Strategic Implementation of the COP30 Presidency Roadmap: A Multidimensional Framework for Halting and Reversing Deforestation by 2030

The first Global Stocktake (GST1) concluded at COP28 provided a clear mandate to the international community: the imperative to halt and reverse deforestation and forest degradation by 2030 is no longer a peripheral environmental goal but a central pillar of the global climate architecture.[1] As the COP30 Presidency, operating in the spirit of *mutirão*—the Brazilian concept of collective, community-led effort—advances its roadmap, it must navigate an increasingly complex landscape defined by the convergence of environmental crime, the necessity of Indigenous territorial sovereignty, and the urgent need to bridge a multi-billion dollar finance gap.[1] This report provides an exhaustive analysis of the critical barriers and enabling levers across four thematic axes: law enforcement and organized crime repression; the integration of Indigenous knowledge and land rights; the evolution of international forest finance and carbon markets; and the scaling of restorative bioeconomy and agroforestry models.

Comparative Analysis of Law Enforcement and Organized Crime Repression

The global effort to reduce illegal logging in tropical rainforests is increasingly challenged by the transformation of forest crime from localized, opportunistic harvesting into a highly organized, transnational criminal enterprise. Research from the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and various peer-reviewed studies suggests that forest crime is rarely an isolated phenomenon; rather, it exists within a "mutually reinforcing system" of illicit activities.[3]

The Mechanism of Crime Convergence

Evidence indicates a profound convergence between forest crime and other serious offenses, including narcotics trafficking, illegal mining, and human rights violations.[3] In the Amazon Basin and Central America, a phenomenon known as "narco-deforestation" has emerged, where organized crime groups (OCGs) reinvest the proceeds of cocaine trafficking into illegal land acquisition and clearing.[4] These groups often establish ranching or agricultural operations not for primary profit, but as a mechanism for money laundering and territorial control.[3]

Category of Convergence	Primary Illegal Activities	Ecological and Social

		Impact
Narcotics and Land Grabbing	Drug trafficking reinvested in cattle ranching, soy, and palm oil.	Rapid primary forest loss; creation of illegal infrastructure (landing strips, roads).[4]
Extractive Industries	Illegal gold and mineral mining within protected territories.	Direct deforestation (62% in tropical areas); toxic chemical dispersion (e.g., mercury).[4]
Transnational Smuggling	Combined trafficking of timber, wildlife, and arms.	Deterioration of keystone species and ecosystem functions.[6]
Human Rights and Labor	Bonded labor, child labor, and trafficking in persons.	Erosion of social stability; exploitation of vulnerable rural populations.[3]

The criminal infrastructure built for the drug trade—including control of transport routes and the corruption of local authorities—facilitates the extraction of timber with impunity.[6] Furthermore, illegal timber frequently penetrates legal supply chains through the use of fraudulent permits and bribery, making it difficult for international demand-side regulations to distinguish between legal and laundered products.[3]

Strategies for Repression and the Role of Governance

Comparative studies of Brazil and Indonesia, the world's most forest-rich nations, highlight the necessity of strategic, state-led enforcement. Brazil's historical success in reducing deforestation was largely attributed to the Action Plan for the Prevention and Control of Deforestation in the Legal Amazon (PPCDAm), which utilized real-time satellite monitoring to deploy federal agents to deforestation hotspots.[9] Indonesia, while pledging significant reductions through sustainable forest management and social forestry, has often struggled with a less centralized strategic approach to law enforcement.[9]

Successful repression tactics identified in the literature prioritize targeting "major violators" over subsistence harvesters.[4] Focusing enforcement on the higher levels of the criminal hierarchy—specifically individuals and corporations conducting large-scale financial transactions and laundering timber through front companies—yields greater environmental returns and reduces the risk of criminalizing vulnerable populations.[4] However, a significant barrier to these strategies is the "balloon effect," where a crackdown in one geographic region or on a specific species (e.g., rosewood) causes criminal actors to shift their operations to

adjacent, less-monitored forests or to pivot to unregulated tree species.[3]

The Dilemma of Coercive Conservation

Despite the need for robust enforcement, peer-reviewed analysis warns against the "securitization" and "militarization" of conservation.[12] Coercive measures can lead to "green violence," where environmental enforcers and the state engage in the dispossession and marginalization of forest-dependent dwellers.[12] In some regions, such as the Romanian Carpathians, the escalation of "forest violence" has created a culture of fear and secrecy, where petty loggers and forest defenders alike are subjected to intimidation and physical harm.[12]

A more effective model involves "participatory law enforcement," which integrates community-led monitoring with state authority.[13] Research in Indonesia indicates that empowering local communities through social forestry programs can minimize economic disparities and create a "new economic center" that serves as a deterrent to illegal activities.[13] For law enforcement to be truly effective, it must be accompanied by socioeconomic development that provides remote rural populations with alternatives to co-option by criminal factions.[6]

Integration of Indigenous Knowledge and Territorial Rights

The roadmap to 2030 cannot be achieved without a paradigm shift that places Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs) at the center of conservation strategy. A growing body of empirical research confirms that Indigenous stewardship is often superior to state-led or private-sector management in maintaining forest integrity and biodiversity.[15]

Measurable Impacts of Land Tenure

Legal land rights and secure tenure for Indigenous peoples are proven drivers of improved forest outcomes. In Brazil's Atlantic Forest, a study of 129 Indigenous lands from 1985 to 2019 demonstrated that formalized tenure—characterized by the legal right to exclude outsiders—was necessary to significantly reduce deforestation and promote reforestation.[16] Crucially, the research indicated that "incomplete" tenure status did not yield the same ecological benefits, highlighting that the mere recognition of presence is insufficient without robust legal protections.[16]

Management Regime	Intact Forest Overlap (%)	Biodiversity Status	Primary Driver of Success
Indigenous and	54% of world's	Often higher	Secure tenure and

Community Lands	remaining intact forests.[15]	vertebrate biodiversity than state-run parks.[15]	legal right to exclude competitors.[16]
Government-Managed Protected Areas	~15-20% global land area.	Variable; prone to "paper park" status if underfunded.	State enforcement and budget allocation.
Private/Commercial Lands	Variable.	Often lower due to conversion pressures.	Economic incentives and regulatory compliance.

Indigenous-managed lands currently hold 610 million hectares of intact forest globally.[15] Systematic evidence shows that deforestation and degradation rates are consistently lower in community-managed forests than in unmanaged areas, even when accounting for external pressures.[15] In Peru, communities equipped with satellite deforestation data and mapping technology have significantly reduced local forest loss by identifying and reporting illegal incursions in real-time.[15]

Decolonizing Conservation Paradigms

A critical barrier to implementing Indigenous-led conservation is the persistence of the "wilderness" ideal—the Western notion that pristine landscapes must be devoid of human presence.[17] This construct has historically justified the eviction of Indigenous peoples from their ancestral homelands to create national parks, often leading to conflict and the degradation of the very ecosystems being "protected".[17]

Peer-reviewed studies argue that many tropical landscapes are not "wild" but have been actively created and managed by Indigenous peoples for millennia through practices like swidden agriculture and traditional agroforestry.[17] For instance, in West Africa, the sophisticated agroforestry systems developed over centuries in Mali and Burkina Faso have reduced soil erosion and improved fertility, while the rangeland restoration practices of the Masai in Tanzania have successfully stabilized watersheds and combated invasive species.[18]

Institutionalizing Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC)

To translate these best practices into policy, the COP30 Roadmap must emphasize the institutionalization of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC).[18] FPIC is not merely a consultative process but a collective right to self-determination that allows communities to grant or deny consent to projects affecting their territories.[18] Furthermore, "silent violence" often occurs when technocratic frameworks appear to comply with formal processes while systematically excluding Indigenous interests through opaque procedures or the waiver of

consultation requirements for "strategic" investments (e.g., lithium mining for the green transition).[19] Integrating Indigenous knowledge into social and environmental policy frameworks requires recognizing Indigenous intellectual property and providing direct financial support for the environmental services these communities provide to the world.[18]

International Forest Finance, Carbon Markets, and Value Chains

The transition to a forest-positive global economy is currently stymied by a "chronic shortfall" in financing.[20] While public budgets are essential, they alone cannot bridge the gap between current flows and the investment required to meet the 2030 targets.

The Forest Finance Gap

As of 2023, annual forest investment reached US $84 billion, a figure that remains significantly under the estimated US $300 billion needed annually by 2030.[2] Private finance remains modest at approximately US$7.5 billion (roughly 9% of the total), with most flows directed toward lower-risk markets rather than the tropical regions where deforestation is most acute.[2]

Financial Metric	Current Flow (2023/2024)	Target/Needed (2030)	Annual Gap
Total Forest Finance	US$84 Billion.[2]	US$300 Billion.[2]	US$216 Billion.[2]
Private Capital Mobilized	US$7.5 Billion.[2]	US$150+ Billion (Target).	~US$140 Billion.
Potentially Damaging Subsidies	US$406 Billion.[2]	Phased out/Redirected.	N/A.
Financial Institutions' Exposure	US$8.9 Trillion (Deforestation risk).[2]	Zero (Net-zero goals).	N/A.

A profound contradiction exists in the global financial system: while forest conservation is underfunded, private financial institutions provided approximately US $8.9 trillion in active financing to companies with high deforestation risk as of late 2024.[2] Furthermore, environmentally damaging subsidies in sectors like agriculture and energy reached US $406 billion in 2023, effectively outspending conservation efforts by a ratio of nearly 5 to 1.[2]

Jurisdictional Carbon Markets and J-REDD+

The evolution of carbon markets toward high-integrity jurisdictional models (J-REDD+) is seen as a primary lever for closing the finance gap.[21] Unlike project-level credits, J-REDD+ operates at the scale of entire administrative regions, allowing governments to align land-use policies, law enforcement, and fiscal incentives with forest conservation.[21] J-REDD+ helps manage the risks of "leakage" and "reversals" (e.g., from wildfires or policy shifts) through rigorous geographic accounting and the use of buffer pools.[21]

International initiatives such as the Tropical Forest Forever Facility (TFFF), launched by Brazil, and the approval of J-REDD+ methodologies for global compliance markets (e.g., CORSIA for aviation) are expected to deliver between US $3 billion and US $ 6 billion per year to tropical forest nations.[21] However, these markets face scrutiny regarding "additionality" and the risk that corporate buyers might use credits to avoid deep internal emissions reductions.[21] Ensuring that carbon finance directly benefits IPLCs through equitable benefit-sharing mechanisms is a prerequisite for market integrity.[21]

Gaps and Barriers in Non-Timber Forest Product (NTFP) Value Chains

Sustainable value chains for Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFPs)—such as fruits, nuts, resins, and medicinal plants—offer a bioeconomy model that avoids land-use conversion. However, these value chains remain underdeveloped and under-realized.

1. **Undervaluation and Data Gaps:** National statistics often focus on formal timber markets, ignoring the informal and subsistence trade in NTFPs used by over 3.5 billion people globally.[23]
2. **Weak Tenure and Governance:** A lack of secured land and tree tenure rights prevents smallholders from investing in the long-term productivity of NTFP species.[23]
3. **Logistical and Technical Bottlenecks:** Value chains are typically short and dominated by intermediaries. Producers lack access to affordable processing technology, reliable transport, and "bankable" financial products.[23]
4. **Unsustainable Harvesting:** High market demand for products like the Brazil nut or Pygeum has pushed some species toward "vulnerable" status, emphasizing the need for domestication in agroforestry systems.[23]

Large-Scale Agroforestry and Restorative Bioeconomy Models

The "Amazon 4.0" paradigm represents an emerging bioeconomy that aggregates new technologies—such as the internet of things (IoT), artificial intelligence, and cyber-physical systems—with the socio-environmental resources of the forest.[26] This model views large-scale restoration as an economic opportunity rather than a cost.

Economic Feasibility of Restoration Models

Techno-economic analysis (TEA) of forest restoration shows that while "pure" ecological restoration (planting for biodiversity only) often fails to attract private investment due to negative Net Present Values (NPV), agroforestry models combining native species with high-value NTFPs are financially sustainable.[27]

Restoration Model Type	Avg. Investment (US$/ha)	Internal Rate of Return (IRR)	Economic Feasibility (NPV > 0)
Pure Ecological Restoration	US$1,138	Negative	Generally No.[27]
Agroforestry with NTFPs	US$2,778	22% (Median)	Yes (7 of 9 models).[27]
Assisted Natural Regeneration	US$100 – 800	High	Variable.[29]

Peer-reviewed studies of 12 models in Brazil, Peru, Cambodia, and Indonesia demonstrate that the starting investment to restore one hectare of tropical forest averages US$1,963, but returns can be significant if value chains for products like açaí, cacao, or rubber are well-structured.[27] Assisted Natural Regeneration (ANR) is found to be up to 10 times cheaper than active planting and often delivers better biodiversity outcomes, though it is less predictable for income generation.[29]

Structural Hurdles to Large-Scale Implementation

Despite the economic potential, several structural barriers impede the scaling of these models in the Amazon and other biomes:

- **Knowledge Gaps:** There is a lack of domestication protocols for thousands of native species and a lack of infrastructure for managing "recalcitrant" seeds that cannot be dried or frozen.[26]
- **Logistical Bottlenecks:** The current demand for native seeds and seedlings far exceeds the capacity of existing nurseries.[26]
- **Competition with Destructive Land Use:** Cattle ranching and soy production remain more profitable in the short term due to established infrastructure and lower perceived risk, often benefiting from the non-compliance with environmental legislation.[26]

Success stories, such as Costa Rica's redistributive Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES)

program, show that large-scale restoration is possible when ecological patterned recovery is prioritized over monoculture plantations.[31] Costa Rica's model demonstrated that naturally regenerating forests recovered acoustic patterns resembling mature reference forests 1.4 times more effectively than monoculture plantations.[31]

The Nexus of Forest Conservation and the Fossil Fuel Transition

The roadmap for halting deforestation is intrinsically linked to the broader "transitioning away from fossil fuels" commitment made at COP28.[1] The socio-economic impacts of these two transformations must be managed in tandem to ensure a just and orderly process.

Just Energy Transition Partnerships (JETPs) and Forests

JETPs in nations like Indonesia, South Africa, and Vietnam aim to simultaneously retire coal-fired power plants and accelerate renewable energy deployment.[32] These programs provide a "natural hedge" against global market volatility by shifting energy supplies to indigenous resources like sun, wind, and water.[32] However, the withdrawal of major partners, such as the United States from JETPs in 2025, underscores the geopolitical fragility of these commitments.[32]

Managing Socio-Economic Disruption

A "just transition" requires anticipating the impacts on communities dependent on fossil fuels or timber extraction. "Silent violence"—normalized, institutionalized harm through the erasure of community interests—is a persistent risk in both the green energy transition and large-scale conservation.[19] Planning for a transition that is just, orderly, and equitable involves:

1. **Participatory Governance:** Ensuring that workers and communities determine their own future through inclusive social dialogue.[33]
2. **Economic Diversification:** Investing in vulnerable communities to draw in new economic activities, such as restoration-based jobs.[33]
3. **Social Welfare Systems:** Strengthening safety nets, compensation, and retraining programs to cushion the shock of transitioning away from carbon-intensive industries.[33]

Research indicates that the "Net-Zero premium"—the extra investment required for a climate-neutral pathway—is declining, but the high cost of capital in emerging markets remains a significant barrier to scaling both clean energy and forest restoration.[35]

Conclusion: Action-Oriented Guidance for the COP30 Roadmap

The findings of this analysis suggest that the COP30 Roadmap must move beyond fragmented sectoral approaches toward a whole-of-economy framework that values forests as engines of

resilience and growth. The implementation of paragraphs 33 and 34 of the GST1 mandate requires three strategic shifts.

First, the global community must adopt a "Nature Crime" framework that recognizes the convergence of deforestation with transnational organized crime. Law enforcement should prioritize financial transparency and the dismantling of the high-level criminal infrastructure that launders timber through legal markets.[4]

Second, the formalization of Indigenous land rights must be treated as a primary conservation technology. Ensuring legal tenure and institutionalizing FPIC are the most cost-effective methods for preserving the world's remaining intact forests.[15] Conservation strategies must be "decolonized" to reflect the agency and millennial knowledge of local populations.[17]

Third, a revolution in forest finance is required. This involves redirecting the US$406 billion currently allocated to harmful subsidies toward J-REDD+ frameworks and restorative bioeconomy models.[2] By scaling agroforestry systems that demonstrate a 22% internal rate of return, the private sector can be transformed from a driver of deforestation into a partner in restoration.[27]

The COP30 Presidency, through its global roadmap initiative, has the opportunity to translate these empirical lessons into a reference document that catalyzes urgent action. In the spirit of *mutirão*, the success of this roadmap will be measured not by the ambition of its targets, but by the inclusivity and justice of its implementation.

Works cited

1. COP30Presidencyinvitation_to_submit_contributions.pdf
2. State of Finance for Forests 2025 | UNEP - UN Environment Programme, accessed April 10, 2026, https://www.unep.org/resources/report/state-finance-forests-2025
3. new study shows forest crime converging with other types of organized crime, fueling harms to the environment, communities, and economy - UNODC, accessed April 10, 2026, https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/press/releases/2025/April/unodc_-new-study-shows-forest-crime-converging-with-other-types-of-organized-crime--fueling-harms-to-the-environment--communities--and-economy.html
4. Part 2a – Forest Crimes: Illegal Deforestation and Logging - Unodc, accessed April 10, 2026, https://www.unodc.org/documents/data-and-analysis/Crimes%20on%20Environment/ECR25_P2a_Deforestation.pdf
5. UNODC: new study shows forest crime converging with other types of organized crime, compounding harms to the environment, communities, and economy - UNIS Vienna, accessed April 10, 2026, https://unis.unvienna.org/unis/pressrels/2025/uniscp1187.html
6. Crime convergence: Natural resource exploitation and transnational organized crime - World Wildlife Fund, accessed April 10, 2026,

https://www.worldwildlife.org/our-work/wildlife/wildlife-crime/crime-convergence-natural-resource-exploitation-and-transnational-organized-crime/
7. Analysis: Organised crime in the Amazon - Nature Crime Alliance, accessed April 10, 2026, https://naturecrimealliance.org/analysis-organised-crime-in-the-amazon/
8. Publication: Illegal Logging, Fishing, and Wildlife Trade: The Costs and How to Combat it - Open Knowledge Repository - World Bank, accessed April 10, 2026, https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/entities/publication/1462c00a-6ef5-5964-9805-f31a9b1463ab
9. Law enforcement and deforestation: Lessons for Indonesia from Brazil, accessed April 10, 2026, https://ideas.repec.org/a/eee/forpol/v108y2019ic3.html
10. Law enforcement and deforestation: lessons for Indonesia from Brazil. - CABI Digital Library, accessed April 10, 2026, https://www.cabidigitallibrary.org/doi/full/10.5555/20193478650
11. Regulating the trees for the forest: How Indonesia and Brazil attempt to reduce deforestation through forestry policy | Tropical Resources Institute, accessed April 10, 2026, https://tri.yale.edu/tropical-resources/tropical-resources-vol-38/regulating-trees-forest-how-indonesia-and-brazil
12. Forests of Fear: Illegal Logging, Criminalization, and Violence in the ..., accessed April 10, 2026, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/24694452.2023.2209631
13. Law Enforcement and Community Participation in Combating Illegal Logging and Deforestation in Indonesia - Horizon Research Publishing, accessed April 10, 2026, https://www.hrpub.org/download/20220730/EER3-14027819.pdf
14. Law Enforcement Against Illegal Logging that Occurs in the Forest Area of Kwala Sefruh Village - International Journal Of Asosiasi Penelitian Dan Pengajar Ilmu Hukum Indonesia, accessed April 10, 2026, https://international.appihi.or.id/index.php/IJSL/article/view/709
15. Protecting Biodiversity Hinges on Securing Indigenous and Community Land Rights, accessed April 10, 2026, https://www.wri.org/insights/indigenous-and-local-community-land-rights-protect-biodiversity
16. Formalizing tenure of Indigenous lands improved forest outcomes in ..., accessed April 10, 2026, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9879837/
17. Indigenous knowledge and the shackles of wilderness - PNAS, accessed April 10, 2026, https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2022218118
18. Indigenous knowledge is crucial in the fight against climate change – here's why, accessed April 10, 2026, https://climatepromise.undp.org/news-and-stories/indigenous-knowledge-crucial-fight-against-climate-change-heres-why
19. Silent violence in the just transition: structural barriers, governance design, and the hidden costs of climate policy - Frontiers, accessed April 10, 2026, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/environmental-science/articles/10.3389/fenvs.2025.1594740/full

20. Financing for Forests: From Commitment to Action - Pollination, accessed April 10, 2026, https://pollinationgroup.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/Fincancing-for-Forests-Report_November_2025_Final.pdf
21. Why financing forests through carbon markets makes sense - The World Economic Forum, accessed April 10, 2026, https://www.weforum.org/stories/2026/03/financing-forests-carbon-markets/
22. 2025 State of the Voluntary Carbon Market (SOVCM) - Ecosystem Marketplace, accessed April 10, 2026, https://www.ecosystemmarketplace.com/publications/2025-state-of-the-voluntary-carbon-market-sovcm/
23. Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFP) and their value ... - Capacity4dev, accessed April 10, 2026, https://capacity4dev.europa.eu/media/250740/download/101690ad-0aa8-4edd-9884-2831673be6ad_en
24. Non-timber Forest Product Use and Market Chains Along a Deforestation Gradient in Southwest Malawi - Frontiers, accessed April 10, 2026, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/forests-and-global-change/articles/10.3389/ffgc.2019.00071/full
25. The commercialisation of NTFPs and conservation of forest: a systematic review for forestry policy - Emerald Publishing, accessed April 10, 2026, https://www.emerald.com/fer/article/6/2/94/1233081/The-commercialisation-of-NTFPs-and-conservation-of
26. Structural Hurdles to Large-Scale Forest Restoration in ... - Frontiers, accessed April 10, 2026, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/ecology-and-evolution/articles/10.3389/fevo.2020.593557/full
27. Economic Feasibility of Tropical Forest Restoration Models Based on Non-Timber Forest Products in Brazil, Cambodia, Indonesia, and Peru - MDPI, accessed April 10, 2026, https://www.mdpi.com/1999-4907/13/11/1878
28. (PDF) Economic Feasibility of Tropical Forest Restoration Models Based on Non-Timber Forest Products in Brazil, Cambodia, Indonesia, and Peru - ResearchGate, accessed April 10, 2026, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/365307481_Economic_Feasibility_of_Tropical_Forest_Restoration_Models_Based_on_Non-Timber_Forest_Products_in_Brazil_Cambodia_Indonesia_and_Peru
29. Integrating techno-economic analysis into restoration ecology: bridging ecological outcomes with financial feasibility - Frontiers, accessed April 10, 2026, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/sustainability/articles/10.3389/frsus.2026.1766022/full
30. TRANSITIONING AWAY FROM FOSSIL FUELS: A BROADER PERSPECTIVE TO DRIVE IMPLEMENTATION, accessed April 10, 2026, https://catavento.biz/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/2025_Catavento_Transitioning-away-from-fossil-fuels.pdf
31. Large-Scale Forest Restoration Accompanied by Biodiversity Recovery in Costa

Rica's Redistributive Payment for Ecosystem Service Program - PubMed, accessed April 10, 2026, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/41636078/
32. The Just Energy Transition Partnership (JETP) can succeed without the United States, accessed April 10, 2026, https://ieefa.org/resources/just-energy-transition-partnership-jetp-can-succeed-without-united-states
33. Good Practices for Just Transition - UNECE, accessed April 10, 2026, https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2026-01/UNECE%20Good%20Practices%20for%20Just%20Transition.pdf
34. Equitable Transitions Away From Fossil Fuels: a Systemic and Narrative Literature Review. - University of Cape Town, accessed April 10, 2026, https://commerce.uct.ac.za/sites/default/files/media/documents/commerce_uct_ac_za/869/prism-working-paper-2025-1-mogess-winkler-updated.pdf
35. Energy Transition 2024–2025: New Demand Vectors, Technology Oversupply, and Shrinking Net-Zero 2050 Premium - MDPI, accessed April 10, 2026, https://www.mdpi.com/1996-1073/18/16/4441
36. Transitioning Away from Fossil Fuels - CEBRI, accessed April 10, 2026, https://cebri.org/revista/en/artigo/221/transitioning-away-from-fossil-fuels