




Neglected SDGs as gaps in sustainability policy? The case of bioeconomy agendas in South America

Karen M. Siegel^{a,*},¹ , Guilherme de Queiroz-Stein^{a,2}, Melisa Deciancio^{a,3}, Daniel Kefeli^{a,4}, Mairon G. Bastos Lima^b

^a University of Münster, Institute of Political Science, Scharnhorststr.100, Münster, 48151, Germany

^b Stockholm Environment Institute, Box 24218, Stockholm, 104 51, Sweden

ABSTRACT

Although the SDGs as set out in the 2030 Agenda are in theory indivisible, research has shown that in practice their uptake and implementation is often highly uneven. Whereas the phenomenon of cherry-picking has been well documented, we examine the other side of the coin, i.e. the neglect of certain SDGs, using the case of bioeconomy policy in Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay. Through a combination of document analysis and a total of 50 stakeholder interviews, we assess the degree to which the 17 SDGs are covered. Our findings demonstrate that such South American bioeconomy policies have neglected SDG 5 (Gender equality), SDG 11 (Sustainable cities and communities), SDG 14 (Life below water) and SDG 16 (Peace, justice and strong institutions). We identify different types of neglect as an outcome of the way power relations, interests and policy processes interact, notably deliberate neglect, limited imagination and a lack of coordination.

1. Introduction

Following their adoption in 2015, the SDGs have often been praised as a key tool for working towards sustainable development in a transformative and inclusive manner. They provide a framework that is both broad (encompassing all three pillars of sustainability with a particular focus on inclusiveness, as captured in the overarching principle to ‘leave no one behind’) and detailed, setting out specific targets for each of the goals. Taken together, the 17 goals and 169 targets are comprehensive and ambitious in pursuing global justice, poverty eradication and environmental protection (Biermann et al., 2022a, 218). Since their adoption by the UN General Assembly in 2015, the SDGs have been the dominant framework for sustainability policy internationally. However, more than halfway through their implementation period, assessments of what has actually been achieved have been sobering. Research to date shows that overall the SDGs are not on track to be achieved by 2030. The political impacts of the SDGs have been mostly discursive, with some inputs for normative and institutional reform. That means they have strengthened the accountability politics of civil society and

non-governmental organizations vis-a-vis governments or companies, and they have provided a useful framework for local and societal actors to organise, yet they have not led to more transformational change in terms of realigning institutions or funding (Biermann et al., 2022b). In addition, there has been backlash against sustainability and multilateralism in several countries, including Brazil under Bolsonaro and Argentina under Milei (Aragão et al., 2024). That has affected the 2030 Agenda insofar as these far-right political movements and governments interpret it as a “socialist” agenda (Financial Times, 2024) and refuse collaboration on the SDGs (Dudar, 2024; Lemos, 2025).

Moreover, studies show that sustainability policy tends to address the SDGs very unevenly. Perhaps most notable is the phenomenon of cherry-picking or metonymy, that is, how certain actors may prioritize certain goals or targets that suit their interests while claiming adherence to the entire 2030 Agenda (Forestier and Kim, 2020; Siegel and Bastos Lima, 2020; Heras-Saizarbitoria et al., 2021). Nevertheless, little attention has been paid to the other side of the coin whereby certain goals may be particularly overlooked — which we refer to as neglected SDGs. This is a dynamic of SDG politics that has received far less

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: Karen.Siegel@uni-muenster.de (K.M. Siegel).

¹ Present address: RIFS Research Institute for Sustainability at GFZ Helmholtz Centre for Geosciences Potsdam, Berliner Straße 130, 14467 Potsdam. kms@rifs-potsdam.de.

² Present address: Institute of Applied Economic Research (IPEA), SEPS 702/902, Bloco C, Brasília, Brazil. guilherme.stein@ipea.gov.br.

³ Present address: FLACSO/CONICET, Tucuman 1966 (1026), Buenos Aires, Argentina. mdeciancio@flacso.org.ar

⁴ Present address: Universidad Tecnológica del Uruguay (UTEC), Av. Italia 6201 Edificio Los Robles, LATU, CP 11500, Montevideo, Uruguay. daniel.kefeli@utec.edu.uy.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esg.2026.100337>

Received 23 September 2025; Received in revised form 21 May 2026; Accepted 8 June 2026

Available online 13 June 2026

2589-8116/© 2026 The Authors. Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

attention. Yet we argue that such “neglected SDGs” are important precisely because they can point to gaps in sustainability claims. Literally, neglect’s etymology indeed comes from “not being read” (*neg-legere* in Latin), which demands inquiry into who is not reading what (Taylor, 2018, 37; Bastos Lima and Kmoch, 2021). We, therefore, can get a meaningful analysis of strategies for sustainable development by looking at neglected SDGs as they can help expose absences and shadows.

This research delves into the phenomenon of neglected SDGs in the context of bioeconomy agendas in South America, using three countries as case studies: Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay. The bioeconomy has been promoted as a pathway for sustainability and development around the globe and several countries now have bioeconomy strategies (Dietz et al., 2018; Varanini et al., 2024). However, that has not been without contestation and there are debates as to different understandings of the term or pathways that can be taken (Backhouse et al., 2021; Boyer et al., 2023). Therefore, how – and which – SDGs are used (or not) to buttress or add legitimacy to action is important and may inform on why certain goals may be left aside and ignored. Those Southern Cone countries, in particular, have been hotbeds of contestation and disputes over bioeconomy agendas (Bastos Lima, 2021a; Siegel et al., 2022; Tittor, 2021; De Queiroz-Stein et al., 2024).

Our paper thus pursues two aims: first, to examine empirically the extent to which bioeconomy policy strategies in South America cover the different SDGs and why certain Goals appear to be neglected; and second, to provide a first conceptual overview of different dimensions of neglect in this context and the various risks associated with it. Our research draws from a broad review of policy documents from each of those three countries, either on the bioeconomy and on SDG implementation, such as their Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs), to quantitatively assess how much attention is devoted to each of the 17 SDGs. That has been complemented qualitatively with a total of 50 semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders in the three countries, such as local researchers, government officials, the private sector, or non-governmental organization (NGO) representatives, particularly to probe into why those SDGs have been neglected.

The article is structured as follows. Section 2 presents our conceptual framework to unpack the notion of SDG politics and to guide our subsequent analysis of different dimensions of neglect. Section 3 provides a background on the bioeconomy as a sustainable development strategy in many parts of the world, with particular attention to South America. Section 4 details our research and data collection methods. Section 5 presents our findings and delves into four different SDGs that we find to be neglected in bioeconomy policies in Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay. Based on this, in section 6 we tease out and discuss different dimensions of neglect ranging from deliberate neglect, which poses severe risks, to incomplete reporting, with arguably more benign impacts. Section 7 concludes the article with our key points and recommendations for policy and for further research.

2. Neglect as a phenomenon of SDG politics

Research on the SDGs has highlighted the importance of looking beyond technical implementation and the monitoring of individual indicators to account for SDG politics, that is, the “processes of contestation over how the goals and targets are interpreted, institutionalized, and implemented (or not) in different country contexts” (Siegel and Bastos Lima, 2020, 2). Here we examine two aspects; power relations and interests on the one hand; and policy processes on the other. While these are usually treated separately in different literatures that are rarely put in dialogue with each other, we deliberately bring them together as key aspects that both shape SDG politics and resultant dimensions of neglect.

It is understood that policy processes often have biases and blind spots, which can result in ignoring issues or focussing on the ones

considered the most urgent. Nevertheless, this prioritization becomes problematic in cases of metonymy, where there is a pretence that all SDGs are taken into account whereas in fact only some are considered. This is even more important if those SDGs are deliberately ignored by powerful interests but are in fact relevant from a scientific evidence point of view, or they are important for actors who are often sidelined in decision-making processes such as women, Indigenous peoples, Black people, or peasant populations. In some contexts, such cherry-picking has become a strategy for avoiding discussion about trade-offs and concealing contradictions (Siegel and Bastos Lima, 2022, 100). Whereas policy makers frequently like to highlight synergies and win-win solutions, there are also trade-offs and goal conflicts between different SDGs that often go unacknowledged – and typically to the detriment of weaker parties (Kroll et al., 2019; Lusseau and Mancini, 2019; Nilsson and Weitz, 2019; Pradhan et al., 2017; Siegel and Bastos Lima, 2022; Warchold and Pradhan, 2025).

That relates to power exercised in the form of agenda setting in the context of the SDGs. Agenda setting refers to “what to think about” and “how to think about” certain issues (Balmas and Sheaffer, 2010). It is concerned both with “object salience” (i.e., what is emphasized) and “attribute salience” (i.e., which facets of something are presented and which ones are overlooked) (McCombs, 1997; Balmas and Sheaffer, 2010). Actors routinely compete for such interpretations and portrayals, as they define not only how issues are communicated but also the disbursement of resources, policy making and, ultimately, the course of governance (see Bastos Lima and Persson, 2020). The ability to determine what gets to be talked about and addressed --- and, crucially, what is left aside and neglected --- is often described in the context of governance as structural power (Clapp and Fuchs, 2009). As as Bachrach and Baratz (1962, p. 948) have seminally put it,

“Of course power is exercised when A participates in the making of decisions that affect B. But power is also exercised when A devotes his energies to creating or reinforcing social and political values and institutional practices that limit the scope of the political process to public consideration of only those issues which are comparatively innocuous to A. To the extent that A succeeds in doing this, B is prevented, for all practical purposes, from bringing to the fore any issues that might in their resolution be seriously detrimental to A’s set of preferences.”

However, not all form of neglect is necessarily purposeful or stemming from the machinations of more powerful actors deliberately seeking to undermine the interests of weaker ones. Structural power often manifests itself in the very dynamics of the policy process, in unintended ways, through governance failures linked to problems of information asymmetry, bounded rationality and a lack of coordination. At a more basic level, certain issues are overlooked because policy-makers lack access to scientific information and evidence produced in other spheres, such as universities, civil society organizations, international organizations or other government agencies; in other words, this is a problem of the policy-science-society interface (Pereira et al., 2019; Velander, 2025; D’Amato et al., 2025) or of gaps in government coordination itself. Here, we take the definition of coordination from Dzebo et al. (2025), who developed it from Peters (2018) and Candel et al. (2023), meaning “the alignment of policies, actors, and organizations to achieve shared objectives or defined goals. [...] Coordination establishes basic operational structures by assigning roles, sharing information, and aligning actions, through which it enables coherence by ensuring that policies support rather than conflict with one another” (Dzebo et al., 2025, p.542-543).

A lack of shared information and coordination can exacerbate a limited imagination. Just as the importance of (radical) imagination in devising strategies for sustainable transitions is argued (Moore and Milkoreit, 2020; Hammond, 2021), it must be assumed that the absence of imagination - or of governance mechanisms that foster collective imagination - can create a barrier to identifying new frontiers of

sustainability. The lack of an imagination capable of envisioning better futures may also reflect precisely the lack of engagement in participatory processes by diverse actors, with non-hegemonic perspectives on the issues under discussion, such as social movements, indigenous peoples or rural communities, who bring creativity stemming from a significant diversity of knowledge and value systems to policy formulation (Pereira et al., 2019).

Furthermore, limited imagination is closely related to cognitive biases that – whether collective or individual – influence decision-making processes (Cairney and Weible, 2017) and may affect issues that are fundamental to sustainability (Korteling et al., 2023). Among these biases, one of the most important in explaining this neglect is the pro-status quo bias, in which there is a decision-making lock-in, since the current state of affairs serves as the reference point upon which new strategies and programmes are built (Engler et al., 2019). The consequence is that policy alternatives are sidelined because they are considered a priori to be unviable; in other words, any change of course from recurring actions is viewed as a loss or as unlikely to yield significant gains. Ultimately, all of these are mechanisms by which structural power reproduce itself within policy processes, excluding important issues from the policy agenda. This is precisely the type of phenomenon we look at in our analysis of how bioeconomy strategies frame the SDGs.

3. Bioeconomy as a contested strategy for development and sustainability

Many actors in different countries have espoused the bioeconomy as a strategy for sustainability, from governments to industries and some civil society organizations. This is evident from the bioeconomy strategies that many countries have been developing and which form basis of our document analysis for the cases of Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay as set out in the next section, as well as institutions specifically on the bioeconomy, such as the National Bioeconomy Directorate created in Argentina in 2019 (Deciancio et al., 2022, 754). At the same time, the concept of bioeconomy is very broad, encompassing a wide range of areas including agriculture, forestry, biodiversity or biotechnology and it has been interpreted in many different ways. For those promoting bioeconomy in industrialised countries, the focus is often on decarbonisation and technological innovation to replace fossil-based products and address climate change. For many countries in the global South, however, there is a much stronger emphasis on promoting development (Puder and Tittor, 2023). A major aspect here is the upgrading of bio-based value chains from agriculture or forestry to increase technological and economic value in either established or new industrial sectors (de Queiroz-Stein et al., 2024; Siegel et al., 2022).

Yet, this promotion of bioeconomy is by no means uncontested. Recent research has found that in some countries, for example Argentina, bioeconomy agendas are dominated by a concentrated elite network that leaves few openings for other perspectives or a diversity of actors (Tittor, 2021; Siegel et al., 2022), while promises of development have been elusive (Puder and Tittor, 2023). In the biofuels sector — a key part of bioeconomy — several studies point to problems. Focussing on biofuel development in Brazil, India and Indonesia, Bastos Lima (2022) analyses the social impacts of bioeconomy promotion in terms of distributive, procedural, retributive and restorative justice. That comparative assessment shows that, despite its promises, bioeconomy promotion often has exacerbated inequalities and fostered unjust production patterns “where benefits and burdens are unevenly distributed, procedural governance over landscapes and resource use tends to be exclusionary, and there is little accountability or redress for past and present damages inflicted upon traditional communities and local populations” (Bastos Lima, 2022, 1).

Looking at Malaysia, South Africa, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Italy and Germany, Varanini and colleagues (2024) found that while bioeconomy policies seek to promote economic growth and address the sustainability problems of the fossil-based economy, they hardly address the environmental stresses that threaten the very functioning of the bioeconomy. Policies thus overlook significant risks that can undermine the whole bioeconomy concept. This is due to the focus on economic growth among the main actors and the under-representation of environmental actors in the processes of policy design. Eversberg and colleagues, in turn, have argued that more than anything else the bioeconomy constitutes a strategy for avoiding socio-ecological transformation (Eversberg et al., 2023). Still, comparative studies also show that there are important differences in terms of how actors in different countries interpret and implement the concept, leading to varied results — for example in terms of inclusiveness, that is, whose perspectives and views are taken into account and the range of concerns covered (Siegel et al., 2022).

Finally, a few studies have examined bioeconomy from the perspective of the SDGs. Some of these studies have shown considerable optimism about how the bioeconomy can establish pathways that enhance the achievement of the SDGs (Stark et al., 2022), while others have highlighted that the bioeconomy is not inherently sustainable (Deciancio et al., 2022). Looking at 48 European countries, Warchold and Pradhan (2025) found that the bioeconomy does not play a transformational role in achieving the SDGs and a more cohesive strategy addressing trade-offs and maximising synergies is necessary. When analysing biofuel policies in Brazil, Martinelli et al. (2022) found a relative consensus on the positive impact on SDGs linked to economic and technological aspects and the fight against climate change. However, there were significant divergences regarding the impacts of biofuels on SDGs linked to biodiversity conservation, health or social aspects. Overall, bioeconomy agendas are thus varied and subject to considerable contestation, offering an insightful case to examine which Goals have been typically neglected.

4. Data sources and methods

We examine bioeconomy as a proposed strategy for sustainability and development through the lens of the SDGs in three South American countries, Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay while also paying attention to developments at the regional level. Our analysis is based on two different sources of evidence: an analysis through coding of key bioeconomy strategy documents as primary sources, and a total of 50 semi-structured interviews with multiple stakeholders in each of those countries to assess our quantitative findings within their broader contexts. In addition, we used other policy documents and civil society reports as well as articles from the media and earlier research for triangulation and a more nuanced understanding of how bioeconomy and SDG politics intersect in the region.

To examine the extent and the ways through which the emerging bioeconomy strategies address or not the SDGs, we selected a set of relevant policy documents for each country published since the adoption of the 2030 Agenda in 2015. We also examined a key document by the UN Economic Commission on Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), to include a regional organisation that plays an important role in the diffusion of the bioeconomy concept in the region. Annex 1 provides an overview of the documents selected and a short explanation of each.

We then mapped these documents against the SDGs by coding the sentences that relate to specific Goals. In the coding, we included both explicit references to the SDGs and implicit ones, where a given Goal was not mentioned but the contents anyway corresponded closely to its

subject. In this process, we took into account not only the title of the SDG but also that of all the associated targets. In addition, we coded sentences that refer to the 2030 Agenda more generally other than to specific SDGs.

We classified an SDG as having ‘high coverage’ in bioeconomy strategy documents if more than 6% of the coding in all the selected documents of that country corresponds to it. That is because if we assume an equal distribution of the references between the 17 SDGs, each SDG would have 5.88% or about 6% of the total. More than that, therefore, signifies higher coverage than average. Conversely, we consider – quite strictly — that an SDG has ‘low coverage’ or is neglected if it corresponds to less than 1% of the mentions. This is a conservative criterion, which signals only residual or negligible attention. ‘Medium coverage’ designates more than 1% and less than 6%, indicating a non-trivial but below-average presence. This approach provides a simple and transparent heuristic that allows for systematic cross-country comparison and helps illuminate patterns of relative neglect that might otherwise remain obscured. However, it entails some important limitations. In particular, it does not capture the qualitative meaning of SDG references within documents or the salience/absence of specific SDGs in the broader political contexts. As such, frequency alone should not be interpreted as a direct proxy for substantive importance. To address these limitations, we triangulate our findings with qualitative evidence from interviews conducted in the three countries, incorporating perspectives from diverse social actors.

We conducted 50 semi-structured interviews with stakeholders from different sectors in the three countries. They came from five main areas: research and academia, civil society, the state, the private sector, and international organizations. In each country we focussed on a key bioeconomy area, notably agriculture in Argentina, forestry in Uruguay, and biodiversity in Brazil, as well as the broader bioeconomy context. Our aim was to understand who the main actors are, who takes up the concept of bioeconomy, and what interests are reflected in this — but also who criticizes that and for what reasons. We also sought to understand how interviewees define sustainability in relation to their area of work. That is, what they see as the main social, environmental and economic challenges, whether they see any risks or trade-offs, and how these might be addressed. We paid particular attention to those aspects that broadly related to the SDGs that appeared to be neglected from the coding. Finally, we checked these observations against the Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs) on the SDGs of the three countries to see whether and which aspects of bioeconomy were mentioned there. The idea has been to also probe into the reasons behind such apparent neglect.

Overall, our analysis of the documents and interviews covers the first seven years of the adoption of the SDGs, from 2015 until 2022, when we finished the interviews. The interviews were done in Spanish or Portuguese and professionally transcribed. The transcripts were then sent back to the interviewees for validation. The interviewees have given their consent for any quotations and direct references used in this article, with translations into English done by the authors themselves. Table 1 shows how many interviews we conducted per country and per sector.

Table 1
Research interviews conducted in the case study countries.

Sector	Argentina	Brazil	Uruguay
Research and academia	6	5	2
Civil Society	0	4	1
State	4	5	13
Private Sector	1	5	3
International Organization	0	1	0
Total	11	20	19

5. Findings: bioeconomy and the SDGs in South America

Our analysis of the bioeconomy strategy documents shows that all three countries as well as ECLAC explicitly refer to the 2030 Agenda as an international framework that is relevant for bioeconomy development. Similarly, in all three countries some of the VNRs mention bioeconomy and refer to bioeconomy strategy documents. It is therefore clear that policy makers across the region establish a link between bioeconomy and the SDGs.

Yet, there are some important differences as to how the relationship between the bioeconomy and the SDGs is represented. The Argentinean and the ECLAC bioeconomy strategy documents note in several places that bioeconomy development will support the 2030 Agenda, suggesting that this is pretty much an automatic process or that the SDGs are inherent to bioeconomy development. Bioeconomy development is, therefore, presented as leading to the achievement of the SDGs and sustainability more broadly. However, this lacks detail and is done in a rather generic manner, bringing into question the extent to which the SDGs are really used to foster sustainable and inclusive bioeconomy development — or whether they mainly serve as a discursive strategy to ward off potential criticism of certain bioeconomy activities and sectors.

The Uruguayan bioeconomy documents, in contrast, note that the bioeconomy strategy should align with the 2030 Agenda. In other words, the 2030 Agenda should be used to guide bioeconomy development. This is quite a different approach as it does not assume that bioeconomy development will automatically support the achievement of the SDGs, but rather it focuses on how it could be done. In the Brazilian Bioeconomy Action Plan, formulated within the National Strategy for Science, Technology and Innovation, each thematic line has a section on its adherence to the SDGs, stipulating to which specific Goals and targets those actions would contribute. The SDGs do not guide the formulation of the policy, but it is not assumed that the bioeconomy inherently contributes to the SDGs, either. Rather, it may align with some specific Goals and targets.

Broadly speaking, our coding of the key bioeconomy strategy documents indicates that all SDGs are covered to some extent. Five of the 17 goals have high coverage in all three countries and ECLAC, notably SDG 2 (Zero Hunger), SDG 8 (Decent work and economic growth), SDG 9 (Industry, innovation and infrastructure), SDG 12 (Responsible consumption and production), and SDG 15 (Life on Land), while SDG 13 (Climate action) has high coverage everywhere except in Brazil, where it has medium coverage. Across the region, these goals are therefore

Table 2
SDG coverage in bioeconomy strategy documents.

	Argentina	Brazil	Uruguay	ECLAC
SDG 1 No poverty	Medium	Medium	Low	Medium
SDG 2 Zero hunger	High	High	High	High
SDG 3 Good health and well-being	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
SDG 4 Quality education	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium
SDG 5 Gender Equality	Low	Low	Medium	Medium
SDG 6 Clean water and sanitation	Medium	Medium	Medium	High
SDG 7 Affordable and clean energy	High	High	Low	Medium
SDG 8 Decent work and economic growth	High	High	High	High
SDG 9 Industry, innovation and infrastructure	High	High	High	High
SDG 10 Reduced inequalities	Low	Medium	Medium	Medium
SDG 11 Sustainable cities and communities	Medium	Low	Low	Medium
SDG 12 Responsible consumption and production	High	High	High	High
SDG 13 Climate action	High	Medium	High	High
SDG 14 Life below water	Low	Low	Medium	Medium
SDG 15 Life on land	High	High	High	High
SDG 16 Peace, justice and strong institutions	Low	Medium	Medium	Low
SDG 17 Partnerships for the goals	Medium	Medium	High	Medium

presented as particularly relevant for bioeconomy development — and, conversely, bioeconomy development is seen as contributing to achieving the SDGs.

Yet we have identified four SDGs with only low coverage in two of the cases and medium elsewhere, and which can be considered to be neglected in bioeconomy strategies in the region. They are: SDG 5 (Gender equality), SDG 11 (Sustainable cities and communities), SDG 14 (Life below water), and SDG 16 (Peace, justice and strong institutions) (see Table 2). We have therefore scrutinised those SDGs in more detail, looking for further information from the interviews and the broader context to understand why these SDGs have been neglected.

5.1. SDG 5 gender equality

Our analysis of SDG 5 uncovers quite a different picture between Argentina and Brazil on the one hand, where the topic of gender equality is almost completely ignored in both policy documents and interviews, and Uruguay on the other, which has several specific policies pointing out its relevance for bioeconomy in the region. In both Argentina and Brazil, interviewees — including the women interviewed — made barely any references to gender-related topics. In Brazil, one of the women interviewed, the coordinator of an NGO, noted:

“Look, the social issue is quite distant from the environmental discussion, isn't it? [...] Fundamentally, much of the environmental discussion doesn't include a look at social issues, issues of race, gender, or violence.” (interview, online, 17.9.2021)

Overall, in Argentina and Brazil, discussions on the bioeconomy focus on economic and some environmental issues, leaving the social dimensions of development aside and, consequently, little room for gender issues. As other studies on Argentina have also found, bioeconomy networks tend to be quite male-dominated (Siegel et al., 2022; Tittor, 2021). This bias is problematic, given that SDG 5 is certainly relevant for agriculture as a key bioeconomy sector, as recognized also in several reports of international organization (FAO, 2023; FAO, 2019, 66). Women farmers frequently have less access to land, water, economic resources, technical assistance or to political decision-making. That means the impacts of sustainable or unsustainable bioeconomy promotion are more likely to affect women. In Brazil, for example, almost 69% of the jobs in agriculture are by men (CEPEA, 2020), but women farmers are known to play a key role in biocultural conservation and agri-food sustainability related to small-scale farming (Emperaire, 2021). Yet, in the studied period (2015–2022), rural social movements or grassroots organizations had little participation in bioeconomy policy-making in Brazil (see also Bastos Lima, 2021b).

In contrast, Uruguay's policy documents and interviews both pay much more attention to gender concerns. In one of the main documents that sets out the country's bioeconomy strategy, SDG 5 is specifically addressed in several aspects (Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Ministerio de GanaderíaAgricultura y Pesca, 2015). The document includes climate adaptation policies, identifying the role of women in rural areas during the development of the National Climate Adaptation Plan for the agricultural sector. Furthermore, the rural development policies set out in the document identify the following actions considering gender equity: differentiated policies to increase the competitiveness of family farming, including a programme for rural women; land access, where the incorporation of a gender perspective is promoted in the joint ownership of land provided in state land leasing programmes for small farmers; specific gender policies and actions such as communication campaigns on how women are portrayed in relation to family farming production, raising awareness on gender issues among technical public sector staff facilitating access to public policies, modifying existing

policies by incorporating weighted scoring in favour of rural women, and promoting and formulating specific policies targeting rural women such as the programme called “We Are Rural Women” (Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Ministerio de GanaderíaAgricultura y Pesca, 2015, 109–110). These measures cover some of the targets of SDG 5 quite explicitly, notably target 5.7 on equal access to economic resources including land access and target 5.9 to strengthen policies and legislation for gender equality.

The gender dimension was also mentioned by some interviewees from different ministries in Uruguay (interviews, online, 12.10.2021 and 12.11.2021). From the perspective of sustainable development and the role of public policies, one of the interviewees clearly recognized a need to address gender issues, acknowledging that women are “affected” and “segregated” in agricultural policy decisions and in the production methods where monoculture predominates. In this regard, a civil servant from what was then the Ministry of Housing, Land Use Planning, and Environment highlighted that the bioeconomy perspective incorporates production methods where women play a more prominent role, such as agroecology. Additionally, the interviewee identified gender issues that arise in response to the establishment of large bioeconomy-related enterprises, and outlined that these require specific policies and preventive action from public policies (interview, online, 12.11.2021).

5.2. SDG 11 sustainable cities and communities

When looking into SDG 11 in more depth, we found quite different dynamics compared to SDG 5. Here, our analysis showed that there are some links between bioeconomy and some of the targets of this SDG on topics such as biofuels, rural-urban relations and food systems, but these are more indirect. In the policy documents none of the three countries engage with those links in much depth or through specific actions, though in some cases the interviews helped understand indirect links that are not reflected in policy documents.

Arguably the most obvious neglect is in relation to target 11.2 on affordable and sustainable transport systems. Biofuels can play an important role in this regard, and in fact there are different policies in the region to promote the production and domestic use of biofuels such as soy-based biodiesel or sugarcane ethanol. Both Argentina and Brazil have blending mandates in place for replacing a percentage of fossil fuels with biofuels. This measure could have been related to promoting more sustainable urban transport, yet policy documents do not make this connection and instead focus on economic growth. In Brazil, an interviewee from an international organisation noted that advances in biofuels in Brazil could make fundamental contributions to achieving target 11.6 by helping to improve air quality in cities (interview, online, 15.10.2021). Biofuels could also contribute to target 11.2, which provides for the construction and expansion of sustainable public transport systems. However, this topic was barely touched on in the bioeconomy strategies proposed at the national level until 2022.

In addition, there are more indirect links with target 11.8, which aims to support positive economic, social and environmental links between urban, peri-urban and rural areas —also not explicitly mentioned in the policy documents. Brazilian bioeconomy policies, for example, could emphasize topics such as the promotion of sustainable urban agriculture or short food supply chains, acting in coordination with territorial planning policies to improve rural-urban relations. This was brought up by interviewees linked to NGOs and rural social movements, such as Instituto Escolhas, Via Campesina and the Smallholder Farmers' Movement (MPA). Here, it seems that these themes are neglected due to a problem of limited imagination on the part of policymakers, who fail to see the synergies between these areas, as well as rigid siloed institutions without sufficient civil society participation. As one of the interviewees

from civil society pointed out,

The MPA, for example, has had a slogan since 2015: "Alliance, Countryside and City." So we have to not only produce food for those who live in the city, which is where our farmers' income comes from, but also talk about the problems they face in the outskirts. The urban problems that affect us too, but which we can also contribute to tackling with our own experience. It's an exchange. (interview, online, 19.10.2021)

Similarly, in the Argentinean policy documents, cities and their sustainability are not addressed and they are not a central concern of bioeconomy experts in the country. Nevertheless, some of the interviewees made reference to the importance of developing and strengthening rural towns and surroundings to avoid the migration of rural workers to the cities, who frequently end up in poor neighbourhoods in the outskirts. In this regard, some interviewees point out the importance of the bioeconomy in creating jobs at the local level in rural areas.

As one policy-maker noted:

"We used to say: 'The issue in Argentina is not agriculture or industry, but industrialising agriculture.' (...) Argentina is basically an urban country. Almost 92% of the people live in cities and towns, and this process will intensify, so we must associate value creation with urban areas. This leads us to a new agrarian model, which is the urbanisation of the countryside. (...) So, we began to think of the bioeconomy as Argentina's main axis of development." (interview, online, 18.3.2022)

One of the Uruguayan reports states that the country follows principles established by the International Sustainable Bioeconomy Working Group (ISBWG) of the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), including the promotion of healthier and more resilient communities, as well as the sustainability of urban centres (Pittaluga, 2020, 41). However, this remains very general and there is no concrete indication of how bioeconomy initiatives might support urban sustainability. There are also no specific goals, instruments, or implementation pathways connected to SDG 11.

In Uruguay, many bioeconomy initiatives are framed as tools to strengthen regional development in rural areas beyond the country's main urban centres (Pittaluga, 2020, 17; Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Pesca, 2015, 99, 103, 161; Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Pesca, 2024, 81). This emphasis on revitalizing local economies may indirectly support urban sustainability by helping to reduce rural-to-urban migration and the expansion of informal settlements. In this sense, the bioeconomy could contribute to target 11.1, which seeks to ensure access to adequate, safe, and affordable housing and basic services and to upgrade slums. However, these potential connections are not made explicit in the policy documents.

Furthermore, other SDG 11 targets—such as 11.5 (reducing disaster-related impacts), 11.6 (reducing cities' environmental impact), and 11.4 (strengthening efforts to protect and safeguard cultural and natural heritage)—are contemplated within Uruguay's national public policies related to land-use planning and biodiversity conservation, as well as through subnational policies focused on waste management, among others. Nevertheless, these targets are absent from bioeconomy-related documents. For instance, although Uruguay has implemented policies promoting the use of biofuels, these were not framed around improving urban air quality (as aligned with target 11.6), but rather around energy diversification and enhancing national energy sovereignty. This pattern seems to reflect a framing bias: bioeconomy strategies do not typically consider urban environmental concerns, disaster risk reduction, or

heritage conservation as relevant components of the bioeconomy agenda. As a result, even when overlaps do exist between bioeconomy strategies and urban sustainability goals, they tend to remain unacknowledged or not considered in bioeconomy policy planning.

5.3. SDG 14 life below water

In relation to SDG 14, our analysis of policy documents and interviews in all three countries indicates two different forms of neglect: ignoring negative environmental impacts of key bioeconomy sectors and overlooking the potential of new possibilities for bioeconomy development.

First, agriculture as a major bioeconomy sector in the region has significant environmental impacts on both, freshwater systems and marine areas, which are completely neglected in policy documents. For example, Argentina's main biodiesel production hub—the Greater Rosario area in Santa Fe Province—is situated along the Paraná River, a central transport route for grains and biodiesel. Numerous studies have documented the environmental impact of glyphosate use in soybean cultivation on the river and its biodiversity. Indeed, one of the river's streams has recently been recorded as having the highest glyphosate concentration in South America (5002 µg/kg). (Cuzziol Boccioni et al., 2025). As the river flows into the ocean this also affects marine areas as set out in target 14.1 which aims to prevent and significantly reduce marine pollution of all kinds, in particular from land-based activities including nutrient pollution, as well as other SDGs, notably SDG 6 (Clean Water and Sanitation) and SDG 15 (Life on Land). In Uruguay, too, freshwater ecosystems and connected marine areas are under increasing pressure due to the expansion of the agricultural frontier. Approximately 93% of the national territory is under some form of agricultural use, contributing significantly to diffuse nutrient pollution in rivers, and several important river basins show eutrophic to hyper-eutrophic conditions, with significant degradation in water quality and impacts on associated biodiversity (Ministerio de Ambiente, 2020, 32). Yet, Uruguayan policy documents make only general references to the need to conserve and restore marine ecosystems, with no concrete pathways to implementation (Pittaluga, 2020, 32). Only one of the main bioeconomy policy documents includes a more direct reference to SDG 14, through a proposed line of work on responsible fishing (Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Pesca, 2015, 68-70). However, even in this case, marine concerns are not acknowledged in the framing of the sought bioeconomic transformation, which remains focused on terrestrial and agro-industrial sectors. Overall, by neglecting the environmental impacts of agriculture on water, policy-makers avoid a confrontation with the powerful agribusiness industry in the region. This reflects findings from other studies on the governance of the La Plata river basin, which found that it is politically very difficult to make binding agreements because of conflicting interests associated with the agribusiness and pulp industries as major sources of pollution (Siegel, 2017, 109).

Second, our analysis also shows that potential opportunities for bioeconomy development based on marine and aquatic resources are mostly overlooked. In Brazil, strategies for the bioeconomy have left the issue of aquatic biodiversity in the background although the country has some of the largest water resources in the world and has significantly expanded its marine protected areas. Within the National Science, Technology and Innovation Strategy for 2016-2022, there was a specific action plan for the bioeconomy and another for the oceans, indicating a view of those as separate things (Ministério da Ciência, Tecnologia, Inovações e Comunicações, 2018).

The topic of river and ocean biodiversity was also mentioned very little in the interviews. In Brazil, they appeared in a very modest way

and only superficially in speeches about the impact of agriculture on water resources or about conservation policies. None addressed the economic and technological potential of marine genetic resources. The situation is similar for Argentina, which possesses a 4700 Km-long marine coastline, and its principal rivers—the Salado del Norte, Paraná, Uruguay, and Colorado—cover a total of 6200 Km. Neither the interviews nor official bioeconomy documents in that country make reference to the goal of conserving life below water. As the attention of Argentinean bioeconomy documents and experts has been predominantly centred on the agricultural sector, scant consideration has been given to the blue bioeconomy or to connecting bioeconomic strategies with marine and riverine ecosystems. In Uruguay, SDG 14 is partially reflected in the Plan Sectorial de Biotecnología, which refers to ‘Blue Biotechnology’ (Gabinete Productivo, 2012, 67). The marine dimension of bioeconomic potential is therefore acknowledged to some extent, but there are no specific goals or actions related to the conservation or sustainable use of marine resources.

5.4. SDG 16 peace, justice and strong institutions

Our analysis of the overall political context and triangulation with interview data shows that this is another case where agriculture as a key bioeconomy sector has significant negative effects in relation to this SDG, but these are frequently ignored. Yet, once more there are also some differences between the three countries with a different situation in Uruguay.

Generally, across the region access to land is highly concentrated and unequal. There is a long history of sometimes severe conflicts over land, and in Argentina and Brazil these are still ongoing. Indigenous communities and small-scale farmers have often suffered from violence and marginalisation in such conflicts with little or no access to justice (Russo Lopes et al., 2021; Bastos Lima and Kmoch, 2021), directly contravening target 16.1 to reduce all forms of violence significantly and target 16.3 on promoting the rule of law and ensuring equal access to justice for all. Although agricultural expansion is often at the heart of these problems, conflicts over land are barely considered in the initial bioeconomy strategies that were developed in Argentina and Brazil or in the regional level document. On the contrary, as several interviewees emphasized, there was a weakening of the institutions to address environmental crimes in Brazil during the Bolsonaro administration (2019-2022), which led to an advance of organized crime in the Amazon region. As one interviewee, the coordinator of an important Brazilian NGO (interview, online, 17.9.2021), noted,

Another big problem, which isn't even a trade-off, is violence, right? Which is associated with everything we're talking about. Trafficking, violence ... we've seen it at alarming rates. [...] So we're talking about large ... let's put it this way, large criminal corporations that are very strongly associated with these activities. So this is a major problem that we have and that we need to tackle. This leads to violence, which leads to the deaths of environmentalists. Brazil is at the top of the list of countries that kill their environmental leaders. [...]

In several interviews it became clear that these issues are crucial for thinking about the type of development associated with the bioeconomy in Brazil. That is, either because they interfere with the expansion and international supply of agricultural commodities or because they are directly related to issues linked to biodiversity conservation, the human rights of traditional knowledge holders, and the development of new value chains based on the local socio-biodiversity.

In Argentina, the agribusiness sector occasionally links peace and justice to narratives emphasising the bioeconomy's role for national

economic development, often associated with the promotion of more stable institutions and inclusive societies (interview, online, 27.8.2021). However, this remains largely peripheral. Bioeconomy debates focus much more on the question of development, understood mainly as economic growth, as reflected both in documents and interviews. As one interviewee noted:

"In my opinion, the problem with the bioeconomy in Argentina—and I have tried to introduce this in all discussions—is Argentina's development path. How can we leverage a more comprehensive development by valuing our natural resources? The answer has consequences for all aspects of a development scheme: territorial and urban planning, forms of work, education, social services, transportation, and communication infrastructures etc. So, it's no longer easy to think about the bioeconomy from the perspective of 'let's protect the environment' or 'let's do business.' For me, the central issue was social sustainability" (interview, online, 18.3.2022).

Thus, despite conflicts surrounding the expansion of Argentina's agricultural frontier, the contamination of air and soil through glyphosate use, and social movements' claims regarding deforestation and the displacement of Indigenous populations for agricultural purposes (Huaranca et al., 2019; Lapegna, 2016), issues of peace and justice have remained absent from bioeconomy debates in the country.

That said, the Uruguayan bioeconomy strategies — and to a lesser extent also the Brazilian documents — do make brief references to SDG 16, but with a focus on targets 16.7 to ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels, and 16.8 to broaden and strengthen the participation of developing countries in the institutions of global governance. These targets are reflected mainly through the participatory and integrated process used in the development of the strategies, as well as through Uruguay's engagement with global governance structures, including participation in international working groups and the involvement of international and regional organizations in the drafting process (Pittaluga, 2020, 3; Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Pesca, 2024, 18-22). Aspects related to institutional strengthening were also reflected in the interviews, with interviewees from the public and the private sector pointing to issues such as the lack of coordination between different ministries (interview, online, 8.9.2021), the various institutional configurations established to address environmental issues (interviews, online, 10.11.2021 and 12.11.2021), the need to build capacity in key bioeconomy sectors (interview, online, 23.8.2021), or the absence of a strategic and long-term vision (interview, online, 15.10.2021).

6. Discussion: identifying different reasons for SDG neglect and why it matters

Our analysis demonstrates that the dynamics and reasons for SDG neglect differ in each case. We here identify and distinguish between at least three possible causes, each owing to a different underlying problem and having different consequences. They partly overlap and are not mutually exclusive. The different dimensions of neglect also highlight the importance of taking into account both power relations and interests, and policy processes as set out in our conceptual framework on SDG politics.

The first reason we have identified is deliberate neglect. It can occur when particular SDGs are controversial or conflict with key economic interests, meaning that including them would increase the political costs of implementation. In such cases, it seems likely that those SDGs are deliberately left out to avoid confronting powerful stakeholders, their vested interests, and hence to reduce political frictions. In the particular case of South America, agribusiness is a key economic sector and a major

political actor in all three countries. Previous research has shown that the cherry-picking of particular SDGs has played an important role in obscuring trade-offs or the negative impacts of intensive agricultural production (Siegel and Bastos Lima, 2022). Across the region, agriculture is a major focus of attention in bioeconomy policy documents and bioeconomy policy strategies play an important role in promoting this sector. Yet, the focus is mostly on large-scale industrialised agriculture associated with agribusiness rather than the different forms of smaller-scale production that also exist in the region. The neglect of SDG 5 (Gender equality) leads to the sidelining of important social movements that push for more socially inclusive and environmentally sustainable agricultural production (Borghoff Maia and Teixeira, 2021; Motta, 2021; Teixeira and Motta, 2024), while the neglect of SDG 16 (Peace, justice and strong institutions) means that important conflicts are ignored. Neglecting SDG 14 (Life below water), in turn, means overlooking the important ecological impacts of intensive agricultural production on aquatic ecosystems.

Generally, an important question to ask in order to identify deliberate neglect is whether more attention to the neglected SDG would run counter to dominant interests. There are serious political risks associated with deliberate neglect, including the entrenching of existing marginalisation, as we see in the case of SDG 5, where the marginalisation of women, in particular from peasant and indigenous communities, has a long history in the region.

The second reason for SDG neglect we identify is a bias in the framing of strategies for sustainability or development — or a type of limited imagination. In this case, SDGs are neglected because they are not perceived as being associated with the strategies promoted as they do not fit into the usual conceptual frameworks that guide public actions. In our cases, the initial bioeconomy strategies had such a strong focus on agriculture and rural areas that other potential bioeconomy sectors, in particular in relation to marine resources under SDG 14, were overlooked. To some extent this reflects broader historical patterns. Generally, the maritime sector has tended to occupy a marginal position within national productive strategies in most of South America, receiving limited policy attention and institutional investment. The potential of the blue bioeconomy is only now beginning to gain visibility in policy discussions in the region (Oliveira et al., 2025; Thompson et al., 2024; Matos et al., 2023). For instance, the new Brazilian National Strategy for Bioeconomy, launched in 2024, takes terrestrial as well as aquatic ecosystems as thematic subjects (Ministério do Meio Ambiente e Mudança do Clima, 2024). In the case of SDG 11, the contribution of biofuels to sustainable cities is not mentioned, presumably because this SDG is not intuitively associated with the dominant framing of bioeconomy strategies. If policy makers do not manage to innovate beyond the usual frameworks or to establish a dialogue with actors capable of proposing innovative pathways, an important risk of such bias in framing or limited imagination is that potential benefits remain side-lined and overlooked.

Finally, a third reason behind SDG neglect may be simply incomplete assessment and reporting, which can be related to a lack of inter-institutional coordination. In the Uruguayan case, for example, we saw that some SDGs are neglected in bioeconomy documents because they are already addressed through other existing policy instruments, but in a context of little cross-sectoral coordination. This may occur because the bioeconomy's contribution to a given SDG is indirect, not explicitly recognized, or already integrated into a different policy area that is not labelled as bioeconomy. This is, therefore, more a problem of informational asymmetry, where there is not enough evidence about the need to include SDGs in bioeconomy strategies, or there are no informational flows for the existing evidence to reach decision-makers. Arguably, this is the least serious dimension of neglect, but nevertheless it can still be associated with a risk of inefficiency or policy

incoherence.

7. Conclusion

This paper has analysed bioeconomy as a proposed pathway for sustainability and development across the world, taking three case studies from South America. We have used the full set of SDGs as a comprehensive framework for assessing how their bioeconomy strategies address or not sustainability concerns, identifying what we call neglected SDGs. While cherry-picking has become quite a well-known phenomenon in SDG politics, this is one of the first efforts to address the other side of the coin — SDG neglect. Our analysis demonstrates that the causes, political dynamics and consequences of neglect can vary significantly, owing to deliberate disregard, poor policy coordination, or ossified framings that fail to innovate and recognize links with more SDGs even when they would exist. Still, further empirical work is still needed to explore other possible reasons behind neglect — and their associated risks. For policymakers committed to fostering just sustainability transitions, it is crucial to pay attention to the phenomenon of SDG neglect and to mitigate it. For that, this assessment may be a first step as neglected SDGs precisely point to gaps and, thus, constitute avenues for bringing about institutional change.

This research also highlights the importance of a comprehensive analysis of sustainability strategies, in particular as efforts towards decarbonisation accelerate. While cherry-picking is relatively easy to see, neglect only becomes apparent when taking the full view. Furthermore, its consequences and risks are arguably more severe, as SDG neglect points not only to political opportunism but also to the weakest links in the chain of purported sustainability strategies. Further research can apply such a lens not only in other geographical regions, but also to other kinds of strategies beyond the bioeconomy, such as nature-based solutions, which also require critical and comprehensive examination to avoid further imbalances or creating new risks as a result.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Karen M. Siegel: Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Project administration, Supervision, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. **Guilherme de Queiroz-Stein:** Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Resources, Writing – review & editing. **Melisa Deciancio:** Conceptualization, Investigation, Resources, Writing – review & editing. **Daniel Kefeli:** Conceptualization, Investigation, Resources, Writing – review & editing. **Mairon G. Bastos Lima:** Conceptualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgments

We gratefully acknowledge funding by the German Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture (BMEL) (grant number 2219NR291) and the University of Münster through the research project 'Transformation and Sustainability Governance in South American Bioeconomies' (SABio) and the Swedish Research Council for Sustainable Development (FORMAS), grant number 2106-00351.

Annex 1: Overview of bioeconomy strategy documents

Document title	Authors	Year of publication	Number of pages	Website to download document	Description of the document
Argentina					
Bioeconomía Argentina. Visión desde Agroindustria	Eduardo Trigo, Elsa Vera Morales, Lucila Grassi, Joaquín Losada, Juan Patricio Dellisanti, María Eugenia Molinari, María Rosa Murmis, Miguel Almada, Sergio Molina	2015	40	https://agroindustria.gob.ar/sitio/areas/bioeconomia/archivos/000000_Bioeconomia%20Argentina.pdf	This document could be clearly considered as a bioeconomy strategy. It was authored by Eduardo Trigo, Elsa Vera Morales, Lucila Grassi, Joaquín Losada, Juan Patricio Dellisanti, María Eugenia Molinari, María Rosa Murmis, Miguel Almada, and Sergio Molina, and published in 2015 by the Ministry of Agroindustry. It introduces a general state of the bioeconomy in Argentina in terms of installed capacities and opportunities. In this sense, this document has a lot in common with the former 2015 document “The Argentinean bioeconomy: scope, present state and opportunities for its sustainable development” where part of the research group also participated. It identifies the concept of bioeconomy and the definition the Ministry will adopt in its policies. It includes a plan of action for the year 2017 with concrete policy strategies and instruments in order to promote bioeconomy within the different policy sectors, Ministries, and private companies.
Bioeconomía Argentina: modelos de negocios para una nueva matriz productiva	Roberto Bisang and Eduardo Trigo	2017	55	https://www.magyp.gob.ar/sitio/areas/bioeconomia/archivos/Modelo_de_negocios.pdf	This document is authored by Roberto Bisang and Eduardo Trigo and was published in 2017. It is a business-oriented text, focused on different business models for the development of bioeconomy in Argentina. It introduces an overview of what bioeconomy is and the installed capacities the country has for the development of bioeconomy and business opportunities for the private sector in this area.
Programa de Fomento de la Bioeconomía	Ministry of Agroindustry	2017	n/a	http://servicios.infoleg.gob.ar/infolegInternet/anexos/275000-279999/278205/norma.htm	Resolución 190-E/2017 (Internal act) This is a resolution (internal act) of the Ministry of Agroindustry from 2017 that falls in line with the strategy introduced in the document “Bioeconomía Argentina” aforementioned. This resolution creates the Program of promotion for bioeconomy, under the Bioindustry sub-secretariat, dependent on the Secretariat of added value for the Ministry of Agroindustry.
THE ARGENTINEAN BIOECONOMY: scope, present state and opportunities for its sustainable development	Eduardo Trigo; Marcelo Regúnaga; Ramiro Costa; Marisa Wierny; Ariel Coremberg	2015	54	http://179.43.114.246/greenstone/collect/bolcer/index/assoc/HASH130a.dir/TheArgentineanbioeconomy.pdf	This document has been prepared for Buenos Aires Grain Exchange in 2015. The document's authors are Eduardo Trigo, Marcelo Regúnaga, Ramiro Costa, Marisa Wierny, and Ariel Coremberg. This document introduces an overview of the country's capacities to develop a bioeconomy strategy and the potential that bioeconomy has for its economic development. To do that, it also presents some bioeconomy experiences underway in Argentina and a proposal for a bioeconomy strategy as public policy.
Brazil					
Estratégia Nacional de Ciência, Tecnologia e Inovação (2016-2022)	Ministério da Ciência Tecnologia, Inovação e Comunicação (MCTIC)	2016	136	http://www.finep.gov.br/images/a-finep/Politica/16_03_2018_Estrategia_Nacional_de_Ciencia_Tecnologia_e_Inovacao_2016_2022.pdf	In 2018, the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation launched upgraded policy papers, with Plan of Actions to specific strategic sectors, including one exclusive to Bioeconomy. Also, there is Plan of Actions to other sectors related, like biomes; biotechnology; Antarctica; food and nutritional security; sustainable agriculture; health; climate; oceans. All these Plan of Actions bring the contribution to each sector to SDGs.

(continued on next page)

(continued)

Document title	Authors	Year of publication	Number of pages	Website to download document	Description of the document
Plano de Ação em Ciência, Tecnologia e Inovação em Bioeconomia	MCTIC– Centro de Gestão e Estudos Estratégicos (CGEE)	2018	36	http://www.mctic.gov.br/mctic/opens/ciencia/SEPED/Publicacoes/ENCTI/PlanosDeAcao.html	Plan of Action in Science, Technology and Innovation to Bioeconomy. Detailed specific expected contribution of the actions to SDGs.
Bioeconomia da Floresta: A Conjuntura da Produção Florestal Não Madeireira do Brasil	MAPA	2019	45	http://www.florestal.gov.br/publicacoes/1727-bioeconomia-da-floresta-conjuntura-da-producao-florestal-nao-madeireira-no-brasil	This policy paper presents data and actions regarding non-timber forest products in value chains of socio-biodiversity.
Plano Decenal de Expansão de Energia 2029; PDE 2029)	MME/EPE	2020	293	https://www.epe.gov.br/pt/publicacoes-dados-abertos/publicacoes/plano-decena-l-de-expansao-de-energia-pde	Ten-year Plan of Energy Expansion to 2029. We have analysed just the chapter regarding bioenergy (21 pages) as this is the only part that is relevant for bioeconomy. This plan was launched in February of 2020 and, in face of corona crisis, the government anticipated to this year the Ten-year Plan of Energy Expansion to 2030. However, the 2030 plan is not a complete plan, but a forecast of the energy demand and the economic scenario.
Uruguay Plan Sectorial de Biotecnología	MIEM	2012	38	https://catalogo.latu.org.uy/opac_css/doc_num.php?explnum_id=345	Developed in 2011 within the framework of the Tripartite Sectoral Biotechnology Council (CSBT), with the joint participation of 25 companies and public and private institutions. Its drafting focused on establishing a state policy to guide the sector's development, promoting the formulation of coordinated and sustainable public policies aimed at fostering its growth.
Uruguay Agointeligente Los desafíos para un desarrollo sostenible	MGAP	2015	165	https://www.gub.uy/ministerio-ganaderia-agricultura-pesca/sites/ministerio-ganaderia-agricultura-pesca/files/2019-12/librocompletoconhipervinculos.pdf	The strategy "Uruguay Agro Inteligente" was initiated by the Minister of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries in 2010. The document describes the policy strategy and instruments implemented since the year 2010.
Consultoría para la elaboración de la Estrategia de Bioeconomía Sostenible (EBS) de Uruguay. Informe N. 2. "Aportes para la elaboración de la EBS de Uruguay"	Pittaluga, Lucía	2020	48	Internal document. We have received permission from the author to use this document for our analysis.	The document is the result of a Consultancy hired by the FAO. It was technically supervised by the FAO (Rome) and the Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries from Uruguay. The document is a first draft of a National Sustainable Bioeconomy Strategy in Uruguay. As in input of this document there are: 1) A previous report, done by the same author, where are detected and analysed all the policies related to bioeconomy in Uruguay; 2) 3 workshops organized by the Sustainable Bioeconomy Strategy Steering Committee (integrated by different representatives of the Government).
ECLAC Hacia una bioeconomía sostenible en América Latina y el Caribe Elementos para una visión regional	ECLAC Autor: Rodríguez, Adrián G. - Rodrigues, Mônica dos Santos - Sotomayor Echenique, Octavio	2019	60	https://www.cepal.org/es/publicacion/es/44640-bioeconomia-sostenible-america-latina-caribe-elementos-vision-regional	

Data availability

The authors do not have permission to share data.

References

- Aragão, R., Bastos Lima, M.G., Burns, G.L., Ross, H., Biggs, D., 2024. 'Greenlash' and reactionary stakeholders in environmental governance: an analysis of soy farmers against zero deforestation in Brazil. *for. Policy Econ* 166, 103267. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2024.103267>.
- Bachrach, P., Baratz, M., 1962. Two faces of power. *Am. Polit. Sci. Rev.* 56 (December), 947–952.
- Backhouse, M., Lehmann, R., Lorenzen, K., Puder, J., Rodríguez, F., Tittor, A., 2021. Contextualizing the bioeconomy in an unequal world: biomass sourcing and global socio-ecological inequalities. In: Backhouse, M., Lehmann, R., Lorenzen, K., Lühmann, M., Puder, J., Rodríguez, F., Tittor, A. (Eds.), *Bioeconomy and Global Inequalities*. Springer International Publishing, pp. 3–22.
- Balmas, M., Sheaffer, T., 2010. Candidate image in election campaigns: attribute agenda setting, affective priming, and voting intentions. *Int. J. Publ. Opin. Res.* 22, 204–229. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijpor/edq009>.
- Bastos Lima, M.G., 2022. Just transition towards a bioeconomy: four dimensions in Brazil, India and Indonesia. *For. Policy Econ.* 136, 102684. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2021.102684>.
- Bastos Lima, M.G., 2021a. Brazil between Bioeconomy barons and grassroots agroecology. In: *The Politics of Bioeconomy and Sustainability*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-66838-9_5.
- Bastos Lima, M.G., Kmoch, L., 2021. Neglect paves the way for dispossession: the politics of "last frontiers" in Brazil and Myanmar. *World Dev.* 148, 105681. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2021.105681>.
- Bastos Lima, M.G., Persson, U.M., 2020. Commodity-Centric landscape governance as a double-edged sword: the case of soy and the Cerrado working Group in Brazil. *Front. For. Glob. Change* 3, 27. <https://doi.org/10.3389/ffgc.2020.00027>.
- Bastos Lima, M.G., 2021b. Corporate power in the bioeconomy transition: the policies and politics of conservative ecological modernization in Brazil. *Sustainability* 13 (12), 6952.
- Biermann, F., Hickmann, T., Sénit, C.-A., Beisheim, M., Bernstein, S., Chasek, P., Grob, L., Kim, R.E., Kotzé, L.J., Nilsson, M., Ordóñez Llanos, A., Okereke, C., Pradhan, P., Raven, R., Sun, Y., Vijge, M.J., Van Vuuren, D., Wicke, B., 2022b. Scientific evidence on the political impact of the sustainable development goals. *Nat. Sustain.* 5 (9), 795–800. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-022-00909-5>.
- Biermann, F., Hickmann, T., Sénit, C.-A., Grob, L., 2022a. The Sustainable development goals as a transformative force? In: Biermann, F., Hickmann, T., Sénit, C.-A. (Eds.), *The Political Impact of the Sustainable Development Goals*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 204–226.
- Borghoff Maia, A., Teixeira, M.A., 2021. Food movements, agrifood systems, and social change at the level of the national state: the Brazilian Marcha das Margaridas. *Sociol. Rev.* 69 (3), 626–646. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00380261211009792>.
- Boyer, M., Kusche, F., Hackfort, S., Prause, L., Engelbrecht-Bock, F., 2023. The making of sustainability: ideological strategies, the materiality of nature, and biomass use in the bioeconomy. *Sustain. Sci.* 18 (2), 675–688. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-022-01254-4>.
- Cairney, P., Weible, C.M., 2017. The new policy sciences: combining the cognitive science of choice, multiple theories of context, and basic and applied analysis. *Policy Sci.* 50 (4), 619–627.
- Candel, J., Princen, S., Biesbroek, R., 2023. Patterns of coordination in the European Commission: an analysis of interservice consultations around climate change adaptation policy (2007–2018). *J. Eur. Public Policy* 30 (1), 104–127.
- CEPEA, 2020. Mercado de Trabalho do Agronegócio Brasileiro em 2019. Boletim CEPEA do Mercado de Trabalho. Centro De Estudos Avançados Em Economia Aplicada, Piracicaba.
- Clapp, J., Fuchs, D. (Eds.), 2009. *Corporate Power in Global Agrifood Governance*. MIT Press.
- Cuzzoli Boccioni, A.P., Lajmanovich, R.C., Repetti, M.R., Attademo, A.M., Zalazar, C.S., Manassero, A., Russell-White, K., Lancelli, M.V., Muchiutti, A., Leon, E.J., Peltzer, P. M., 2025. Ecotoxicological impact of agro-industry on streams from a South American basin: amphibian tadpoles as indicators of environmental health. *Water Environ. Res.* 97 (6), e70117. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wer.70117>.
- d'Amato, D., Rantala, S., Korhonen-Kurki, K., Locher-Krause, K.E., Stoffers, T., Falco, E., et al., 2025. A social network analysis of the European science-policy-society interface on biodiversity. *Conserv. Biol.* 39 (5), e70023.
- de Ganadería, Ministerio, Pesca, Agricultura y, 2024. Uruguay: Estrategia Nacional De Bioeconomía Sostenible. https://www.gub.uy/ministerio-ganaderia-agricultura-pesca/sites/ministerio-ganaderia-agricultura-pesca/files/documentos/publicaciones/Estrategia%20Nacional%20de%20Bioeconom%C3%ADa%20Sostenible_1.pdf.
- De Queiroz-Stein, G., Martinelli, F.S., Dietz, T., Siegel, K.M., 2024. Disputing the bioeconomy-biodiversity nexus in Brazil: coalitions, discourses and policies. *For. Policy Econ.* 158, 103101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2023.103101>.
- Deciancio, M., Siegel, K.M., Kefeli, D., de Queiroz Stein, G., Dietz, T., 2022. Bioeconomy governance and (sustainable) development. In: Deciancio, M., Nemiña, P., Tussie, D. (Eds.), *Elgar Handbook on the Politics of International Development*. Elgar, Publishers.
- Dietz, T., Börner, J., Förster, J.J., Von Braun, J., 2018. Governance of the bioeconomy: a global comparative study of national bioeconomy strategies. *Sustainability* 10 (9), 3190. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10093190>.
- Dudar, V., 2024. The right-wing radical vision of a multipolar world: specifics of anti-globalist rhetoric of leaders of contemporary right-wing politicians in the EU and the United States. *Foreign Aff.* 34 (5), 35–47. [https://doi.org/10.46493/2663-2675.34\(5\).2024.35](https://doi.org/10.46493/2663-2675.34(5).2024.35).
- Dzebo, A., Shawoo, Z., Browne, K., 2025. Does policy coherence make national implementation of global sustainability agendas more successful? *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.* 50.
- Emperaire, L., 2021. Gerar, cuidar e manter a diversidade biológica - introdução. In: Cunha, M.C. da, Magalhães, S.B., Adams, C. (Eds.), *Povos Tradicionais E Biodiversidade No Brasil: Contribuições Dos Povos Indígenas, Quilombolas E Comunidades Tradicionais Para a Biodiversidade, Políticas E Ameaças*. SBPC, São Paulo, pp. 14–18.
- Engler, J.O., Abson, D.J., von Wehrden, H., 2019. Navigating cognition biases in the search of sustainability. *Ambio* 48 (6), 605–618.
- Eversberg, D., Koch, P., Lehmann, R., et al., 2023. The more things change, the more they stay the same: promises of bioeconomy and the economy of promises. *Sustain. Sci.* 18, 557–568. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-023-01321-4>.
- FAO, 2019. Towards sustainable bioeconomy—Lessons learned from case studies. *Environ. Natural Resources Manag. Working Paper* 73. <https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/5509de4-34f9-47ea-b312-7b40029df66c/content>.
- FAO, 2023. The Status of Women in Agrifood Systems. FAO. <https://doi.org/10.4060/cc5343en>.
- Financial Times, 2024. Argentina's Javier Milei denounces UN's 'socialist' agenda. *Financ. Times*, 24 September.
- Forestier, O., Kim, R.E., 2020. Cherry-picking the sustainable development goals: goal prioritization by national governments and implications for global governance. *Sustain. Dev.* 28 (5), 1269–1278. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2082>.
- Gabinete Productivo, 2012. Plan Sectorial De Biotecnología, pp. 61–98. https://catalogo.latu.org.uy/opac.css/doc_num.php?explnum_id=345.
- Hammond, M., 2021. Imagination and critique in environmental politics. *Environ. Polit.* 30 (1–2), 285–305. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2021.1880062>.
- Heras-Saizarbitoria, I., Urbietia, L., Boiral, O., 2021. Organizations' engagement with sustainable development goals: from cherry-picking to SDG-washing? *Corp. Soc. Responsib. Environ. Manag.* 29 (2), 316–328. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2202>.
- Huaranca, L.L., Iribarnegaray, M.A., Albesa, F., Volante, J.N., Brannstrom, C., Seghezze, L., 2019. Social perspectives on deforestation, land use change, and economic development in an expanding agricultural frontier in northern Argentina. *Ecol. Econ.* 165, 106424. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.106424>.
- Korteling, J.E., Paradies, G.L., Sassen-van Meer, J.P., 2023. Cognitive bias and how to improve sustainable decision making. *Front. Psychol.* 14, 1129835. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1129835>.
- Kroll, C., Warchold, A., Pradhan, P., 2019. Sustainable development goals (SDGs): are we successful in turning trade-offs into synergies? *Palgrave Commun* 5, 140. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-019-0335-5>.
- Lapegna, P., 2016. Soybeans and power: genetically modified crops. *Environmental Politics, and Social Movements in Argentina*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190215132.001.0001>.
- Lemos, M.D.D., 2025. Backlash politics of sustainable development goals in the Brazilian context. *Rev. Int. Études Dév.* 258, 109–134. <https://doi.org/10.4000/14bb4>.
- Lusseau, D., Mancini, F., 2019. Income-based variation in sustainable development goal interaction networks. *Nat. Sustain.* 2 (3), 242–247. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0231-4>.
- Martinelli, F.S., Biber-Freudenberger, L., Stein, G., Börner, J., 2022. Will Brazil's push for low-carbon biofuels contribute to achieving the SDGs? A systematic expert-based assessment. *Clean. Environ. Syst.* 5, 100075. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cesys.2022.100075>.
- Matos, A.P., Pereira, A.C., Perretta, A., Romero-Murillo, P., Del Gobbo, L.M., Martínez, E. S.G., Hilevski, S., Sepúlveda, L.R., Boan, A.F., Sartoni, D., Pereyra, D.Y., Martínez, L. G., Liebana, C., Berdun, F., Friedman, I.S., Fischer, L., Ale, M.C., Da Costa, T.V., Sacristán, H.J., Fernández-Gimenez, A.V., 2023. Impressions of the scientific training in fishery and aquaculture biotechnology in Mar del Plata, Argentina: communication, networking, and multidisciplinary research. *Aquaculture* 574, 739685. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2023.739685>.
- McCombs, M., 1997. Building consensus: the news media's agenda-setting roles. *Polit. Commun.* 14 (4), 433–443.
- Ministerio de Ambiente, 2020. Informe del estado del ambiente (período 2016–2019). República Oriental del Uruguay. Versión Preliminar. https://www.gub.uy/ministerio-ambiente/sites/ministerio-ambiente/files/documentos/publicaciones/DCA-Info_rme_del_estado_del_ambiente_2019_29122020_digital.pdf.
- Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Pesca, 2015. Uruguay agointeligente: los desafíos para un desarrollo sostenible. <https://www.gub.uy/ministerio-ganaderia-agricultura-pesca/sites/ministerio-ganaderia-agricultura-pesca/files/2019-12/libro%20completo%20con%20hipervinculos.pdf>.
- Ministério da Ciência, Tecnologia, Inovações e Comunicações, 2018. Estrategia Nacional de Ciência, Tecnologia e Inovação 2016/2022: Sumário Executivo. Centro de Gestão e Estudos, Brasília.
- Ministério do Meio Ambiente e Mudança do Clima, 2024. Estrategia nacional de bioeconomia. Ministério do Meio Ambiente e Mudança do Clima. <https://www.gub.br/mma/pt-br/composicao/sbc/dpeb/estrategia-nacional-de-bioeconomia/estrategia-nacional-de-bioeconomia>. (Accessed 9 September 2025).
- Moore, M.-L., Milkoreit, M., 2020. Imagination and transformations to sustainable and just futures. *Elem. Sci. Anth.* 8, 1. <https://doi.org/10.1525/elementa.2020.081>.
- Motta, R., 2021. Feminist solidarities and coalitional identity: the popular feminism of the Marcha das Margaridas. *Lat. Am. Perspect.* 48 (5), 25–41. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0094582x211017896>.

- Nilsson, M., Weitz, N., 2019. Governing trade-offs and building coherence in policy-making for the 2030 Agenda. *Polit. Govern.* 7 (4), 254–263. <https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.v7i4.2229>.
- Oliveira, A.C.V., Silva, A.S., Spinola, C.A., Moreira, Í.T.A., 2025. Bioeconomia circular e biorrefinaria: conceitos, oportunidades e desafios considerando o uso de biomassa de microalgas no Brasil. *Rev. Bras. Planej. Desenvol.* 14 (1), 236–268. <https://doi.org/10.3895/rbpd.v14n1.16978>.
- Pereira, L., Sitas, N., Ravera, F., Jimenez-Aceituno, A., Merrie, A., 2019. Building capacities for transformative change towards sustainability: imagination in Intergovernmental Science-Policy Scenario processes. *Elem. Sci. Anth.* 7, 35. <https://doi.org/10.1525/elementa.374>.
- Peters, B.G., 2018. The challenge of policy coordination. *Policy Des. Pract.* 1 (1), 1–11.
- Pittaluga, L., 2020. Insumos para la elaboración de la Estrategia de Bioeconomía Sostenible (EBS) para Uruguay. Informe 2. Aportes Para la Elaboración De la EBS De Uruguay (internal document).
- Pradhan, P., Costa, L., Rybski, D., Lucht, W., Kropp, J.P., 2017. A systematic study of sustainable development goal (SDG) interactions. *Earths Future* 5 (11), 1169–1179. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017ef000632>.
- Puder, J., Tittor, A., 2023. Bioeconomy as a promise of development? The cases of Argentina and Malaysia. *Sustain. Sci.* 18 (2), 617–631. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-022-01284-y>.
- Russo Lopes, G., Bastos Lima, M.G., Reis, T.N., 2021. Maldevelopment revisited: inclusiveness and social impacts of soy expansion over Brazil's Cerrado in Matopiba. *World Dev.* 139, 105316.
- Siegel, K.M., 2017. Regional Environmental Cooperation in South America. Palgrave Macmillan UK. <https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-55874-9>.
- Siegel, K.M., Deciancio, M., Kefeli, D., Queiroz-Stein, G., Dietz, T., 2022. Fostering transitions towards sustainability? The politics of bioeconomy development in Argentina, Uruguay and Brazil. *Bull. Lat. Am. Res.* 41 (4), 541–556. <https://doi.org/10.1111/blar.1335>.
- Siegel, K.M., Bastos Lima, M.G., 2020. When international sustainability frameworks encounter domestic politics: the sustainable development goals and agri-food governance in South America. *World Dev.* 135, 105053. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105053>.
- Siegel, K.M., Bastos Lima, M.G., 2022. Trade-offs and SDG politics in South American agrifood governance. In: Breuer, A., Malerba, D., Srigiri, S., Balasubramanian, P. (Eds.), *Governing the Interlinkages Between the Sdgs*. Routledge.
- Stark, S., Biber-Freudenberger, L., Dietz, T., Escobar, N., Förster, J.J., Henderson, J., Laibach, N., Börner, J., 2022. Sustainability implications of transformation pathways for the bioeconomy. *Sustain. Prod. Consum.* 29, 215–227. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spc.2021.10.011>.
- Taylor, C., 2018. *Empire of Neglect: the West Indies in the Wake of British Liberalism*. Duke University Press.
- Teixeira, M.A., Motta, R., 2024. Broadening the climate movement: the Marcha das Margaridas' agenda for the climate (and other) crises. *Int. J. Polit. Cult. Soc.* 37 (4), 513–541. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10767-023-09464-z>.
- Thompson, C., Ortmann, A.C., Bolhuis, H., Makhalyane, T., Thompson, F., 2024. Harnessing marine microbiomes to develop a sustainable, all-atlantic bioeconomy. *mLife* 3 (2), 163–166. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mlf2.12124>.
- Tittor, A., 2021. The key role of the agribusiness and biotechnology sectors in constructing the economic imaginary of the bioeconomy in Argentina. *J. Environ. Pol. Plann.* 23 (2), 213–226. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1523908X.2021.1893162>.
- Varanini, G., Proestou, M., Goritz, N., Feindt, P.H., 2024. Explaining low salience of environmental resilience challenges in bioeconomy strategies: a cross-regional comparative analysis. *Earth Syst. Gov.* 21, 100218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esg.2024.100218>.
- Velander, S., 2025. From silos to synergy: mapping institutional collaboration across global environmental science-policy interfaces. *Environ. Sci. Pol.* 170, 104126.
- Warchold, A., Pradhan, P., 2025. Bioeconomy and sustainable development goals: how do their interactions matter? *Geogr. Sustain.* 6 (3), 100293. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geosus.2025.100293>.