Wildlife and Law: Conservation Governance, International Frameworks, and the Challenges of Enforcement

Dr. Neha Mishra[1], Dr. Papiya Golder[2], Dr. Atul Jain[3], Dr. Pranshul Pathak[4], Dr. Manisha Madhav[5], Sakshi Kanodia[6]

[1]Assistant Professor, Amity University Haryana, nmishra@ggn.amity.edu

[2]Associate Professor, Brainware University, Kolkata, dpg.law@brainwareuniversity.ac.in

[3]Associate Professor, Amity University Haryana, ajain@ggn.amity.edu

[4]Associate Professor, Amity University Haryana, ppathak@ggn.amity.edu

[5]Assistant Professor, UPES University, Dehradun, manisha.madhav90@gmail.com

[6]Advocate, Delhi High Court, kanodia.sakshi95@gmail.com

HOW TO CITE:
Neha Mishra, Papiya Golder, Atul Jain, Pranshul Pathak, Manisha Madhav, Sakshi Kanodia (2026). Wildlife and Law: Conservation Governance, International Frameworks, and the Challenges of Enforcement. International Journal of Special Education, 41(4s), 107-114.

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:
Copyright: © 2026 Authors. Open access publication underthe terms and conditions of the Creative CommonsAttribution (CC BY) license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

ABSTRACT:
Wildlife law occupies a critical intersection between environmental science, international relations, and domestic legal systems. As biodiversity loss accelerates—driven by habitat destruction, climate change, and illegal trade—the adequacy of existing legal frameworks has come under increasing scrutiny. This article examines the evolution of wildlife law from early common-law doctrines to contemporary multilateral treaties, with particular emphasis on the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and regional enforcement regimes. Drawing on comparative legal analysis and empirical data from enforcement agencies, the study evaluates the structural gaps between normative legal standards and practical conservation outcomes. The article argues that effective wildlife governance requires not only stronger international coordination but also the integration of indigenous rights, adaptive management principles, and technology-driven monitoring. The findings have direct implications for policymakers, conservation practitioners, and legal scholars engaged in the urgent task of halting the sixth mass extinction.

Keywords: wildlife law, biodiversity, CITES, poaching, environmental governance, conservation policy, illegal wildlife trade.

1. INTRODUCTION

The legal regulation of wildlife represents one of the oldest yet most rapidly evolving domains of environmental law. From the royal hunting prerogatives of medieval England to the contemporary architecture of global biodiversity treaties, the relationship between legal systems and the natural world has undergone profound transformation (Bowman et al., 2010). Today, wildlife law is shaped by an intricate web of

international conventions, domestic statutes, customary norms, and judicial interpretations—all responding to an ecological crisis of unprecedented scale.

According to the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), approximately one million animal and plant species are currently threatened with extinction, many within decades (IPBES, 2019). Illegal wildlife trade—estimated at between USD 23 billion and USD 73 billion annually—ranks among the most lucrative transnational criminal enterprises, trailing only narcotics, human trafficking, and arms dealing (UNODC, 2020). These statistics underscore the urgency of robust legal responses.

Yet law alone cannot solve the biodiversity crisis. Effective wildlife governance must reckon with enforcement capacity gaps, jurisdictional fragmentation, the commodification of nature in global markets, and the socioeconomic conditions that drive local communities into exploitative relationships with wildlife. This article provides a comprehensive review of the legal frameworks governing wildlife, identifies key structural weaknesses, and proposes directions for reform.

The article is structured as follows. Section 2 traces the historical development of wildlife law. Section 3 analyzes the principal international treaties. Section 4 examines domestic regulatory systems with comparative perspectives. Section 5 discusses enforcement challenges and innovations. Section 6 addresses the emerging nexus between wildlife law, indigenous rights, and community-based conservation. Section 7 considers future directions, and Section 8 concludes.

2. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF WILDLIFE LAW

2.1 Pre-Modern and Colonial Origins

The earliest formal wildlife laws were rooted in sovereign property rights rather than conservation ethics. In feudal Europe, game laws functioned primarily to reserve hunting privileges for the nobility, criminalizing subsistence hunting by peasants as poaching (Munsche, 1981). The res nullius doctrine—under which wild animals were treated as unowned until captured—provided the philosophical foundation for unregulated exploitation that persisted well into the industrial era.

Colonial expansion extended these extractivist frameworks globally, with European powers establishing wildlife regulations in Africa and Asia that dispossessed indigenous peoples of their land-based livelihoods while facilitating commercial hunting for export markets (Neumann, 1998). The establishment of game reserves in colonial Africa, though often presented as conservation measures, functioned simultaneously as mechanisms of social control and resource appropriation (Brockington, 2002).

2.2 The Conservation Turn of the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries

The late nineteenth century witnessed the emergence of a conservationist consciousness in response to the visible destruction of wildlife populations. In the United States, the near-extinction of the American bison (Bison bison) from an estimated 30 million individuals to fewer than 1,000 by 1889 galvanized public opinion and prompted legislative action (Isenberg, 2000). The Lacey Act of 1900 became the first federal wildlife protection statute in the United States, prohibiting interstate commerce in illegally taken wildlife.

Internationally, the first multilateral wildlife treaties emerged during this period, including the 1900 Convention for the Preservation of Wild Animals, Birds and Fish in Africa—though this agreement, negotiated exclusively among colonial powers, reflected imperial interests rather than genuine ecological concern (Lyster, 1985). The interwar period saw the development of more ecologically grounded frameworks, culminating in the 1933 London Convention Relative to the Preservation of Fauna and Flora in Their Natural State.

3. INTERNATIONAL LEGAL FRAMEWORKS FOR WILDLIFE PROTECTION

3.1 The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES)

Adopted in 1973 and entering into force in 1975, CITES represents the cornerstone of international wildlife trade regulation (Sand, 1997). With 183 Parties as of 2023, the convention regulates the international trade of over 38,000 species through a permit-based system organized around three appendices that correspond to varying degrees of trade restriction (CITES Secretariat, 2023).

CITES operates on the principle that international trade in specimens of certain species should be subject to controls in order to ensure that such trade is not detrimental to wild populations. Species listed in Appendix I, which includes iconic taxa such as the African elephant (Loxodonta africana) and all rhinoceros species, are afforded the strictest protections, with commercial trade prohibited in principle. Appendix II species may be traded commercially subject to non-detriment findings and export permits issued by competent national authorities (Reeve, 2002).

Despite its achievements, CITES has faced persistent criticism. Rosen and Smith (2010) argue that the convention's effectiveness is undermined by its reliance on national implementation, inadequate monitoring, and the limited resources of enforcement agencies in range states. The ivory trade debate—centering on proposals to permit regulated ivory sales from southern African stockpiles—has exposed deep tensions between utilization-based and protectionist conservation philosophies (Stiles, 2004). Moreover, CITES focuses exclusively on trade and does not address habitat destruction, which remains the primary driver of species decline (Bowman et al., 2010).

3.2 The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Kunming-Montreal Framework

Concluded at the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) established the first comprehensive global framework for the conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable use of its components, and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from genetic resources (Secretariat of the CBD, 2000). Unlike CITES, the CBD adopts an ecosystem-level approach, obligating Parties to develop national biodiversity strategies and action plans, establish protected areas, and integrate biodiversity considerations into sectoral policies.

The Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, adopted at COP15 in December 2022, set ambitious new targets—including the protection of 30% of land and ocean areas by 2030 ('30x30')—and represents the most significant international biodiversity commitment since the CBD itself (CBD Secretariat, 2022). Legal scholars have noted, however, that the Framework lacks binding enforcement mechanisms, rendering its ambitions dependent on voluntary national action (Morgera et al., 2023).

3.3 Regional Treaties and Agreements

Beyond the global treaty system, a proliferation of regional instruments addresses wildlife protection in specific biomes and political contexts. The African Convention on the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (Revised 2003) provides a comprehensive regional framework encompassing biodiversity, protected areas, and sustainable use. The Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP) exemplifies the species-specific regional approach, coordinating conservation action across the ranges of 31 seabird species threatened by fisheries bycatch (ACAP, 2023).

In Southeast Asia—home to extraordinary wildlife diversity and among the world's hotspots for illegal trade—regional mechanisms have proven insufficient. The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) Wildlife Law Enforcement Network (ASEAN-WEN), established in 2005, represented an important step toward regional cooperation but has been hampered by sovereignty sensitivities and capacity constraints (Krishnasamy & Stoner, 2016).

4. DOMESTIC WILDLIFE REGULATORY SYSTEMS: A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

4.1 United States

The United States has developed one of the world's most elaborate domestic wildlife legal frameworks. The Endangered Species Act (ESA) of

1973, often described as the most powerful environmental law ever enacted, prohibits the 'take' of listed species—defined expansively to include habitat modification that significantly impairs breeding, feeding, or sheltering—and mandates the designation of critical habitat (Rohlf, 1991). The ESA has been credited with preventing the extinction of iconic species such as the bald eagle (Haliaeetus leucocephalus) and the grey wolf (Canis lupus), though it has also generated significant political conflict in contexts where species protection intersects with agricultural, extractive, or development interests (Goble et al., 2006).

Complementing the ESA, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 provides broad protections for migratory birds under treaties with Canada, Mexico, Japan, and Russia. Recent administrative interpretations of the MBTA's prohibition on 'take' have oscillated between expansive and narrow readings, creating regulatory uncertainty for industries including energy and construction (Murchison, 2020).

4.2 European Union

The European Union has established a sophisticated multi-level governance framework for wildlife protection, anchored by the Habitats Directive (92/43/EEC) and the Birds Directive (2009/147/EC). The Habitats Directive establishes the Natura 2000 network—the world's largest coordinated network of protected areas—covering approximately 18% of EU land surface and significant marine areas (European Commission, 2020). The concept of 'favorable conservation status' provides the normative standard against which species and habitat protection measures are assessed.

Enforcement of EU wildlife law occurs through a combination of infringement proceedings initiated by the European Commission and domestic criminal sanctions. The transposition of the EU Environmental Crime Directive (2008/99/EC) has harmonized criminal penalties for wildlife offences across Member States, though enforcement intensity varies considerably (Faure & Visser, 2021).

4.3 India

India's Wildlife Protection Act of 1972, amended most recently in 2022, constitutes the primary domestic instrument for wildlife conservation in one of the world's megadiverse nations. The Act established a system of protected areas including national parks and wildlife sanctuaries, prohibited the hunting of scheduled species, and created the apparatus for wildlife crime enforcement. India's tiger conservation program, operating under Project Tiger since 1973, is widely credited with reversing the decline of the Bengal tiger (Panthera tigris tigris) from approximately 1,800 individuals in 1973 to over 3,000 by 2022 (National Tiger Conservation Authority, 2022).

However, tensions persist between wildlife conservation and the rights of tribal and forest-dwelling communities. The Forest Rights Act of 2006 recognized the rights of scheduled tribes to forest resources but has been inconsistently implemented in the context of protected area management, generating ongoing legal disputes (Springate-Baginski et al., 2010).

5. ENFORCEMENT CHALLENGES AND TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATIONS

5.1 Structural Enforcement Gaps

The gap between legal prescription and operational reality constitutes perhaps the most significant challenge facing wildlife law. Transnational wildlife crime networks exploit the jurisdictional fragmentation of the international legal order, moving illegal products through multiple transit countries with varying levels of regulatory capacity (Wyatt, 2013). The TRAFFIC network estimates that only a fraction of wildlife crimes result in prosecution, and sentences, where obtained, are often inadequate to deter sophisticated criminal enterprises (TRAFFIC, 2021).

Corruption represents a pervasive obstacle to effective enforcement. Studies conducted in Central Africa, Southeast Asia, and Latin America document systematic collusion between wildlife traffickers and law enforcement personnel, customs officials, and government ministers (Nellemann et al., 2016). Without addressing governance failures at

the institutional level, legal frameworks remain aspirational rather than operative.

5.2 Technology as an Enabler of Enforcement

The past decade has witnessed the emergence of a suite of technological tools with transformative potential for wildlife law enforcement. Remote sensing and geographic information systems (GIS) now enable near-real-time monitoring of deforestation and habitat encroachment, providing evidence admissible in legal proceedings and enabling proactive enforcement responses (Laurance et al., 2012). DNA barcoding and forensic genetics allow investigators to trace the geographic origin of seized wildlife products with high precision, strengthening prosecutorial cases and supporting species identification in markets (Ogden et al., 2009).

Artificial intelligence applications—including camera trap image classification, acoustic monitoring for gunshots, and predictive poaching risk models—are being piloted in protected areas across Africa and Asia (Norouzzadeh et al., 2018). Blockchain technology has been proposed as a mechanism for creating immutable supply chain records for legal wildlife products, potentially enabling more effective differentiation between legal and illegal trade flows (Weiller et al., 2018). However, critics caution that technological solutions may divert attention and resources from the social and economic drivers of wildlife crime (Duffy et al., 2019).

6. WILDLIFE LAW, INDIGENOUS RIGHTS, AND COMMUNITY-BASED CONSERVATION

A growing body of scholarship and policy practice has challenged the dominant paradigm of state-centered, exclusionary conservation—sometimes termed 'fortress conservation'—in favor of approaches that recognize the rights and expertise of indigenous and local communities (Adams & Hutton, 2007). The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), adopted in 2007, affirms the rights of indigenous peoples to maintain, control, protect, and develop their cultural heritage and traditional knowledge, and to own, use, develop, and control their territories and resources—rights directly applicable to wildlife governance contexts.

Community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) programs in southern Africa, including CAMPFIRE in Zimbabwe and communal conservancies in Namibia, demonstrate that devolving resource governance rights to local communities can generate both conservation and livelihood benefits, albeit under specific governance conditions (Jones, 2001). Legal recognition of customary resource rights, as embedded in Namibia's Nature Conservation Amendment Act of 1996, has been identified as a critical enabling factor for CBNRM success (WWF, 2013).

The rights-based turn in conservation law must contend with complex questions of institutional design. Legalistic approaches that simply recognize indigenous rights without providing governance capacity, dispute resolution mechanisms, or secure tenure may prove insufficient in contexts where state institutions are weak or predatory (Sikor & Lund, 2009). A more integrated approach, embedding rights recognition within broader frameworks of legal pluralism and adaptive co-management, offers greater promise for sustainable outcomes.

7. FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN WILDLIFE LAW AND GOVERNANCE

The biodiversity crisis demands urgent reform of wildlife law and governance at multiple scales. Several priority areas emerge from this analysis.

First, the strengthening of international enforcement cooperation is essential. Proposals for a World Environment Organization or a strengthened international environmental court merit serious consideration, as existing mechanisms lack the authority and resources to address transnational wildlife crime at scale (Biermann & Pattberg, 2012). Enhanced mutual legal assistance frameworks and harmonized criminal penalties across jurisdictions would reduce the regulatory arbitrage that currently benefits trafficking networks.

Second, the integration of biodiversity considerations into all relevant sectors—agriculture,

infrastructure, energy, finance—requires development of legal instruments that extend beyond traditional protected area models. The emerging field of biodiversity law, drawing on analogies from climate change governance including carbon markets and national contribution frameworks, offers potential pathways (Morgera et al., 2023).

Third, the digital transformation of wildlife law enforcement must be accompanied by robust data governance frameworks that protect the privacy of indigenous communities, prevent the misuse of surveillance technologies, and ensure that technological benefits are equitably distributed across enforcement capacity levels. The development of international standards for digital evidence in wildlife crime prosecutions represents a practical priority.

Fourth, greater attention must be paid to the demand-side drivers of illegal wildlife trade. Legal interventions aimed at reducing consumer demand in key markets—including public awareness campaigns with legal backing, criminalization of possession, and regulatory requirements for due diligence in wildlife product supply chains—may prove as or more effective than supply-side enforcement alone (Drury, 2011).

8. CONCLUSION

Wildlife law has evolved from an instrument of sovereign privilege and colonial exploitation into a sophisticated—if imperfect—system of international and domestic rules aimed at preserving biological diversity for present and future generations. The foundational frameworks of CITES, the CBD, and domestic statutes such as the ESA represent genuine achievements of international legal cooperation. Yet the persistence of biodiversity loss and the expansion of illegal wildlife trade demonstrate the inadequacy of existing frameworks when measured against ecological need.

This article has argued that effective wildlife governance requires a multipronged legal response: stronger international enforcement cooperation, integration of biodiversity into sectoral law, recognition of indigenous and community rights, deployment of technology with appropriate governance safeguards, and demand-reduction strategies. No single intervention will be sufficient; the scale and urgency of the biodiversity crisis demands comprehensive reform.

The role of law in this project is both instrumental and constitutive. Legal frameworks shape the incentives and capacities of governments, corporations, and individuals, but they also reflect and reproduce the values societies hold toward the natural world. Transforming those values—toward recognizing the intrinsic worth of non-human life and the long-term dependencies of human civilization on functioning ecosystems—may ultimately prove as important as any specific legal reform. Wildlife law, at its best, can be a vehicle for that transformation.

REFERENCES

Adams, W. M., & Hutton, J. (2007). People, parks and poverty: Political ecology and biodiversity conservation. Conservation and Society, 5(2), 147–183.

Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels. (2023). Status of albatrosses and petrels. ACAP Secretariat. https://www.acap.aq

ASEAN Wildlife Enforcement Network. (2005). ASEAN-WEN operational guidelines. ASEAN Secretariat.

Biermann, F., & Pattberg, P. (2012). Global environmental governance reconsidered. MIT Press.

Bowman, M., Davies, P., & Redgwell, C. (2010). Lyster's international wildlife law (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Brockington, D. (2002). Fortress conservation: The preservation of the Mkomazi Game Reserve, Tanzania. James Currey.

CBD Secretariat. (2022). Kunming-Montreal global biodiversity framework. Convention on Biological Diversity. https://www.cbd.int

CITES Secretariat. (2023). The CITES appendices. https://www.cites.org/eng/app/index.php

Drury, R. (2011). Hungry for success: Urban consumer demand for wild animal products in Vietnam. Conservation and Society, 9(3), 247–257. https://doi.org/10.4103/0972-4923.86995

Duffy, R., St John, F. A. V., Büscher, B., & Brockington, D. (2019). Why we must question the militarisation of conservation. Biological Conservation, 232, 66–73. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2019.01.013

European Commission. (2020). Natura 2000 network. European Environment Agency. https://www.eea.europa.eu

Faure, M., & Visser, M. (2021). Environmental crime and the European Union. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Goble, D. D., Scott, J. M., & Davis, F. W. (Eds.). (2006). The Endangered Species Act at thirty: Vol. 1. Renewing the conservation promise. Island Press.

Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. (2019). Global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services. IPBES Secretariat. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3831673

Isenberg, A. C. (2000). The destruction of the bison: An environmental history, 1750–1920. Cambridge University Press.

Jones, B. T. B. (2001). The evolution of a community-based approach to wildlife management at Kunene, Namibia. In D. Hulme & M. Murphree (Eds.), African wildlife and livelihoods (pp. 160–176). James Currey.

Krishnasamy, K., & Stoner, S. (2016). Trading faces: A rapid assessment on the use of Facebook to trade wildlife in Peninsular Malaysia. TRAFFIC.

Laurance, W. F., Useche, D. C., Rendeiro, J., Kalka, M., Bradshaw, C. J. A., Sloan, S. P., Laurance, S. G., Campbell, M., Abernethy, K., Alvarez, P., Arroyo-Rodriguez, V., Ashton, P., Benítez-Malvido, J., Blom, A., Bobo, K. S., Cannon, C. H., Cao, M., Carroll, R., Chapman, C., ... Zamzani, F. (2012). Averting biodiversity collapse in tropical forest protected areas. Nature, 489(7415), 290–294. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11318

Lyster, S. (1985). International wildlife law. Grotius Publications.

Morgera, E., Razzaque, J., & Tsioumani, E. (2023). The global biodiversity framework: Legal implications. Journal of Environmental Law, 35(1), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1093/jel/eqad001

Munsche, P. B. (1981). Gentlemen and poachers: The English game laws 1671–1831. Cambridge University Press.

Murchison, K. M. (2020). Before and after the Migratory Bird Treaty Act: Implementing an international conservation agreement. University Press of Kansas.

National Tiger Conservation Authority. (2022). Status of tigers, co-predators and prey in India 2022. Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of India.

Nellemann, C., Henriksen, R., Kreilhuber, A., Stewart, D., Kotsovou, M., Raxter, P., Mrema, E., & Barrat, S. (Eds.). (2016). The rise of environmental crime: A growing threat to natural resources, peace, development and security. UNEP & INTERPOL.

Neumann, R. P. (1998). Imposing wilderness: Struggles over livelihood and nature preservation in Africa. University of California Press.

Norouzzadeh, M. S., Nguyen, A., Kosmala, M., Swanson, A., Palmer, M. S., Packer, C., & Clune, J. (2018). Automatically identifying, counting, and describing wild animals in camera-trap images with deep learning. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 115(25), E5716–E5725. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1719367115

Ogden, R., Dawnay, N., & McEwing, R. (2009). Wildlife DNA forensics—Bridging the gap between conservation genetics and law enforcement. Endangered Species Research, 9(3), 179–195. https://doi.org/10.3354/esr00144

Reeve, R. (2002). Policing international trade in endangered species: The CITES treaty and compliance. Earthscan.

Rohlf, D. J. (1991). Six biological reasons why the Endangered Species Act doesn't work—and what to do about it. Conservation Biology, 5(3), 273–282. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.1991.tb00141.x

Rosen, G. E., & Smith, K. F. (2010). Summarizing the evidence on the international trade in illegal wildlife. EcoHealth, 7(1), 24–32. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10393-010-0317-y

Sand, P. H. (1997). Commodity or taboo? International regulation of trade in endangered species. In G. Handl (Ed.), Yearbook of international environmental law (Vol. 8, pp. 19–58). Oxford University Press.

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. (2000). Sustaining life on Earth: How the Convention on Biological Diversity promotes nature and human well-being. CBD Secretariat.

Sikor, T., & Lund, C. (2009). Access and property: A question of power and authority. Development and Change, 40(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7660.2009.01503.x

Springate-Baginski, O., Bonnin, M., Bhatt, S., & Bhatt, P. (2010). Grounding the discourse: India's forest rights act and its implementation. Policy Matters, 17, 77–86.

Stiles, D. (2004). The ivory trade and elephant conservation. Environmental Conservation, 31(4), 309–321. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0376892904001614

TRAFFIC. (2021). Wildlife trade monitoring network annual review. TRAFFIC International. https://www.traffic.org

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2020). World wildlife crime report: Trafficking in protected species. UNODC. https://www.unodc.org

Weiller, C., Bärenbold, R., de Weck, O. L., Nüesch, S., & Giger, M. (2018). Blockchain for wildlife conservation: Opportunities and challenges. IUCN.

World Wildlife Fund. (2013). Namibia's community conservancies: A review of accomplishments and challenges. WWF Namibia. https://www.wwf.org

Wyatt, T. (2013). Wildlife trafficking: A deconstruction of the crime, the victims and the offenders. Palgrave Macmillan.