Climate Change and Species Protection: Reimagining Environmental Law in the Anthropocene

Tarkesh Molia[1] and *Rahul J Nikam[2]

[1] Sharda Law School, Sharda University, Greater Noida U.P., India
[2] Sharda Law School, Sharda University, Greater Noida U.P., India
rahulsnikam@gmail.com

Abstract. One of the biggest threats to biodiversity worldwide is climate change, which is hastening the extinction of species at a never-before-seen pace. Ecosystems are changing due to factors like rising temperatures, sea level rise, ocean acidification, changed precipitation patterns, and extreme weather events, making conventional conservation methods ineffective. The diffuse, transboundary, and systemic nature of climate-induced species loss is currently putting both domestic and international legal frameworks to the test. Historically, these frameworks were created to address localized environmental harms like pollution or habitat destruction. Through the prism of domestic biodiversity laws, international environmental law, climate litigation, and developing jurisprudence, this chapter explores the legal ramifications of climate change for the protection of species. It assesses important documents like the Endangered Species Act, the Paris Agreement, the Convention on Biological Diversity, and court rulings like the historic Massachusetts v. Environmental Protection Agency. The chapter makes the case that an integrated legal strategy that balances rights-based frameworks, ecosystem restoration, adaptation, and climate mitigation is necessary to protect species in the Anthropocene focusing on SDG 13, 15 & 16. In order to increase species resilience to climate stress, it ends by suggesting doctrinal and policy changes.

Keywords: Biodiversity Protection, Climate Litigation, SDG 13, 15 & 16.

1 Climate Change and the Sixth Mass Extinction

Many scientists term the current geological period the Anthropocene because human activity has had a major impact on Earth's processes. The "Sixth Mass Extinction," or loss of biodiversity, is one of the most concerning implications of this change [1]. People are responsible for the current extinction problem, unlike volcano eruptions, asteroid impacts, and climate change. Industrialization, deforestation, burning fossil fuels, creating cities, and intensive farming have altered atmospheric chemistry and ecosystems. These processes have led to climate change, which is a primary cause of species decrease. The scientific agreement is that global temperatures have risen significantly from the pre-industrial era, causing ecological issues. Warming causes species to move, change migration patterns, have problems mating, and have mismatched feeding chains. Reefs are bleaching as the ocean warms and acidifies. Polar creatures are losing their homes to thawing ice. Changes in temperature and moisture make amphibians more vulnerable. The consequences affect ecosystems and push

R. Dave et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the International Conference on Conceptualizing Legal Framework and Policies for Domestic Animal and Wildlife Conservation: Issues and Challenges in Hybrid Mode (ICAR 2026)*, Atlantis Highlights in Social Sciences, Education and Humanities 52,
https://doi.org/10.2991/978-94-6239-725-5_3

many species beyond their adaptability. Legal and biological issues surround extinction. Ecological networks need species for pollination, nitrogen cycling, carbon sequestration, and freshwater management focusing on SDG 13, 15 & 16. Biodiversity loss threatens food security, jobs, and public health. Animal loss is no longer limited to overhunting or habitat fragmentation as climate change worsens. The environment is changing worldwide; thus, laws and norms must reflect it. Localized issues including factory pollution, animal trafficking, and forest cutting led to modern environmental law. The Convention on Biological Diversity and other international agreements promote conservation and sustainability. The ESA and other domestic legislation list endangered species and designate critical areas [2]. But climate change creates new issues these standards can't solve. The threat of climate change is not limited in time. Legal systems that use short-term compliance benchmarks or immediate harm are harder to use since greenhouse gas emissions take decades to manifest. Second, spatial effects cross borders. Emissions can destroy habitat in another, making it tougher for regulators to enforce laws. Third, causation is complex and cumulative. A direct cause-and-effect relationship between an emitter and a species' extinction is difficult to prove and explain, especially in traditional liability systems. Migration across national borders or outside protected zones is often required for species to adapt to climate change. Conservation methods based on fixed territorial protection may fail when habitats move. This highlights the need for adaptive conservation techniques like corridor establishment, assisted migration, and ecosystem-based adaptation supported by flexible laws. Environmental law's normative philosophy is called into question by the Sixth Mass Extinction. Traditional legal systems prioritize biodiversity for human benefit [3]. The extent of biodiversity loss challenges this paradigm and supports ecocentric approaches that recognize ecological significance. Now, policy and law must integrate climate change mitigation with biodiversity protection. Climate change has made biodiversity protection a governance issue rather than a local issue. To stop the Sixth Mass Extinction, we must combine climate law and conservation law, acknowledge that science isn't always certain, and develop new legal ideas for an ecologically connected world.

2 International Laws Legal Protection of Species

The global response to biodiversity loss relies on international law. Conservation efforts in one country are insufficient since species are disappearing and climate is changing globally. Multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) regulate biodiversity, animal commerce, habitat protection, and climate change [4]. However, the rapidly shifting climate demonstrates these frameworks' strengths and flaws. Global biodiversity governance is dominated by the Rio Earth Summit-passed CBD [5]. The CBD's three main goals are maintaining biological variety, exploiting its parts sustainably, and fairly and evenly distributing genetic resource advantages. Unlike prior conservation accords that focused on specific species or ecosystems, the CBD considers the whole environment. The CBD was created before scientists understood the potential

of climate change causing extinction, but the Conference of the Parties has incrementally included climate change issues. Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans increasingly include climate adaptation and ecosystem resilience. CBD ecosystems emphasize resilience, caution, and flexible management, which aligns with climate adaption measures. However, state reporting and collaboration are more important to the CBD than binding enforcement. Its duties are often described vaguely or programmatically. As climate change worsens, some worry if voluntary efforts can save biodiversity. The latest Kunming–Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework strengthens aims including safeguarding 30% of land and marine by 2030 ("30x30") [6]. Implementation gaps remain major issues. Biodiversity treaties conserve species, whereas climate treaties reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The UNFCCC's Paris Agreement intends to limit global warming to far below 2°C and move toward 1.5°C [7]. Reaching these goals is crucial to preventing species extinction. The Paris Agreement emphasizes ecosystem protection in climate change action. It emphasizes biodiversity in its introduction. Ecosystem-based adaptation plans are suggested in Article 7. The Agreement's core legal purpose is not biodiversity protection. Nationwide Determined Contributions (NDCs) focus on carbon reduction targets and vary in how governments integrate biodiversity strategies [8]. This divide between climate change mitigation and species conservation causes inconsistent rules. Poorly planned renewable energy projects or monoculture afforestation techniques could allow emissions reduction commitments without biodiversity protections. To properly preserve species, CBD and Paris implementation methods must be coordinated. The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) [9] is crucial to governing wildlife trade worldwide. CITES places species in appendices with differing protection levels to prevent trade from threatening survival. Climate change causes stressors unrelated to trade that CITES was not designed to address. Even without commercial exploitation, species can go extinct. The CMS and other mechanisms protect migratory species [10]. Migration is increasing due to climate change, making these agreements even more crucial because they require cross-border collaboration. The execution of many treaties is decentralized and dependent on political will. Climate change reduces certainty and forces rapid adaptation, worsening these issues. Enhancing compliance procedures, financial aid for developing nations, and biodiversity and climate regime cooperation are crucial. International laws protect species, but their usefulness in the face of climate change depends on how well they are integrated, implemented, and enhanced. The global legal response to climate change must involve mitigation, adaptation, trade regulation, and ecological governance to stop biodiversity loss.

3 Domestic climate change responses to species threats

Domestic legal institutions are the first barrier against climate change-caused biodiversity loss. International treaties only operate if governments pass legislation, obey the regulations, and interpret them logically. However, climate change makes traditional domestic conservation models less useful because they were designed to address local problems like poaching, deforestation, and pollution. Domestic law must

contain adaptable, science-based, and integrated frameworks when species' habitats, ecosystems, and weather patterns change focusing on SDG 13, 15 & 16. Many countries have laws protecting species or habitats to protect biodiversity. The Wildlife Protection Act of India protects species and creates national parks and wildlife sanctuaries. It's illegal to "take" endangered animals and names vital habitats under the US Endangered animals Act (ESA). These laws originated in a stable environment. Climate change alters species distribution and habitat appropriateness, contradicting this idea. Protection areas are normally fixed in space, but climate change may reduce their value. Alpine animals, marine species, and forest ecosystems may migrate to cooler microclimates. Domestic legislation that use static conservation zones must be flexible to maintain natural connection. This can be done using animal corridors, buffer zones, and landscape planning. Statutory listing procedures frequently require prior decline evidence. Climate change requires preemptive protection based on predictive models. Climate forecasts should be included in species assessments to minimize permanent loss. Biological Diversity Convention commitments are often included in domestic biodiversity frameworks [11]. The Indian Biological Diversity Act is a decentralized biodiversity governance example. It established the National Biodiversity Authority and local management committees. These organizations encourage community participation, environmentally friendly resource usage, and ecological knowledge preservation. Because adaption solutions generally require local environmental knowledge, climate change makes decentralized governance even more crucial. Community-managed forests, wetlands, and mangroves strengthen ecosystems and safeguard them from climate change. Domestic biodiversity institutes frequently operate independently of climatic authorities. Splitting institutions makes policies less uniform and planning tougher. To address climate change concerns, biodiversity authorities must collaborate with climate adaptation missions, forest departments, coastal regulators, and disaster management organizations. Construction of new infrastructure or use of renewable energy can harm vulnerable ecosystems, but cross sectoral coordination prevents this. Constitutional protections safeguard climate responsive species in some jurisdictions. Indian courts have expanded environmental rights law using Article 21 (right to life), Article 48A (environment protection), and Article 51A(g) (citizen obligation). The judiciary has incorporated precaution, the polluter pays, and intergenerational equality into domestic law through public interest litigation. Climate change-caused extinction makes intergenerational equity important. It makes biodiversity conservation a constitutional obligation for future generations. M.C. Mehta v. Union of India shows that judges are willing to set stringent environmental criteria [12]. Though there aren't many direct climate-species instances, constitutional law can be used to employ climate research to protect wildlife. Environmental Impact Assessment and Climate Integration India's principal environmental law is the 1986 Environment Protection Act. Environmental Impact Assessment standards are included. Climate change must be considered when authorizing animal habitat initiatives, hence EIAs are crucial. Infrastructure and development projects must increasingly include environmental impacts. However, typical EIAs focus on short-term site effects rather than climate sensitivity. Climate risk assessment, species distribution modeling, and ecosystem resilience criteria in EIA frameworks would strengthen US climate-related threat responses [13]. Despite powerful legal and constitutional tools, challenges remain. Economic development,

renewable energy expansion, and infrastructure corridors may collide with vital habitats. Climate change may worsen human-animal conflicts as species move closer to humans. Mangroves and wetland ecosystems vital to biodiversity are threatened by coastal erosion. The country's legal reform should address these issues: 1. Creating climate-resistant protected areas that encourage ecological connection. 2. Integrating climate adaptation into forest and animal management plans. 3. Strengthening enforcement and monitoring with technology. 4. Incorporating biodiversity objectives into climate mitigation strategies to prevent maladaptation. In summary, domestic legal systems have the structures in place to protect species, but climate change requires a major shift in how we do things. Static conservation regimes must transform into dynamic, integrative frameworks that anticipate ecological changes and incorporate resilience into statutory interpretation and administrative governance.

4 Domestic climate change responses to species threats

Climate litigation is one of the most fascinating new environmental law developments. A growing number of courts are investigating how inadequately governments are handling climate change. Many instances emphasize mitigation requirements or human rights, yet their effects on species protection are important. Climate lawsuit forces firms to reduce emissions and modifies environmental governance norms, which could safeguard biodiversity. Urgenda Foundation v. State of the Netherlands, a landmark lawsuit, ordered the government to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to protect people from climate change [14]. Human rights, particularly the European Convention on Human Rights' right to life and well-being, underpinned the argument. But the rationale also protects species in other ways. Courts reduce temperature-sensitive ecological hazards by mandating better mitigation goals. The German Federal Constitutional Court underlined intergenerational justice in Neubauer v. Germany (2021), arguing that not fighting climate change now stresses future generations [15]. Though biodiversity wasn't the major aim, the logic supports long-term environmental protection. The courts' rising understanding of intergenerational justice is akin to earlier environmental legislation that claimed maintaining the environment was a duty to future beneficiaries. This reasoning makes it easier to argue for higher legal safeguards for climate vulnerable species. Some courts have linked species decline to climate change. Climate change has been used to list species as endangered or threatened under the ESA. The 2008 polar bear listing was significant since it was based on global warming estimates of sea ice loss [16]. Courts have also considered whether federal agencies consider climate consequences enough when approving habitat-impacting projects. Protecting species can lead to environmental litigation over climate change. It's still challenging to prove causation. Plaintiffs must demonstrate that the government's acts or inaction significantly impact the species' climatic harms. This is difficult to prove because emissions are cumulative and worldwide. Doctrinal hurdles often impede climate species lawsuits. Courts traditionally require plaintiffs to demonstrate substantial harm to establish standing. Courts may term claims speculative if species harm is indirect or predictable. In some cases, the political question doctrine prevents judges from intervening in legislative or executive policymaking. However, courts are accepting

scientific climate attribution proof. Recent climate modeling advances have made it easier to link emissions to ecosystem harm. In environmental issues, courts have started to embrace probabilistic reasoning, especially when precautionary considerations are implicated, even though emitter attribution is problematic. Innovative legal solutions recognize ecosystems and species' rights beyond litigation. Some places allow natural entities to be represented in court as legal people. It's rare in climate-species litigation, but it could help climate-change-affected ecosystems gain legal footing. PIL has complicated environmental law in India. Climate-focused species cases are rare, but the precautionary principle, public trust doctrine, and intergenerational equity—developed in M.C. Mehta v. Union of India—could support biodiversity claims based on climate change [17]. Climate litigation protects species in three ways. First, it encourages governments to establish stricter greenhouse gas emission targets, which helps ecosystems lessen climate change. Second, it requires government agencies to examine animal habitats for climate risk. Third, it supports environmental protection norms including precaution, sustainability, and intergenerational responsibility. But lawsuits alone can't replace a legal change. Courts follow existing laws and act within their institutions. Climate litigation's ability to conserve species hinges on how successfully biodiversity law incorporates climate research. Climate litigation is transforming environmental law and making species protection simpler in a warming future. Courts are steadily establishing a legal system that recognizes climate change's consequences on biodiversity by linking human rights, constitutional values, and ecological integrity.

5 Doctrinal Barriers to Climate Change Species Protection

Traditional environmental law has doctrinal problems due to climate change. Most species protection laws address specific harms produced by specific people in specific regions, like unlawful hunting, habitat loss, and pollution. However, climate-induced biodiversity loss is cumulative, cross-border, and scientifically difficult to grasp. Thus, courts, legislatures, and regulators face significant conceptual hurdles in adapting legal principles to a warming planet. Causation is difficult to prove. Traditional responsibility principles in tort and environmental law require a causal link between the defendant's actions and the injury. However, global greenhouse gas emissions over many years drive climate change. When temperatures rise or the ocean acidifies, it's hard to tell how much damage one emitter or government failure caused. The plaintiffs must prove that the government's actions endangered a listed species in Endangered Species Act litigation. The listing of Arctic ice-dependent species shows that climate change is becoming a problem [18]. However, courts struggle with indirect emission-related injury. Even though climate attribution science has improved probabilistic modeling, doctrinal proofs generally require more assurance than ecological science can provide. Long-term climate change. Species decline may occur progressively, with critical thresholds decades after emissions. However, many legal systems prioritize speedy cures and immediate harm. Often, standing requires plaintiffs to prove they will be damaged. Speculative ecological loss projections. Multiple jurisdictions recognize intergenerational equity to address this temporal disparity. Some courts have utilized this theory to urge increased environmental protection, citing future generations. The

law on intergenerational equity varies greatly from place to place. Moral obligation remains doctrinally difficult to legalize. Environmental law traditionally relies on territorial sovereignty. International law holds states accountable for damage within their borders and across borders focusing on SDG 13, 15 & 16. These land assumptions are insecure due to climate change. Emissions from one country may harm wildlife in another. Climate change may lead migratory species to relocate across borders. Responsibility is tougher to assign. The CBD and Paris Agreement emphasize national sovereignty over biological resources. However, the Paris Agreement requires national contributions. Neither framework assigns culpability for global emissions-caused biodiversity loss. This divide between climate and conservation regimes makes enforcement and compliance tougher. Climate change makes species protection tougher due to scientific uncertainty. Ecological systems react nonlinearly to warming, and prediction modeling has error margins. When causes are uncertain, courts and regulators may not want to set strict restrictions. A partly doctrinal solution, the precautionary principle allows people to defend themselves even when they don't know what will happen. Many nations' laws and accords include this principle. But its real-life use varies. Some courts only recognize reliable scientific risk evidence as precaution. Others take a broader precautionary approach. There is still debate over how much precaution can justify broad measures to protect habitats or reduce risks. More substantial doctrinal conflicts arise from the fact that most legal systems prioritize humans. Environmental protection is often cited as crucial for health, property, and the economy. Species are protected for environmental or cultural reasons. However, climate change-induced extinction undermines this approach by emphasizing ecological significance. By giving ecosystems legal personality or acknowledging nature's rights, people are avoiding anthropocentric restrictions. Despite being new, these strategies are rare and unpopular. Without a doctrinal shift toward ecocentric reasoning, species conservation may continue to rely on human suffering. Finally, climate and biodiversity law are usually handled separately. Climate policy reduces emissions, whereas wildlife laws protect animals. This dispersion of regulations hinders collaboration. Renewable energy initiatives that reduce emissions may threaten vital habitats if biodiversity problems aren't considered. Protecting species from climate change requires a paradigm shift, not just policy adjustments. Be cautious, consider causation's intricacies, reconcile time and space, and rethink anthropocentric preconceptions. Legal systems may slip behind ecological reality if they don't adapt to climate change.

6 Upcoming Legal & Policy Ideas

Old methods of biodiversity protection are failing as climate change stresses it [19]. In response, legal systems are testing novel strategies to conserve species that aid the environment, fight climate change, and enhance ecosystem resilience. These new legal notions shift from controlling species individually to regulating ecosystems, which can accommodate environmental changes. Ecosystem-based adaptation is becoming more popular as a means for communities to adapt to climate change using biodiversity and ecosystem services. In addition to developing infrastructure, EbA restores and protects natural systems like wetlands, mangroves, forests, and coral reefs to combat climate

change. Under the Convention on Biological Diversity, support is growing. This applies to Paris Agreement-compliant national adaptation strategies. EbA mandates ecological science in land-use planning, forest management, and coastal regulation [20]. Mangrove protection rules safeguard biodiversity and coastal populations from storm surges and rising sea levels. EbA unites climate resilience and species conservation legislation, breaking down regulation fragmentation. For restored ecosystems to thrive, money, democratic governance, and scientific monitoring are needed. A new policy and legislative approach called Nature-Based Solutions (NbS) links climate change mitigation and biodiversity protection. NbS, like EbA, protects, manages, or restores ecosystems without harming them to solve social issues like climate change. Tree planting, peatland restoration, and city green spaces are examples. To protect the environment, NbS needs legal protections. Large-scale tree plantations aimed to store carbon could replace diverse ecosystems with monocultures if not properly managed. Thus, when integrating NbS to domestic climate regulations, biodiversity must be considered. NbS is incorporated in several national climate laws and sustainable development strategies. Climate finance instruments increasingly support biodiversity and local community projects. Integrated climate change mitigation and conservation policy help bridge the gap. Despite species migration due to climate change, protected-area systems remain. Thus, legislative developments highlight dynamic conservation models. Ecological corridors, buffer zones, and transboundary protected landscapes allow species movement. Home wildlife laws like the Wildlife Protection Act are introducing landscape-level conservation techniques. Based on scientific habitat assessments, climate-responsive management plans may allow property boundary adjustments or adaptive zoning. Real-time environmental data can transform marine protected zones with dynamic ocean management systems. This flexibility recognizes that climatic stress changes ecosystems, unlike rigorous conservation frameworks. Ecosystems or natural entities having rights is a groundbreaking environmental legal development. This "rights of nature" approach goes beyond human-centered legal reasoning [21]. Giving rivers, woods, and ecosystems legal personality or inherent rights encourages courts and governments to safeguard the environment. Though unusual, this paradigm has influenced global environmental discourse. Ecosystems as rights-holders may reduce legal standing and representation issues. Climate recognition could help safeguard animals and habitats at risk from global warming by acting early. Another novel approach is to incorporate climate science and biodiversity into Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Environmental impact assessments (EIAs) have historically examined site-specific environmental impacts. New techniques include studying how climate change affects species, ecosystem strength, and vulnerability. This proactive strategy ensures that development projects like renewable energy infrastructure don't harm species protection. Climate-sensitive EIAs use the precautionary principle to allow regulators to intervene before issues arise. Climate finance mechanisms are increasingly linked to biodiversity results by law. International financing now supports habitat restoration and carbon storage programs. Including biodiversity protections in carbon markets ensures that greenhouse gas reduction initiatives meet species protection aims. In summary, new legal approaches can address climate change's complex biodiversity loss issues. Through ecosystem-based adaptation, dynamic conservation, ecocentric jurisprudence, and climate-sensitive governance instruments, legal systems are steadily becoming

resilience-oriented. These new ideas suggest a promising environmental law that recognizes the link between climate stability and species existence. However, implementation and enforcement remain issues. We need major reforms to climate governance and biodiversity conservation strategies to prevent species extinction due to climate change. Slow framework changes aren't enough; governments need integrated, science-based, and forward-looking initiatives. The following policies aim to make species protection easier in a period of fast climate change. Integrating climate and biodiversity policies is a crucial reform. Globally, Convention on Biological Diversity requirements should match Paris Agreement commitments. Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) [22] must include mitigation targets from Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) to ensure emission reduction strategies consider species and ecosystem resilience. Each country's environment, climate, forestry, and infrastructure ministries should coordinate plans. Inter-ministerial climate-biodiversity task teams can standardize policy and reduce unrelated rules. Without collaboration, damage reduction may harm conservation goals. Landscapes that can adapt to climate change must replace static conservation zones. Governments should prioritize ecological corridors for species migration as temperatures and rainfall patterns change. Geospatial modeling and climate projections can identify habitat refugia and connection corridors for landscape-level conservation planning [23]. Legal mechanisms should allow changing protected area limits and having scientists check them periodically. Marine protected areas may need versatile governance to adapt to changing ocean conditions. Environmental impact assessments should include climate risk and biodiversity vulnerability evaluations. Projects that change wildlife habitats must consider the long-term implications of climate change. Climate modeling should be used to evaluate infrastructure, mining, renewable energy, and coastal development ideas. The cautious concept in EIA procedures enables regulators act when science is uncertain. Development approvals should require climate-resilient mitigation and environmental restoration. Climate liability is complicated, but new policies are possible. Governments may seek to strengthen "polluter pays" and implement severe liability mechanisms for environmental damage that makes species more vulnerable [24]. Companies should be required to disclose their emissions and biodiversity impacts to increase accountability. Already, climate litigation has changed things. Judicial scrutiny can ensure the executive branch upholds the law and Constitution to protect biodiversity and reduce emissions. Ecosystem restoration efforts funded by the government benefit the environment and animals. Large-scale reforestation, mangrove restoration, wetland protection, and watershed rehabilitation store carbon and conserve habitats. Restoration programs must prioritize ecosystem health and native species diversity. Avoid monoculture plantations, which harm biodiversity. Climate financing regimes in the US and worldwide should promote biodiversity-benefitting projects [25]. Indigenous and local populations have valuable ecological knowledge for adaptive conservation. Participatory governance improves enforcement, monitoring, and long term success. Recognition of community forest rights and biodiversity management committees improves community resilience and inclusive decision-making.

7 Conclusion and Future Plans

Climate change has transformed species protection. Protecting habitats or combating poaching has become a complex governance issue. Many species depend on ecosystems that are threatened by rising temperatures, ocean acidification, rainfall patterns, and harsh weather. National and international legal institutions must adapt conservation concepts to a warming world. Conventions like the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Paris Agreement regulate biodiversity and climate change. However, fragmented rules, inadequate enforcement, and unequal implementation make them less effective at addressing climate change-related extinction concerns. India's strong statute laws and constitutional environmentalism demonstrate domestic judicial and legislative creativity. Fixed protected-area systems and reactive legal processes must be replaced by climate-aware, flexible solutions. To safeguard species in the future, we must shift from isolated conservation to resilience-based ecological governance. Wildlife law must incorporate predictive modeling, ecosystem connectivity, and precautionary decision-making for adaptive management. Climate-sensitive Environmental Impact Assessments, transboundary conservation corridors, and dynamic marine protection systems should be allowed. Legal thought has changed with the recognition of intergenerational equality and possibly ecocentric ideas. Changing from anthropocentric to ecological thinking helps strengthen biodiversity protection norms. Climate litigation, rights-of-nature campaigns, and community-based governance models show how legal understanding is developing and how environmental accountability is affected. All areas must cooperate together in future legal change. Expanding renewable energy, constructing infrastructure, and boosting the economy must support biodiversity goals. Restoration initiatives and climate finance should prioritize ecosystem health and native species variety. Strengthening compliance processes, transparency, and international cooperation are crucial. Protecting species in the Anthropocene is moral and legal. Biodiversity loss undermines ecosystems, human health, and the planet's resilience. Law must adapt to social changes. It must perceive and plan for the future. Climate resilience in biodiversity governance can help legal systems become proactive environmental protectors. This will keep species survival essential to global sustainability for decades in support of SDG 13, 15 & 16.

References

[1] Shivanna, K. R. (2020). The Sixth Mass Extinction Crisis and its Impact on Biodiversity and Human Welfare. *Resonance*, *25*(1), 93–109. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12045-019-0924-z

[2] Hilty, J., Worboys, G. L., Keeley, A., Woodley, S., Lausche, B. J., Locke, H., Carr, M., Pulsford, I., Pittock, J., White, J. W., Theobald, D. M., Levine, J., Reuling, M., Watson, J. E., Ament, R., & Tabor, G. M. (2020). *Guidelines for conserving connectivity through ecological networks and corridors*. https://doi.org/10.2305/iucn.ch.2020.pag.30.en

[3] Parks, L., & Tsioumani, E. (2023). Transforming biodiversity governance? Indigenous peoples' contributions to the Convention on Biological Diversity. *Biological Conservation*, *280*, 109933. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2023.109933 Heid, B., & Márquez-Ramos, L. (2023). International environmental agreements and imperfect enforcement: Evidence from

CITES. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, *118*, 102784. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2023.102784

[4] Heid, B., & Márquez-Ramos, L. (2023). International environmental agreements and imperfect enforcement: Evidence from CITES. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*, *118*, 102784. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2023.102784

[5] Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. (n.d.). *The Rio Conventions*. https://www.cbd.int/rio

[6] Zhang, Z., Cao, D., Ma, T., Liu, H., & Mao, Z. (2025). International cooperation for a biodiverse future: Opportunities and challenges under the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. *Global Ecology and Conservation*, *58*, e03385. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2024.e03385

[7] Fransen, T. (n.d.). *1.5 degrees C: Understanding world's critical warming threshold*. World Resources Institute. https://www.wri.org/insights/1-5-degrees-c-target-explained

[8] Overholt, M. (n.d.). *What are Nationally Determined contributions (NDCs) and why do they matter?* World Resources Institute. https://www.wri.org/insights/nationally-determined-contributions-ndcs-explained

[9] Dahal, S., & Heinen, J. T. (2025). A History of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora Implementation in Nepal. *Diversity*, *17*(5), 312. https://doi.org/10.3390/d17050312

[10] Sellheim, N., & Schumacher, J. (2022). Increasing the effectiveness of the Bonn Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species. *Journal of International Wildlife Law & Policy*, *25*(4), 367–383. https://doi.org/10.1080/13880292.2022.2153461

[11] Amos, R. (2025). A critical analysis of the Global Biodiversity Framework. *Journal of International Wildlife Law & Policy*, *28*(2), 123–192. https://doi.org/10.1080/13880292.2025.2539577

[12] Boyd, D. R. (2012). The constitutional right to a healthy environment. *Environment Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, *54*(4), 3–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/00139157.2012.691392

[13] Moe, S. J., Brix, K. V., Landis, W. G., Stauber, J. L., Carriger, J. F., Hader, J. D., Kunimitsu, T., Mentzel, S., Nathan, R., Noyes, P. D., Oldenkamp, R., Rohr, J. R., Van Den Brink, P. J., Verheyen, J., & Benestad, R. E. (2023). Integrating climate model projections into environmental risk assessment: A probabilistic modelling approach. *Integrated Environmental Assessment and Management*, *20*(2), 367–383. https://doi.org/10.1002/ieam.4879

[14] Programme, U. N. E. (2023). Global Climate Litigation Report: 2023 Status Review. In *United Nations Environment Programme eBooks*. https://doi.org/10.59117/20.500.11822/43008

[15] *Reparation for climate Change: The successes and Limits of litigation*. (2026). https://doi.org/10.38107/073

[16] Change, I. P. O. C. (2022). Polar regions. In *Cambridge University Press eBooks* (pp. 203–320). https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009157964.005

[17] Clinic, H. R. L. (2024). *UNDER THE SURFACE: Human rights and environmental implications of the proposed Sijimali Bauxite mine in Odisha*. https://doi.org/10.55496/oyam4342

[18] Ramanathan, V., Aines, R. D., Auffhammer, M., Cole, J., Forman, F., Han, H., Jacobsen, M. R., Pellow, D. N., Pezzoli, K., Press, D., Rignot, E., Samuelsen, S., Silver, W. L., Solomon, G., Somerville, R. C. J., Tucker, M. E., Victor, D. G., Zaelke, D., & Barth, M. (2019). Learning companion to bending the curve: Climate change solutions. *eScholarship (California Digital Library)*. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2b80d2k2

[19] Weiskopf, S. R., Rubenstein, M. A., Crozier, L. G., Gaichas, S., Griffis, R., Halofsky, J. E., Hyde, K. J., Morelli, T. L., Morisette, J. T., Muñoz, R. C., Pershing, A. J., Peterson, D. L., Poudel, R., Staudinger, M. D., Sutton-Grier, A. E., Thompson, L., Vose, J., Weltzin, J. F., & Whyte, K. P. (2020). Climate change effects on biodiversity, ecosystems, ecosystem

services, and natural resource management in the United States. *The Science of the Total Environment*, *733*, 137782. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.137782

[20] Calvin, K., Dasgupta, D., Krinner, G., Mukherji, A., Thorne, P. W., Trisos, C., Romero, J., Aldunce, P., Barrett, K., Blanco, G., Cheung, W. W., Connors, S., Denton, F., Diongue-Niang, A., Dodman, D., Garschagen, M., Geden, O., Hayward, B., Jones, C., . . . Ha, M. (2023). *IPCC, 2023: Climate Change 2023: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Core Writing Team, H. Lee and J. Romero (eds.)]. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland.* https://doi.org/10.59327/ipcc/ar6-9789291691647

[21] Harden-Davies, H., Humphries, F., Maloney, M., Wright, G., Gjerde, K., & Vierros, M. (2020). Rights of Nature: Perspectives for Global Ocean Stewardship. *Marine Policy*, *122*, 104059. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2020.104059

[22] Seddon, N., Daniels, E., Davis, R., Chausson, A., Harris, R., Hou-Jones, X., Huq, S., Kapos, V., Mace, G. M., Rizvi, A. R., Reid, H., Roe, D., Turner, B., & Wicander, S. (2020). Global recognition of the importance of nature-based solutions to the impacts of climate change. *Global Sustainability*, *3*. https://doi.org/10.1017/sus.2020.8

[23] Stralberg, D., Lewis, D. W., Stolar, J., Kehm, G. J., Cosgrove, C. F., Morgan, D. G., Nelson, E. A., Kuntzemann, C. E., Raymundo, A., Sang, Z., Viliani, L., Jumean, Z., Meier, M., Enslow, C., Estevo, C. A., Fraser-Reid, E. C., Campbell, E. M., Grant, J. A., Howard, S., . . . Carroll, C. (2025). Integrating climate-change exposure and refugia into landscape planning: A practical guide. *Conservation Science and Practice*, *8*(1). https://doi.org/10.1111/csp2.70171

[24] Wiesmeth, H. (2020). Market-oriented policy tools. In *Elsevier eBooks* (pp. 183–193). https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-821798-6.00016-8

[25] Bosma, C., Hein, L., & Miller, D. C. (2025). International climate and biodiversity funding: does allocation follow need in Global South countries? *World Development*, *196*, 107160. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2025.107160