientific level of the priorities that the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework should have, including the linking of biodiversity to other global processes such as climate change, gender diversity and mitigation processes [139]. Our article seeks to contribute to this discussion by substantiating the lack of a critical territorial perspective, and the opportunity for future global plans and strategies to incorporate such a perspective to enable a discussion on hegemonic discourses about nature and its conservation in relation to dialogue with other visions of actors who are usually silenced, such as Good Living and territorial feminisms. We also argue the need to rescue social inequalities from their nominal meaning (i.e., their superficial mention) by using conservation strategies that also address other

territorial problems such as social justice, economic inequality and access to natural places, gender violence and the fight for human and nature rights. The intention is, therefore, to move forward towards a real social transformation that this time would truly make life in harmony with nature possible.

This North–South dialogue has been a challenge for the authors due to the breadth and complexity of the topic and the wide range of approaches addressed. As a result, the work has some limitations, especially from a methodological point of view, given the difficulty of comparing two such dissimilar geopolitical realities as Europe and Latin America and finding a meeting ground between them. Addressing the number of terms, concepts, policy documents and frameworks in this work has been a hard task but, at the same time, it has enabled us to use the deeper, more complex and plural approach required by conservation policies. Notwithstanding this difficulty, the above results help to identify the gaps, strengths and opportunities that contribute to fairer and more critical global strategies for nature conservation and management.

In the following, we synthesise the recommendations for future global nature conservation strategies, based on the identified convergences between European and Latin American territorial discourse:

(i)　Territorialisation of nature conservation

- To emphasise the articulation between conservation policies, land use and spatial planning;
- To make recommendations consistent with regional diversities and concerns from geographical and historical perspectives;
- To promote place-based conservation strategies aimed at territorial cohesion and a just territorial transition, the construction of community feeling among people and with nature;
- To visualise conservation from a microscale point of view, i.e., as care for the body/family.

(ii)　To broaden and deepen the sense of justice

- To strengthen social, environmental and historical justice as a core goal of conservation;
- To recognise nature as a subject of rights;
- To judge nature degradation as violence (by developing the concept of environmental crime, including the idea of ecocide as a category of international crime, and the link with human rights);
- To give importance to all the dimensions of justice (distributional, restorative, recognitional and procedural).

(iii)　To promote a critical–epistemological discussion

- To establish a critical view of the aspiration to development and instrumental conception of nature with recognition of alternative perceptions such as Good Living and territorial feminisms;
- To foment complex relational spatial, temporal and multidimensional thinking that integrates notions such as 'bioculturality' into policy formulation and evaluation;
- To incorporate transdisciplinary targets and assessments by emphasising the role and contributions of social sciences and alternative types of knowledge to nature conservation.

References

1. IPBES. *Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services*; IPBES Secretary: Bonn, Germany, 2019.
2. CBD. *Global Biodiversity Outlook 5*; Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity: Montreal, OC, Canada, 2020; p. 208. Available online: https://www.cbd.int/gbo/gbo5/publication/gbo-5-en.pdf (accessed on 15 October 2021).
3. CBD. Draft of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. 2019. Available online: https://www.cbd.int/doc/c/abb5/591f/2e46096d3f0330b08ce87a45/wg2020-03-03-en.pdf (accessed on 15 October 2021).
4. Lefebvre, H. *La Production de L'espace*; Éditions Anthropos: París, France, 1974; p. 596.
5. Harley, J.B. Deconstructing the map. *Cartographica* **1989**, *26*, 1–20. [CrossRef]
6. Herner, M.T. Territory, deterritorialization and reterrirorialization. A theoretical approach from the perspective of Deleuze and Guattari. *Huellas* **2009**, *13*, 158–171.
7. Castree, N.; Braun, B. The Construction of Nature and the Nature of Construction: Analytical and Political Tools for Building Survivable Futures. In *Remaking Realaty: Nature at the Millenium*; Braun, B., Castree, N., Eds.; Routledge: London, UK; New York, NY, USA, 1998; pp. 3–42.
8. Escobar, A. Whose Knowledge, Whose nature? Biodiversity, Conservation, and the Political Ecology of Social Movements. *J. Political Ecol.* **1998**, *5*, 53–82. [CrossRef]
9. Demeritt, D. What is the 'social construction of nature'? A typology and sympathetic critique. *Prog. Hum. Geogr.* **2002**, *26*, 767–790. [CrossRef]
10. Asher, K.; Ojeda, D. Producing nature and making the state: Ordenamiento territorial in the Pacific lowlands of Colombia. *Geoforum* **2009**, *40*, 292–302. [CrossRef]
11. Machado, H. La 'Naturaleza' como objeto colonial. Una mirada desde la condición eco-bio-política del colonialismo contemporáneo. *Bol. Onteaiken* **2010**, *10*, 35–47.
12. Porto-Gonçalves, C.W. Da geografía ás geografías. Um mundo em busca de novas territorialidades. In *La Guerra Infinita: Hegemonía y Terror Mundial*; Ceceña, A., Sader, E., Eds.; CLACSO: Buenos Aires, Argentina, 2002; pp. 217–256.
13. Haesbaert, R. *O Mito da Desterritorializaçao: Do "Fim dos Territórios" á Multiterritiralidade*; Bertrand: Río de Janeiro, Brazil, 2004; 395p.
14. Elden, S. *The Birth of Territory*; University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL, USA, 2013; p. 512.
15. Wallerstein, I. *El Moderno Sistema Mundial*; Siglo XXI Editores: Mexico City, Mexico, 1979; p. 640.
16. Radcliffe, S. Geography and indigeneity I: Indigeneity, coloniality and knowledge. *Prog. Hum. Geogr.* **2017**, *41*, 220–229. [CrossRef]
17. Zaragocin, S. Feminismo decolonial y Buen Vivir. In *Feminismos y Buen Vivir: Utopías Descoloniales*; Varea, S., Zaragocin, S., Eds.; Universidad de Cuenca: Cuenca, Ecuador, 2017; pp. 17–25.
18. Escobar, A. *Sentipensar con la Tierra: Nuevas Lecturas Sobre Desarrollo, Territorio y Diferencia*; Editions UNAULA: Medellín, Colombia, 2014; p. 189.

19. Halvorsen, S. Decolonising territory: Dialogues with Latin American knowledges and grassroots strategies. *Prog. Hum. Geogr.* **2018**, *43*, 790–814. [CrossRef]

20. Wilshusen, P.; Brechin, S.; Fortwangler, C.; West, P. Contested nature: Conservation at the turn of the twenty-first century. In *Contested Nature: Promoting International Biodiversity with Social Justice in the Twenty-First Century*; Brechin, S., Wilshusen, P., Fortwangler, C., West, P., Eds.; State University of New York Press: New York, NY, USA, 2003; pp. 1–25.

21. Stevens, S. (Ed.) *Indigenous Peoples, National Parks, and Protected Areas: A New Paradigm Linking Conservation, Culture, and Rights*; University of Arizona Press: Tucson, AZ, USA, 2014; p. 392.

22. Ulloa, A. Territory feminism in Latin America: Defense of life against extractivism. *Nómadas* **2016**, *45*, 123–139. [CrossRef]

23. Mellet, S.; Kepe, T. (Eds.) *Land Rights, Biodiversity Conservation and Justic Land Rights, Biodiversity Conservation and Justice*; Routledge: London, UK, 2018; p. 220. [CrossRef]

24. Santos, M. *La Naturaleza del Espacio: Técnica y Tiempo, Razón y Emoción*; Editorial Ariel: Madrid, Spain, 2000; p. 352.

25. Farinós Dasí, J. Gobernanza territorial para el desarrollo sostenible: Estado de la cuestión y agenda. *BAGE* **2008**, *46*, 11–32.

26. Luukkonen, J. Planning in Europe for 'EU'rope: Spatial planning as a political technology of territory. *Plan. Theory* **2015**, *14*, 174–194. [CrossRef]

27. CDB. *Program of Work on Protected Areas*; Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity: Montreal, OC, Canada, 2004; p. 31.

28. Phillips, A. Turning Ideas on Their Head: The New Paradigm for Protected Areas. *Georg. Wright Forum* **2003**, *20*, 8–32.

29. Soule, M.E. The "New Conservation". *Conserv. Biol.* **2013**, *27*, 895–897. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

30. Lerda, J.C.; Acquatella, J.; Gómez, J.J. Coordinación de políticas públicas: Desafíos y oportunidades para una agenda fiscal-ambiental. In *Política Fiscal y Medio Ambiente: Bases Para una Agenda Común*; Acquatella, J., Bárcena, A., Eds.; Cepal: Santiago de Chile, Chile, 2005; pp. 65–88.

31. Sánchez Salazar, M.T.; Casado Izquierdo, J.M.; Bocco Verdinelli, G. La política de ordenamiento territorial en México: De la teoría a la práctica. Reflexiones sobre sus avances y retos a futuro. In *La política de Ordenamiento Territorial en México: De la Teoría a la Práctica*; Sánchez-Salazar, M.T., Bocco, G., Casado, J.M., Eds.; Instituto de Geografía y Centro de In-vestigaciones en Geografía Ambiental, UNAM/Instituto Nacional de Ecología y Cambio Climático, Semarnat: Mexico City, Mexico, 2013; pp. 19–44.

32. Paredes-Leguizamon, G. *Integrando las Áreas Protegidas al Ordenamiento Territorial: Caso Colombia*; PNNC y UICN: Bogota, Colombia, 2018; p. 142.

33. Frantzeskaki, N.; Vandergert, P.; Connop, S.; Schipper, K.; Zwierzchowska, I.; Collier, M.; Lodder, M. Examining the policy needs for implementing nature-based solutions in cities: Findings from city-wide transdisciplinary experiences in Glasgow (UK), Genk (Belgium) and Poznań (Poland). *Land Use Policy* **2020**, *96*, 104688. [CrossRef]

34. Boron, V.; Tzanopoulos, J.; Gallo, J.; Barragan, J.; Jaimes-Rodriguez, L.; Schaller, G.; Payán, E. Jaguar Densities across Human-Dominated Landscapes in Colombia: The Contribution of Unprotected Areas to Long Term Conservation. *PLoS ONE* **2016**, *11*, e0153973. [CrossRef]

35. Da, S.S.; Márquez, J.R.G.; Sommer, J.H.; Thiombiano, A.; Zizka, G.; Dressler, S.; Schmidt, M.; Chatelain, C.; Barthlott, W. Plant biodiversity patterns along a climatic gradient and across protected areas in West Africa. *Afr. J. Ecol.* **2018**, *56*, 641–652. [CrossRef]

36. Nackoney, J.; Williams, A. Comparison of scenarios for rural development planning and conservation in the Demo-cratic Republic of the Congo. *Biol. Conserv.* **2013**, *164*, 140–149. [CrossRef]

37. Hewson, J.; Razafimanahaka, J.H.; Wright, T.M.; Mandimbiniaina, R.; Mulligan, M.; Jones, J.P.; Van Soesbergen, A.; Andri-amananjara, A.; Tabor, K.; Rasolohery, A.; et al. PLand Change Modelling to Inform Strategic Decisions on Forest Cover and CO$_2$ Emissions in Eastern Madagascar. *Environ. Conserv.* **2019**, *46*, 25–33. [CrossRef]

38. Degele, P.E. Land Use Planning as a Counter-Hegemonic Tool for Nature Conservation in Latin America. Study in Buenos Aires Province (Argentina). Ph.D. Thesis, Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, Mendoza, Argentina, 2021.

39. Farinós Dasí, J. La gobernanza como elemento de transformación territorial, ambiental y urbana ¿gobernanza territorial sin territorio? In *Ordenación Del Territorio, Urbanismo Y Medio Ambiente En Un Mundo En Cambio*; Rodríguez, S., Ed.; Universitat de València: València, Spain, 2017; pp. 213–245.

40. Leff, E. *Saber Ambiental: Sustentabilidad, Racionalidad, Complejidad, Poder*; Siglo XXI/UNAM/PNUMA: Mexico City, Mexico, 2002; p. 285.

41. Anand, R. International Environmental Justice. In *A North-South Dimension*; Routledge: London, UK, 2017. [CrossRef]

42. Elliott, L. The Global Politics of the Environment. In *The Global Politics of the Environment*; Palgrave: London, UK, 2004; pp. 223–238. [CrossRef]

43. Atapattu, S.; Gonzalez, C.G. The North–South Divide in International Environmental Law. In *International Environmental Law and the Global South*; Shawkat, A., Atapattu, S., Gonzalez, C.G., Razzaque, J., Eds.; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 2015; pp. 1–20. [CrossRef]

44. Krippendorff, K. *Content Analysis. An Introduction to Its Methodology*, 2nd ed.; Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, 2004; p. 422.

45. CONAMI. Agenda Política de las Mujeres Indígenas de México. 2012. Available online: http://www.undp.org/content/dam/mexico/docs/Publicaciones/PublicacionesGobernabilidadDemocratica/UNDP-MX-DemGov-AGENDAPOLITICAMujIndigenas-2012.pdf (accessed on 15 October 2021).

46. WCN. Agenda de Mujeres en Conservación de Latinoamérica y el Caribe. 2019. Available online: https://mujeresenconservacionhome.files.wordpress.com/2021/03/agenda-mujeres-conservacion-interactivo.pdf (accessed on 3 September 2021).

47. European Commission. *ESDP—European Spatial Development Perspective. Towards Balanced and Sustainable Development of the Territory of the European Union*; Office for Official Publications of the European Communities: Luxembourg, 1999; ISBN 92-828-7658-6.

48. TAEU, Territorial Agenda of the European Union. Towards a More Competitive and Sustainable Europe of Diverse Regions. In Proceedings of the Informal Ministerial Meeting on Urban Development and Territorial Cohesion, Leipzig, Germany, 24–25 May 2007.

49. European Commission. Green paper on territorial cohesion. Turning territorial diversity into strength. *Inforeg. Panor.* **2008**, *29*, 3–17.

50. TAEU, Territorial agenda of the European Union 2020. Towards an inclusive, smart and sustainable Europe of diverse regions. In Proceedings of the Informal Ministerial Meeting of Ministers responsible for Spatial Planning and Territorial Development, Gödöllő, Hungary, 19 May 2011.

51. TAEU, Territorial Agenda 2030. A future for all places. In Proceedings of the Informal meeting of Ministers responsible for Spatial Planning and Territorial Development and/or Territorial Cohesion, Germany, 1 December 2020.

52. Bolivia Plan. Plan Nacional de Desarrollo Bolivia Digna, Soberana, Productiva y Democrática para Vivir Bien. Lineamientos Estratégicos 2006–2011. 2006. Available online: https://dds.cepal.org/redesoc/publicacion?id=3073 (accessed on 15 October 2021).

53. Ecuador Plan. Plan Nacional para el Buen Vivir 2009–2013. 2009. Available online: https://www.planificacion.gob.ec/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2012/07/Plan_Nacional_para_el_Buen_Vivir.pdf (accessed on 15 October 2021).

54. Venezuela Plan, 2012. Plan de la Patria 2013–2019 de Venezuela. Available online: https://observatorioplanificacion.cepal.org/es/planes/plan-de-la-patria-2013-2019-de-venezuela (accessed on 3 September 2021).

55. El Salvador Plan. Plan Quinquenal de Desarrollo 2014–2019 "El Salvador productivo, educado y seguro". 2015. Available online: https://observatorioplanificacion.cepal.org/es/planes/plan-quinquenal-de-desarrollo-2014-2019-el-salvador-productivo-educado-y-seguro (accessed on 15 October 2021).

56. CDB. Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020. 2010. Available online: https://www.cbd.int/sp/ (accessed on 30 August 2021).

57. Sellberg, M.; Borgström, S.T.; Norström, A.V.; Peterson, G. Improving participatory resilience assessment by cross-fertilizing the Resilience Alliance and Transition Movement approaches. *Ecol. Soc.* **2017**, *22*, 28. [CrossRef]

58. Faludi, A.; Waterhout, B. *The Making of the European Spatial Development Perspective*; Routledge: London, UK; New York, NY, USA, 2002.

59. Williams, R.H. *European Union Spatial Policy and Planning*; Chapman Publishing: London, UK, 1996.

60. CEMAT. *Resolution No. 2 on The European Regional/Spatial Planning Charter (Torremolinos Charter)*; Adopted on 20 May 1983 at Torremolinos; Council of Europe Publishing: Strasbourg, France, 1983.

61. CEMAT. Resolution No. 1 on the foundations of a European regional planning policy. In Proceedings of the 1st Session of the CEMAT, Bonn, Germany, 9–11 September 1970.

62. Dühr, S.; Colomb, C.; Nadin, V. *European Spatial Planning and Territorial Cooperation*; Routledge: London, UK, 2010.

63. Faludi, A. European spatial planning beyond sovereignty. *Trans. Assoc. Eur. Sch. Plan.* **2020**, *4*, 99–110. [CrossRef]

64. ESPON Programmes. Available online: https://www.espon.eu/programme/espon/espon-2020-cooperation-programme (accessed on 15 October 2021).

65. Moisio, S.; Luukkonen, J. European spatial planning as governmentality: An inquiry into rationalities, techniques and manifestations. *Environ. Plan. C Gov. Policy* **2014**, *33*, 828–845. [CrossRef]

66. Amin, A.; Tomaney, J. A framework for cohesion. In *Behind the Myth of European Union*; Amin, A., Tomaney, J., Eds.; Routledge: London, UK, 1995; pp. 307–321.

67. Albrechts, L. In Pursuit of New Approaches to Strategic Spatial Planning. A European Perspective. *Int. Plan. Stud.* **2001**, *6*, 293–310. [CrossRef]

68. CEMAT. Implementation of strategies and visions for sustainable spatial development of the European continent. In Proceedings of the 13th European Conference of Ministers responsible for Regional Planning (CEMAT), Ljubljana, Slovenia, 16–17 September 2003.

69. Fernández-Tabales, A.; Pedregal, B.; Rodríguez, J.C.; Pita, M.F.; Zoido, F. The territorial cohesion concept: Scales of application, measurement systems and derivative policies. *BAGE* **2009**, *50*, 397–400. Available online: https://bage.age-geografia.es/ojs/index.php/bage/article/view/1123 (accessed on 2 November 2021).

70. Walsh, C. Territorial Agenda of the European Union 2020: Towards an Inclusive, Smart and Sustainable Europe of Diverse Reg. *Plan. Theory Pr.* **2012**, *13*, 493–496. [CrossRef]

71. Weck, S.; Madanipour, A.; Schmitt, P. Place-based development and spatial justice. *Eur. Plan. Stud.* **2021**, *30*, 791–806. [CrossRef]

72. Seoane, J. (Ed.) *Movimientos Sociales y Conflictos en América Latina*; CLACSO: Buenos Aires, Argentina, 2003; p. 184.

73. Quijano, A. Colonialidad del poder, eurocentrismo y América Latina. In *Cuestiones y Horizontes: De la Dependencia Histórico-Estructural a la Colonialidad/Descolonialidad del Poder*; CLACSO: Buenos Aires, Argentina, 2014; pp. 777–832.

74. Composto, C.; Navarro, M.L. *Territorios en Disputa. Despojo Capitalista, Luchas en Defensa de los Bienes Co-Munes Naturales y Alternativas Emancipatorias para América Latina*; Bajo Tierra Ediciones: Mexico City, Mexico, 2014; p. 452.

75. Gudynas, E. *Extractivismos. Ecología, Economía y Política de un Modo de Entender el Desarrollo y la Naturaleza*; RedGE: Lima, Peru, 2015; p. 453.

76. Martinez Alier, J. El ecologismo popular. *Ecosistemas* **2007**, *16*, 148–151.

77. Svampa, M. Cambio de Época. In *Movimientos Sociales y Poder Político*; Siglo XXI-Clacso: Buenos Aires, Argentina, 2008; p. 238.

78. Degele, P.E. Las ciencias sociales en la conservación de la naturaleza: Estado de situación de un abordaje impostergable. In *Política, Gestión y Evaluación de la Investigación y la Vinculación en y Desde las Ciencias Sociales en América Latina y el Caribe*; UNC-CLACSO: Córdoba, Argentina, 2021; pp. 625–658. Available online: https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=8209306 (accessed on 23 June 2022).

79. Escobar, A. El postdesarrollo como concepto y práctica social. In *Políticas de Economía, Ambiente y Sociedad en Tiempos de Globalización*; Mato, M., Ed.; Facultad Ciencias Económicas y Sociales (Universidad Central Venezuela): Caracas, Venezuela, 2005; pp. 17–31.

80. Acosta, A. El Buen Vivir como alternativa al desarrollo. Algunas reflexiones económicas y no tan económicas. *Política Y Soc.* **2015**, *52*, 299–330. [CrossRef]

81. Stoessel, S. El giro a la izquierda en la América Latina del siglo XXI: Revisitando los debates académicos. *Polis* **2014**, *39*, 2–18.

82. Harnecker, M. *América Latina y el Socialismo del Siglo XXI*; INEDH-CLACSO: Concepción, Chile, 2010; p. 82.

83. Pequeño, A. *Participación y Políticas de Mujeres Indígenas en Contextos Latinoamericanos Recientes*; FLACSO/Ministerio de Cultura del Ecuador: Quito, Equador, 2009; p. 243.

84. Donato, L.; Escobar, E.; Escobar, P.; Pazmiño, A.; Ulloa, A. *Mujeres Indígenas, Territorialidad y Biodiversidad en el Contexto Latinoamericano*; Universidad Nacional de Colombia: Bogotá, Colombia, 2007; p. 302.

85. Svampa, M. *Las Fronteras del Neoextractivismo en América Latina: Conflictos Socioambientales, Giro Ecoterritorial y Nuevas Dependencias*; Bielefeld University Press: Bielefeld, Germany, 2019; p. 142.

86. Padilla García, A. Mujeres y feminismo en el Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional (EZLN). Ph.D. Thesis, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Madrid, Spain. Available online: https://eprints.ucm.es/id/eprint/49488/1/T40333.pdf (accessed on 15 October 2021).

87. Hilary, K. 'Compañeras'. In *Historias de Mujeres Zapatistas*; El Colectivo y Tinta Limón: Buenos Aires, Argentina, 2019; p. 352.

88. Bidaseca, A.; Gutierrez Meneses, M.P. (Eds.) Poética Erótica de la Relación: Brasil es Indígena. In *La 2° Marcha de Mujeres Indígenas de Brasil*; CLACSO: Buenos Aires, Brazil, 2021. Available online: https://www.clacso.org/boletin-5-poetica-erotica-de-la-relacion/ (accessed on 15 October 2021).

89. CMCTF [Colectivo Miradas Críticas del Territorio desde el Feminismo]. *Mapeando el Cuerpo-Territorio. Guía Metodológica para Mujeres que Defienden sus Territorios*; CMCTF, Red Universitaria de Mujeres Defensoras de Derechos Sociales y Ambientales, Instituto de Estudios Ecologistas del Tercer Mundo, CLACSO: Quito, Equator, 2017; p. 56.

90. Gudynas, E. Buen Vivir: Germinando alternativas al desarrollo. América Latina en Movimiento. *ALAI* **2011**, *462*, 1–20.

91. Caudillo Félix, G. Reflexiones sobre el Buen Vivir o Vivir Bien (Suma Qamaña; Sumak Kawsay, Balu Wala). Temas De Nuestra América. *Rev. Estud. Lat.* **2012**, 185–196. Available online: https://www.revistas.una.ac.cr/index.php/tdna/article/view/4246 (accessed on 30 August 2021).

92. Luizaga, J. Hacia el Vivir Bien: Un Aporte de la Estructura del Lenguaje Quechua. *Punto Cero* **2017**, *22*, 73–84.

93. Choquehuanca, D. Sumaj Kausay "Vivir Bien". Encuentro Latinoamericano Pachamama, Pueblos, Liberación y Sumak Kawsay. 2010. Available online: https://www.servindi.org/actualidad/41823 (accessed on 15 July 2021).

94. Ñanculef Huaiquinao, J. *Tayiñ Mapuche Kimün Epistemología Mapuche—Sabiduría y Conocimientos*; Universidad de Chile: Santiago, Chile, 2016; p. 130.

95. Serrano, D.F. Social Memory and Territory in Disputes on Lands in an Indigenous Community. An Approach from a Politicized Oral Tradition. *Tabula Rasa* **2015**, *22*, 189–207.

96. Millán, M.F.; Chaparro, M.G.; Mariano, M. Diálogos interculturales sobre territorios ancestrales en la provincia de Buenos Aires, Argentina. *Iconos* **2019**, *2019*, 161–184. [CrossRef]

97. Massiris-Cabeza, A. *Fundamentos Conceptuales y Metodológicos del Ordenamiento Territorial*; Uptc: Tunja, Colombia, 2005; p. 122.

98. Cabnal, L. Acercamiento a la construcción de la propuesta de pensamiento epistémico de las mujeres indígenas feministas comunitarias de Abya Yala. In *Feminismos Diversos: El Feminismo Comunitario*; Cabnal, L., Segovias, A.-L., Eds.; ACSUR: Las Segovias, España, 2010; pp. 10–25.

99. Ulloa, A. Environment and Development: Reflections from Latin America. In *The Routledge Handbook of Political Ecology*; Perreault, T., Bridge, G., McCarthy, J., Eds.; Routledge: London, UK, 2015; pp. 320–331.

100. Haesbaert, R. From Body-Territory to Territory-Body (of the Earth): Decolonial Contributions. *Rev. Cult. Represent. Soc.* **2020**, *15*, 267–301.

101. Mariaca, K. Epistemological feelings and thoughts on mountain biocultural diversity and integral development to Live Well in Bolivia. *Rev. Cienc. Tecnol. Innovación* **2019**, *17*, 11–29.

102. Gavin, M.C.; McCarter, J.; Mead, A.; Berkes, F.; Stepp, J.R.; Peterson, D.; Tang, R. Defining biocultural approaches to conservation. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **2015**, *30*, 140–145. [CrossRef]

103. Nemogá, G.R. Biocultural Diversity: Innovating in Research for Conservation. *Acta Biológica Colomb.* **2016**, *21*, 311–319. [CrossRef]

104. Caillon, S.; Cullman, G.; Verschuuren, B.; Sterling, E.J. Moving beyond the human–nature dichotomy through biocultural approaches: Including ecological well-being in resilience indicators. *Ecol. Soc.* **2017**, *22*, 27. [CrossRef]

105. Shepherd, G. *The Ecosystem Approach: Learning from Experience*; IUCN: Gland, Switzerland, 2008; p. 190.

106. Guerry, A.D.; Polasky, S.; Lubchenco, J.; Chaplin-Kramer, R.; Daily, G.C.; Griffin, R.; Ruckelshaus, M.H.; Bateman, I.J.; Duraiappah, A.; Elmqvist, T.; et al. Natural capital and ecosystem services informing decisions: From promise to practice. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **2015**, *112*, 7348–7355. [CrossRef]

107. Bull, J.; Jobstvogt, N.; Böhnke-Henrichs, A.; Mascarenhas, A.; Sitas, N.; Baulcomb, C.; Lambini, C.; Rawlins, M.; Baral, H.; Zähringer, J.; et al. Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats: A SWOT analysis of the ecosystem services framework. *Ecosyst. Serv.* **2015**, *17*, 99–111. [CrossRef]

108. Soliku, O.; Schraml, U. Making sense of protected area conflicts and management approaches: A review of causes, contexts and conflict management strategies. *Biol. Conserv.* **2018**, *222*, 136–145. [CrossRef]

109. Mace, G.M. Whose conservation? *Science* **2014**, *345*, 1558–1560. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

110. Anaya, F.C.; Espírito-Santo, M.M. Protected areas and territorial exclusion of traditional communities: Analyzing the social impacts of environmental compensation strategies in Brazil. *Ecol. Soc.* **2018**, *23*, 8. [CrossRef]

111. Ferrero, B.G. Defining Protected Areas. Notes on the conservation of nature in Argentina. *Rev. Univ. De Geogr.* **2008**, *27*, 99–117.

112. Reyes-García, V.; Fernández-Llamazares, Á.; Aumeeruddy-Thomas, Y.; Benyei, P.; Bussmann, R.W.; Diamond, S.K.; García-Del-Amo, D.; Guadilla-Sáez, S.; Hanazaki, N.; Kosoy, N.; et al. Recognizing Indigenous peoples' and local communities' rights and agency in the post-2020 Biodiversity Agenda. *Ambio* **2021**, *51*, 84–92. [CrossRef]

113. Pacheco Balanza, D. *Vivir Bien en Armonía y Equilibrio con la Madre Tierra: Una Propuesta para el Cambio de las Relaciones Globales Entre los Seres Humanos y la Naturaleza*; Universidad de la Cordillera-Fundación de la Cordillera: La Paz, Bolivia, 2013; p. 157.

114. Swyngedouw, E. ¡La naturaleza no existe! La sostenibilidad como síntoma de una planificación despolitizada. *Urban* **2011**, *1*, 41–46.

115. Jonas, H.D.; Barbuto, V.; Kothari, A.; Nelson, F. New Steps of Change: Looking Beyond Protected Areas to Consider Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures. *PARKS* **2014**, *20*, 111–128. [CrossRef]

116. Jonas, H.D.; Ahmadia, G.N.; Bingham, H.C.; Briggs, J.; Butchart, D.H.M.; Cariño, J.; Chassot, O.; Chaudhary, S.; Darling, E.; DeGemmis, A.; et al. Equitable and effective area-based conservation: Towards the conserved areas paradigm. *PARKS* **2021**, *27*, 71–84. [CrossRef]

117. Rodríguez-Rodríguez, D.; Sánchez-Espinosa, A.; Malak, D.A. Potential contribution of OECMs to international area-based conservation targets in a biodiversity rich country, Spain. *J. Nat. Conserv.* **2021**, *62*, 126019. [CrossRef]

118. Quintana, A.C.E.; Giron-Nava, A.; Urmy, S.; Cramer, A.N.; Domínguez-Sánchez, S.; Rodríguez-Van Dyck, S.; Aburto-Oropeza, O.; Basurto, X.; Weaver, A.H. Positive Social-Ecological Feedbacks in Community-Based Conservation. *Front. Mar. Sci.* **2021**. [CrossRef]

119. CMS. Improving Ways of Addressing Connectivity in the Conservation of Migratory Species, Resolution 12.26 (REV.COP13). In Proceedings of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals, Gandhinagar, India, 17–22 February 2020; UNEP/CMS/COP13/ CRP 26.4.4. 2020. Available online: https://www.cms.int/sites/default/files/document/cms_cop13_crp26.4.4_addressing-connectivity-in-conservation-ofmigratory-species_e_0.docx (accessed on 15 October 2021).

120. Hilty, J.; Worboys, G.L.; Keeley, A.; Woodley, S.; Lausche, B.; Locke, H.; Carr, M.; Pulsford, I.; Pittock, J.; White, J.W.; et al. *Guidelines for Conserving Connectivity through Ecological Networks and Corridors*; Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series No. 30; UICN: Gland, Switzerland, 2021; p. 124.

121. Marimán, P. ¡*Escucha, Winka...! Cuatro Ensayos de Historia Nacional Mapuche y un Epílogo Sobre el Futuro*; LOM Ediciones: Santiago de Chile, Chile, 2006; p. 282.

122. Millan, M. Políticas de Educación Superior y Pueblos Originarios y Afrodescendientes en Argentina. In *Educación Superior y Pueblos Indígenas y Afrodescendientes en América Latina. Normas, Políticas y Práctica*; Matos, D., Ed.; IE-SALC-UNESCO: Caracas, Venezuela, 2012; pp. 113–138.

123. CEC (Commission of the European Communities). Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Committee of the Regions and the European Economic and Social Committee: Green Paper on Territorial Cohesion—Turning Territorial Diversity into Strength. 2008. Available online: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri\protect$\relax\protect{\begingroup1\endgroup\@@over4}$COM:2008:0616:FIN:EN:PDF (accessed on 9 August 2021).

124. Pierotti, R.; Wildcat, D. Traditional Ecological Knowledge: The Third Alternative (Commentary). *Ecol. Appl.* **2000**, *10*, 1333–1340. [CrossRef]

125. Zylstra, M.J.; Knight, A.T.; Esler, K.J.; Le Grange, L.L. Connectedness as a Core Conservation Concern: An Interdisciplinary Review of Theory and a Call for Practice. *Springer Sci. Rev.* **2014**, *2*, 119–143. [CrossRef]

126. Heffron, R.; McCauley, D. What is the 'Just Transition'? *Geoforum* **2017**, *88*, 74–77. [CrossRef]

127. Calderón-Argelich, A.; Benetti, S.; Anguelovski, I.; Connolly, J.J.; Langemeyer, J.; Baró, F. Tracing and building up environmental justice considerations in the urban ecosystem service literature: A systematic review. *Landsc. Urban Plan.* **2021**, *214*, 104130. [CrossRef]

128. Güiza Suárez, L. The Effectiveness of Administrative Sanctioning Instruments and the Requirement for the Repair of Environmental Damage in Colombia. *Estud. Socio-Jurídicos* **2008**, *10*, 307–335.

129. Dunlap, A. The Politics of Ecocide, Genocide and Megaprojects: Interrogating Natural Resource Extraction, Identity and the Normalization of Erasure. *J. Genocide Res.* **2021**, *23*, 212–235. [CrossRef]

130. Minkova, L.G. The Fifth International Crime: Reflections on the Definition of "Ecocide". *J. Genocide Res.* **2021**, 1–22. [CrossRef]

131. Boyd, D.R. The right to a healthy environment. In *Revitalizing Canada ´s Constitution*; UBC Press: Toronto, ON, Canada, 2012. [CrossRef]

132. Boyd, D.R. *The Rights of Nature: A Legal Revolution That Could Save the World*; ECW Press: Toronto, ON, Canada, 2017; p. 312.

133. Aragão, A.; Jacobs, S.; Cliquet, A. What's law got to do with it? Why environmental justice is essential to ecosystem service valuation. *Ecosyst. Serv.* **2016**, *22*, 221–227. [CrossRef]

134. West, P.; Igoe, J.; Brockington, D. PARKS and Peoples: The Social Impact of Protected Areas. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* **2006**, *35*, 251–277. [CrossRef]

135. Sowman, M.; Sunde, J. Social impacts of marine protected areas in South Africa on coastal fishing communities. *Ocean Coast. Manag.* **2018**, *157*, 168–179. [CrossRef]

136. Santos, C. *¿Qué Protegen las Áreas Protegidas? Conservación, Producción, Estado y Sociedad en la Implementación del Sistema Nacional de Áreas Protegidas*; Ediciones Trilce: Montevideo, Uruguay, 2011; p. 126.

137. Timpte, M.; Marquard, E.; Paulsch, C. *Analysis of the Strategic Plan 2011–2020 of the Convention on Biological Biodi-Versity (CBD) and First Discussions of Resulting Recommendations for a Post-2020 CBD Framework*; Full Study Report; Institute for Biodiversity— Network (IBN): Regensburg, Germany, 2018. [CrossRef]

138. Zazzarini, S.B. Biodiversity after Aichi: Discussions on the post-2020 global framework. *Difusiones* **2021**, *20*, 140–162.

139. IUCN. IUCN Position: Zero Draft of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. 2020. Available online: https://www.iucn.org/ sites/dev/files/iucn_position_paper_-_zero_draft_post-2020_global_biodiversity_framework_-_oewg2_09022020.pdf (accessed on 25 August 2021).