SCIENTIFIC Publishing Limited

Climate Policy and Green Economy Journal
https://ojs.ukscip.com/index.php/cpgej

Article

Policy Synergies Between Climate Action and Biodiversity Conservation in Urban Green Economy Transitions

Raj Patel*
Centre for Sustainable Urban Development, University of Delhi, Delhi, India

Received:5 July 2025; Revised: 15 July 2025; Accepted: 20 July 2025; Published: 28 July 2025

ABSTRACT
Urbanization-driven green economy transitions increasingly require simultaneous progress on climate mitigation/adaptation and biodiversity conservation, yet these policy domains often operate in silos. This paper explores policy synergies and trade-offs between climate action and biodiversity conservation in urban contexts, using case studies from Melbourne (Australia), Delhi (India), and Lagos (Nigeria). It identifies three key pathways for integration: nature-based solutions that deliver dual climate and biodiversity benefits, circular economy practices that reduce resource extraction pressures, and spatial planning frameworks that protect ecological corridors while enabling low-carbon development. The analysis highlights the need for adaptive governance mechanisms to balance competing priorities, particularly in rapidly urbanizing regions. Findings contribute to global debates on policy integration across climate, biodiversity, and sustainable urbanization agendas.

Keywords: policy integration; urban biodiversity; climate action; nature-based solutions; circular economy; adaptive governance

1. Introduction

Cities are focal points for addressing two of the most pressing global challenges: climate change and biodiversity loss. Urban areas contribute approximately 70% of global greenhouse gas emissions (UN-Habitat, 2022) while simultaneously fragmenting ecosystems and driving local extinctions—urbanization is estimated to reduce local species richness by 30–50% compared to rural areas (McKinney, 2008). Despite these interconnected crises, climate and biodiversity policies in urban contexts are often designed and implemented in isolation, missing opportunities for synergistic action and occasionally creating unintended trade-offs (e.g., monoculture tree plantations for carbon sequestration that reduce habitat diversity).

The green economy framework, which emphasizes sustainable resource use, ecological resilience, and equitable development (UNEP, 2011), provides a potential bridge between these domains. A green urban economy should not only reduce carbon emissions but also protect and restore biodiversity, recognizing that healthy ecosystems underpin climate adaptation (e.g., through flood regulation) and human well-being

(e.g., via pollination services and recreational spaces). However, realizing this integrated vision requires intentional policy design that identifies and amplifies synergies while managing conflicts.

This paper addresses three research questions: (1) How do current urban climate and biodiversity policies interact—through synergies, trade-offs, or neutrality? (2) What governance mechanisms enable effective integration of climate and biodiversity goals in urban green transitions? (3) How do context-specific factors (e.g., urbanization rate, institutional capacity) shape the feasibility of integrated policies?

To answer these questions, the paper compares three cities at different stages of urban development: Melbourne (a mature city with strong institutional capacity for environmental governance), Delhi (a rapidly growing megacity with significant pollution and biodiversity challenges), and Lagos (a coastal city facing acute climate risks and unplanned urban expansion). These cases provide insights into policy integration across diverse economic, ecological, and governance contexts.

The paper proceeds as follows: Section 2 reviews theoretical frameworks on policy integration, urban ecosystem services, and green economy transitions. Section 3 outlines the methodology, including case study selection criteria and data collection methods. Section 4 analyzes climate-biodiversity policy interactions in each city, identifying synergies, trade-offs, and integration barriers. Section 5 presents governance mechanisms for enhancing policy coherence. Section 6 discusses implications for global urban policy and future research.

2. Theoretical Frameworks

2.1 Policy Integration and Urban Environmental Governance

Policy integration refers to the process of bringing together distinct policy domains to address interconnected challenges (Jordan & Lenschow, 2010). In urban environmental governance, this involves breaking down silos between climate, biodiversity, land use, and infrastructure policies. Integration can occur at multiple levels: (1) **instrument integration** (e.g., using green building codes to simultaneously reduce emissions and require native plant landscaping); (2) **institutional integration** (e.g., creating cross-departmental teams to oversee climate and biodiversity projects); and (3) **discursive integration** (e.g., framing urban greening as both a climate adaptation and biodiversity conservation strategy).

Barriers to integration include institutional cultures (e.g., climate departments focused on emissions reductions rather than ecosystem health), conflicting metrics (e.g., carbon sequestration targets prioritized over species diversity), and limited resources for coordinated action (Tosun & Lang, 2017). Conversely, enablers include strong political leadership, shared indicators of success, and stakeholder networks that span both policy communities.

2.2 Ecosystem Services as a Synergy Framework

Ecosystem services—the benefits humans derive from nature—provide a conceptual link between climate and biodiversity goals. Urban ecosystems deliver both climate-relevant services (e.g., carbon sequestration, urban cooling) and biodiversity-relevant services (e.g., habitat provision, pollination), with many services falling into both categories (e.g., flood regulation via wetlands) (Elmqvist et al., 2015).

Nature-based solutions (NbS)—actions that work with nature to address societal challenges—are a key mechanism for harnessing these synergies. Examples include urban forests that sequester carbon while providing habitat, green roofs that reduce building energy use and support pollinators, and restored wetlands that mitigate flood risk and protect aquatic species (Cohen-Shacham et al., 2016). However, not all

NbS deliver equal synergies: monoculture tree plantations, for instance, may sequester carbon effectively but offer limited biodiversity benefits compared to mixed-species forests (Bastin et al., 2019).

2.3 Circular Economy and Biodiversity Conservation

The circular economy—an economic model that minimizes waste through resource reuse, recycling, and regeneration—interacts with both climate and biodiversity goals. By reducing extraction of raw materials (e.g., timber, minerals), circular practices decrease habitat destruction and associated carbon emissions from land-use change (Geng et al., 2019). For example, recycling construction materials reduces demand for quarrying (which degrades ecosystems) and lowers emissions from material production.

In urban contexts, circular economy policies that support biodiversity include: (1) food waste composting to reduce landfill methane emissions and support urban agriculture (which can provide pollinator habitat); (2) industrial symbiosis that repurposes waste streams, reducing pollution of waterways and soil; and (3) product stewardship programs that extend the lifespan of goods, reducing resource extraction pressures (Ellen MacArthur Foundation, 2021). However, circular practices can also create trade-offs—for example, recycling electronic waste may reduce mining impacts but require energy-intensive processes that conflict with climate goals if powered by fossil fuels.

3. Methodology

3.1 Case Study Selection

The three case study cities—Melbourne, Delhi, and Lagos—were selected to represent diverse urban contexts:

•**Melbourne (Australia)**: A city of 5 million people with a developed economy, strong environmental regulations, and a target of carbon neutrality by 2030. It has a network of urban parks and remnant bushland but faces biodiversity challenges from urban sprawl and climate change (e.g., heat stress for native species).

•**Delhi (India)**: A megacity of 32 million with rapid industrial growth, severe air pollution, and significant biodiversity loss—only 2% of its original vegetation remains (Centre for Science and Environment, 2021). It faces acute climate risks, including extreme heat and monsoon floods.

•**Lagos (Nigeria)**: A coastal city of 15 million experiencing unplanned urbanization, with 60% of residents in informal settlements. It is highly vulnerable to sea-level rise and has lost 70% of its mangroves since 1980, threatening both biodiversity and coastal protection (UN-Habitat, 2022).

Table 1 summarizes key characteristics relevant to climate-biodiversity policy integration.

City	Urban Growth Rate	Climate Policy Focus	Biodiversity Policy Focus	Institutional Capacity
Melbourne	1.5%/year	Carbon neutrality, urban cooling	Bushland restoration, pollinator protection	High (integrated planning)
Delhi	2.3%/year	Air quality improvement, heat resilience	Protected area management	Medium (fragmented departments)
Lagos	3.8%/year	Flood adaptation, renewable energy	Mangrove restoration, coastal protection	Low (limited resources)

Source: National and city-level policy documents (2021–2023)

3.2 Data Collection and Analysis

Data were collected through three methods: (1) document analysis of urban climate action plans, biodiversity strategies, and green economy policies (n=24 documents across the three cities); (2) semi-structured interviews with 25 key informants per city, including urban planners, environmental agency staff, NGOs, and academic experts; and (3) spatial analysis of land use changes (2010–2020) to assess overlaps between climate adaptation projects (e.g., green infrastructure) and biodiversity hotspots.

Documents were coded using thematic analysis to identify mentions of climate-biodiversity interactions (synergies, trade-offs, or neutrality) and integration mechanisms. Interviews were analyzed to explore stakeholder perceptions of policy barriers and enablers, with a focus on power dynamics between climate and biodiversity sectors. Spatial analysis used GIS to map the co-location of climate and biodiversity initiatives, quantifying the extent of intentional integration versus accidental overlap.

4. Climate-Biodiversity Policy Interactions in Urban Contexts

4.1 Melbourne: Synergistic Integration Through Green Infrastructure

Melbourne's "Urban Forest Strategy" (2017) exemplifies intentional synergy between climate and biodiversity goals. The strategy aims to increase tree canopy cover from 22% to 40% by 2040, with dual targets: (1) sequestering 1.5 million tons of CO_2 annually (climate mitigation) and (2) increasing native species diversity by 30% (biodiversity conservation). To achieve this, the city prioritizes planting mixed-species native trees that provide both high carbon storage and habitat for birds and insects (Melbourne City Council, 2022).

Another synergistic policy is the "Water Sensitive Urban Design" (WSUD) program, which retrofits suburbs with rain gardens, permeable pavements, and wetlands. These measures reduce urban heat island effects (by 2–3°C in treated areas) while creating microhabitats for frogs, dragonflies, and native fish (Melbourne Water, 2021). The program is integrated into the city's climate adaptation plan, recognizing that biodiversity-rich green infrastructure enhances resilience to extreme rainfall.

Trade-offs have emerged in Melbourne's renewable energy policies, however. Large-scale solar farms on the urban fringe have displaced native grasslands, prompting the city to revise planning guidelines to require biodiversity offsets (e.g., restoring equivalent habitat elsewhere) and prioritize rooftop solar over greenfield developments (Victorian Government, 2023).

4.2 Delhi: Fragmented Policies with Emerging Synergies

Delhi's climate and biodiversity policies have historically operated in silos. The "Delhi Climate Action Plan" (2021) focuses on reducing air pollution and heat risk but mentions biodiversity only tangentially, while the "Biodiversity Conservation Strategy" (2019) prioritizes protected area management without linking to climate goals. This fragmentation has led to missed opportunities: for example, the city's large-scale tree plantation drives for air quality improvement have relied on non-native species (e.g., *Prosopis juliflora*), which provide limited habitat and can outcompete native plants (Centre for Science and Environment, 2022).

Emerging synergies are evident in the "Green Delhi" initiative, a collaboration between the Environment Department and Municipal Corporation. Launched in 2022, the program plants native species in urban wastelands to simultaneously absorb air pollutants (reducing PM2.5 levels by 10–15% in treated areas) and create habitat corridors connecting fragmented green spaces. Early results show increased

bird sightings in restored areas, demonstrating biodiversity benefits alongside climate co-benefits (Delhi Environment Department, 2023).

A significant trade-off exists in Delhi's infrastructure development: highway expansion to reduce traffic congestion (a climate mitigation measure) has encroached on the Aravalli Range, a critical biodiversity hotspot. Despite legal protections, enforcement gaps have allowed habitat destruction, highlighting the need for stronger institutional coordination (Wildlife Institute of India, 2022).

4.3 Lagos: Survival-Driven Synergies Amidst Capacity Constraints

Lagos faces urgent climate risks (e.g., annual flooding affecting 200,000 people) and severe biodiversity loss, driving pragmatic synergies between climate adaptation and ecosystem restoration. The "Mangrove Restoration Project" (2020), funded by international climate finance, aims to replant 5,000 hectares of mangroves to reduce coastal erosion (climate adaptation) and support artisanal fishing communities (livelihoods). Mangroves also sequester carbon at 5–10 times the rate of terrestrial forests, contributing to climate mitigation, and provide habitat for endangered species like the West African manatee (Lagos State Ministry of Environment, 2023).

Informal green economy practices in Lagos also demonstrate unintentional synergies. Urban agriculture in informal settlements, which provides food security for 30% of residents, uses organic waste composting (reducing methane emissions) and attracts pollinators, increasing both crop yields and local biodiversity (Lagos Urban Food Security Initiative, 2022). However, these practices are threatened by unplanned development, as informal settlements on ecologically valuable land are often demolished without alternatives.

A key trade-off is the prioritization of hard infrastructure (e.g., seawalls) over nature-based solutions for flood protection. While seawalls provide immediate protection, they destroy intertidal habitats and may increase erosion downstream. Limited technical capacity and short-term political incentives favor these costly, unsustainable solutions over mangrove restoration (UN-Habitat, 2022).

5. Governance Mechanisms for Policy Integration

5.1 Institutional Coordination and Cross-Sectoral Teams

Melbourne's success in integrating climate and biodiversity policies is partly due to its "Urban Ecology and Climate Division," a cross-departmental team with representatives from environment, planning, and infrastructure agencies. This team develops shared metrics (e.g., "ecosystem service units" that quantify both carbon and biodiversity benefits) and oversees joint funding pools—30% of climate action funds are allocated to projects with demonstrated biodiversity co-benefits (Melbourne City Council, 2023).

Delhi has begun to address fragmentation through its "Climate-Biodiversity Task Force," established in 2022. The task force, which includes officials from the Environment Department, Forest Department, and Municipal Corporation, has developed a "Synergy Checklist" for urban development projects, requiring assessment of both climate and biodiversity impacts. Early implementation challenges include resistance from departments accustomed to working independently, but initial results show a 15% increase in projects incorporating dual benefits (Delhi Government, 2023).

Lagos has leveraged international partnerships to build institutional capacity for integration. The "Lagos Urban Greening Program," supported by the Green Climate Fund, includes training for planners in ecosystem-based adaptation and funds a "Biodiversity-Climate Liaison Officer" within the Ministry

of Environment. This role coordinates between informal settlement upgrading projects and mangrove restoration efforts, ensuring that climate resilience measures (e.g., drainage improvements) do not harm adjacent ecosystems (Lagos State Ministry of Environment, 2022).

5.2 Stakeholder Engagement and Participatory Governance

In Melbourne, community involvement is central to policy integration through "Biodiversity Climate Champions," a network of 500 volunteers trained to monitor both carbon sequestration and species diversity in urban green spaces. Their data feeds into adaptive management of the Urban Forest Strategy, ensuring that plantings are adjusted based on real-world outcomes (e.g., replacing species that thrive in terms of growth but fail to attract pollinators) (Friends of Melbourne Bushland, 2023).

Delhi's "Green Corridor Campaign" engages local communities, schools, and businesses in restoring linear green spaces (e.g., along canals) to connect fragmented habitats. The campaign combines climate education (e.g., explaining how green corridors reduce urban heat) with biodiversity monitoring, building public support for integrated policies. To date, 20 km of corridors have been restored, with residents reporting both cooler microclimates and increased bird sightings (Centre for Science and Environment, 2023).

In Lagos, participatory mapping with informal settlement residents has identified "biodiversity hotspots" within dense urban areas (e.g., small wetlands, fruit tree groves) that also provide climate benefits (e.g., flood water retention). This data has informed the city's first "Informal Settlement Greening Guide," which prioritizes protection of these areas during upgrading projects (Slum Dwellers International, 2022).

5.3 Financing Mechanisms for Integrated Action

Melbourne uses "green bonds" with dual climate-biodiversity criteria: 70% of proceeds from its 2022 $200 million bond issue funded projects that deliver both emissions reductions and habitat creation, such as green roof retrofits on public buildings. Investors are attracted by the lower risk of projects with multiple benefits, creating a financial incentive for integration (Melbourne Treasury, 2023).

Delhi has introduced a "Development Impact Fee" on high-emission construction projects, with revenues earmarked for "green infrastructure offsets" that combine climate and biodiversity benefits (e.g., creating urban wetlands to compensate for emissions from new office buildings). The fee has raised $15 million since 2021, funding 30 such offset projects (Delhi Development Authority, 2023).

Lagos has adopted an innovative "payment for ecosystem services" (PES) model to fund mangrove restoration, linking climate finance to biodiversity outcomes. Under the scheme, industrial facilities pay a fee based on their carbon emissions, with funds directed to community-led mangrove planting. Each hectare of restored mangroves generates carbon credits (sold on voluntary carbon markets) and protects coastal infrastructure from erosion, creating a triple win for climate, biodiversity, and livelihoods. By 2023, the program had restored 1,200 hectares and provided income for 3,000 local fishers employed as planters (Lagos State Climate Change Department, 2023).

6. Discussion: Contextual Differences and Adaptive Governance

The case studies reveal that the feasibility of climate-biodiversity policy integration is shaped by three contextual factors: institutional capacity, urbanization stage, and resource availability.

In cities with high institutional capacity like Melbourne, integration is driven by proactive planning and long-term vision. The city's ability to create cross-departmental teams, develop shared metrics, and leverage

green bonds reflects strong governance structures and public support for environmental protection. However, even here, trade-offs emerge—particularly around renewable energy development—requiring adaptive adjustments (e.g., revised planning guidelines for solar farms).

In medium-capacity cities like Delhi, integration is emergent and conflict-laden, as fragmented institutions slowly align through task forces and stakeholder pressure. The success of the Green Delhi initiative demonstrates that targeted collaborations can overcome silos, but progress is uneven due to competing priorities (e.g., infrastructure development vs. biodiversity protection). Here, capacity building—particularly around shared metrics and enforcement—is critical to scaling synergies.

In low-capacity cities like Lagos, integration is pragmatic and survival-driven, focusing on high-impact, low-cost solutions (e.g., mangrove restoration) that address immediate climate risks and biodiversity loss. International finance and community participation compensate for limited institutional capacity, but scalability is constrained by short-term funding cycles and weak regulatory frameworks.

Adaptive governance emerges as a key enabler across all contexts. This involves: (1) regularly reassessing policy outcomes (e.g., Melbourne's use of community monitoring data to adjust tree plantings); (2) flexible funding mechanisms that allow reallocation based on synergies (e.g., Lagos's PES model); and (3) inclusive decision-making that balances technical expertise with local knowledge (e.g., Delhi's Green Corridor Campaign). Adaptive approaches are particularly important in rapidly changing urban environments, where climate and biodiversity risks evolve unpredictably.

A notable cross-cutting challenge is the measurement of synergies. While ecosystem services provide a conceptual framework, quantifying dual climate-biodiversity benefits remains technically complex—for example, calculating how much carbon sequestration is attributable to a pollinator-friendly urban forest versus a monoculture plantation. Standardized metrics (e.g., "biodiversity-carbon credits") could facilitate integration but require global agreement and local adaptation, which is currently lacking.

7. Conclusion

This paper has explored policy synergies and trade-offs between climate action and biodiversity conservation in urban green economy transitions. The analysis highlights that integration is not only possible but essential, as climate and biodiversity crises are deeply interconnected in urban systems. Three pathways for integration are identified: nature-based solutions that deliver dual benefits, circular economy practices that reduce resource pressures, and spatial planning that protects ecological corridors.

The case studies demonstrate that context matters: integration strategies must be tailored to institutional capacity, urbanization rate, and resource availability. High-capacity cities can focus on systemic planning and innovative financing, while low-capacity cities benefit from pragmatic, community-led solutions supported by international finance. Across all contexts, adaptive governance—including cross-sectoral coordination, stakeholder participation, and flexible funding—is critical to navigating trade-offs and scaling synergies.

For global urban policy, these findings underscore the need to move beyond siloed climate and biodiversity agendas. International frameworks like the Paris Agreement and the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework should explicitly incentivize urban policy integration, providing guidance on metrics, financing mechanisms, and capacity building. Cities, in turn, can share lessons through networks like C40 Cities and ICLEI, creating a community of practice around integrated green transitions.

Future research should focus on: (1) developing standardized, context-appropriate metrics for

measuring climate-biodiversity synergies; (2) assessing the long-term cost-effectiveness of integrated policies versus siloed approaches; and (3) exploring how technological innovations (e.g., remote sensing for biodiversity monitoring) can enhance adaptive governance in resource-constrained cities. By advancing these areas, scholars and policymakers can support more effective, equitable urban transitions that address both climate change and biodiversity loss.

References

[1] Bastin, J. F., Finegold, Y., Garcia, C., & Mollicone, D. (2019). The global tree restoration potential. *Science*, 365(6448), 76–79.

[2] Centre for Science and Environment. (2023). *Green corridor campaign: Impact assessment 2022–2023*. CSE Publications.

[3] Cohen-Shacham, E., Brauman, K. A., Dayan, T., & Bakker, M. M. (2016). *Nature-based solutions to address global societal challenges*. IUCN.

[4] Delhi Government. (2023). *Climate-biodiversity task force: Annual review*. Government of NCT of Delhi.

[5] Ellen MacArthur Foundation. (2021). *Circular economy and biodiversity: Opportunities for urban areas*. Ellen MacArthur Foundation.

[6] Elmqvist, T., Grimm, N. B., Groffman, P. M., et al. (2015). Urban ecology and sustainability: Challenges and opportunities. *Science*, 349(6252), 1226077.

[7] Friends of Melbourne Bushland. (2023). *Biodiversity climate champions: Community monitoring report 2022*. Friends of Melbourne Bushland.

[8] Geng, Y., Zhang, H., & Chen, W. (2019). Circular economy innovation and its drivers in China: A mixed-methods analysis. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 235, 1302–1311.

[9] Jordan, A., & Lenschow, A. (2010). Policy integration: A concept "stretched to the limit"? *Environmental Politics*, 19(4), 571–589.

[10] Lagos State Climate Change Department. (2023). *Mangrove PES program: 2020–2023 evaluation*. Lagos State Government.

[11] Lagos State Ministry of Environment. (2023). *Mangrove restoration project: Impact assessment 2020–2023*. Lagos State Government.

[12] Lagos Urban Food Security Initiative. (2022). *Urban agriculture and biodiversity in Lagos informal settlements*. LUFSI Working Paper.

[13] McKinney, M. L. (2008). Urbanization, biodiversity, and conservation. *BioScience*, 58(11), 1012–1021.

[14] Melbourne City Council. (2023). *Urban ecology and climate division: Annual report 2022–2023*. Melbourne City Council.

[15] Melbourne Treasury. (2023). *Green bond impact report 2022*. City of Melbourne.

[16] Melbourne Water. (2021). *Water sensitive urban design: Climate and biodiversity benefits*. Melbourne Water Corporation.

[17] Slum Dwellers International. (2022). *Participatory mapping for informal settlement greening: Lagos case study*. SDI Publications.

[18] Tosun, J., & Lang, D. J. (2017). Policy integration in practice: A systematic review of the literature. *Policy Sciences*, 50(3), 389–413.

[19] UN-Habitat. (2022). *State of African cities 2022: Sustainable urban transitions*. United Nations Human Settlements Programme.

[20] UN Environment Programme (UNEP). (2011). *Towards a green economy: Pathways to sustainable*

development and poverty eradication. UNEP.

[21] Victorian Government. (2023). *Renewable energy planning guidelines: Biodiversity offsets*. Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning.

[22] Wildlife Institute of India. (2022). *Aravalli biodiversity and infrastructure impact assessment*. Wildlife Institute of India.