

# Minutes: Meeting between IUCN Red List Committee and Proteus Partners

---

## Proteus Partnership Annual Meeting 2014: Monday 12<sup>th</sup> May

16:00 - 17:30

UNEP-WCMC Offices, 219 Huntingdon Road, Cambridge, CB3 0DL

**Welcome and introduction - Jon Hutton (Director, UNEP-WCMC).** Jon opened the meeting by thanking the Proteus Partners for offering their time to engage in dialogue with the IUCN Red List committee regarding commercial access to the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. He discussed the value of introducing both communities to each other, noting that IUCN had approached UNEP-WCMC to help facilitate the meeting. He also highlighted reference to the IUCN Red List data in IFC PS6 criteria as a key contributor to increased industry interest in use of species spatial distribution data.

**Introduction to the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species - Mike Hoffman (Chairman of the IUCN Red List Committee).** Mike welcomed Proteus Partners on behalf of the IUCN Red List Committee. He outlined the function and membership of the Committee<sup>1</sup> and summarized the objectives of the Committee's ongoing 3-day meeting. Mike opened the meeting by expressing the Committee's key questions to Proteus Partners: How do industry partners want to use the IUCN Red List data? How can the IUCN Red List data be used to improve industry decision-making?

**Overview: Use of the Red List by the private sector- Jon Ekstrom (Director, The Biodiversity Consultancy).** Jon presented on the "Application of the IUCN Red List data for industry risk management". See the presentation [here](#).<sup>2</sup>

**An industry perspective on using the Red List - Mark Johnston (Group Ecologist, BP).** Mark provided an overview of how Red List data is routinely used across BP, and gave a personal perspective on how species range data might be applied in businesses decision making.

After the opening remarks and presentations, Jon Hutton and Melissa Tolley (Head of Business and Biodiversity, UNEP-WCMC) facilitated an open discussion addressing:

- **The industry's practices in using Red List data and assessing species distributions.** Proteus Partners highlighted that the Red List data (within the Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool [IBAT]) are primarily used in the early screening stages, and do not replace the collection of site-scale data during a project. In particular, the data are most useful in the

---

<sup>1</sup> The Red List Committee oversees and guides the work of the Species Survival Commission (SSC) on biodiversity assessments. This includes responsibility for the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Members present at the meeting included species experts, representatives of the Red List partnership and the Red List Secretariat.

<sup>2</sup> Presentations are available in the Partner area of the Proteus website – the password is "pose1don"

early stages of project development such as when bidding at short notice on exploration areas.

- **Barriers and opportunities for industry use of the Red List data.** During discussion, several key limitations were identified by industry as inhibiting more comprehensive use of Red List data.
  - The Red List status of a species is assessed at the global scale, while industry frequently want to use the data at the local scale
  - There is a lack of understanding by industry of the coverage and data gaps in species assessments
  - There is no avenue through which industry can currently access spatial data for individual species ranges
  - The Red List Extent of Occurrence is often considered coarse and does not clearly include information on Area of Occupancy or Extent of Suitable Habitat which would be more applicable to industry use at the site or local scale
  - Industry would find direct communication with in-country experts who might be able to provide further information on specific species useful in interpretation of the Red List data, for example in reference to the degree of confidence in the Red List assessment. [IUCN responded that there was a large global network of species specialists contributing to the Red List and that facilitating access would be seen as a service provision by the Committee and something they would be willing to engage in for an appropriate fee.]
- **Ways that industry could support the Red List through data sharing.** It was noted that large engineering consultancies involved in baseline surveys on behalf of industry collect significant amounts of species data and that there was an opportunity to discuss the sharing of this data with IUCN to complement information used by IUCN in species assessments. A potential limitation is for data collected in countries where the national government stipulates that the data collected by industry is owned by the government and cannot be shared outside of the country (e.g. Indonesia).
- **Support the Red List Committee would like to seek from industry with regards to financing the Red List and understanding corporate data needs.** Members of the Red List Committee explained the key ways in which they could see support from industry being of benefit to the operation of the Red List:
  - **A better understanding of industry processes and how they are using the Red List data and information to inform decisions and policy.** For example, the Committee would be interested to know whether industry is concerned by extinction threat only, or also takes into consideration decrease in population as a significant impact/risk; and whether assessments related to species are outsourced within company practice. Industry

representatives responded to the latter that risk assessments are often carried out in-house, whereas Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) tend to be outsourced.

- **Making financial contributions towards the cost of maintaining the Red List** The Committee explained the significant cost associated with maintaining a comprehensive knowledge product such as the IUCN Red List. In response, industry representatives noted that authorisation to pay for a dataset depends on other departments within the company who require a detailed justification for financial expense and therefore a clear business case for use of the data or contribution of funding was needed. The price-point companies are willing to pay for any dataset will depend on the value of those data to company processes. If the data are too expensive to access, companies will opt not to use them.
- **Better communication between industry and IUCN re species information.** Better communication channels can facilitate the exchange of expertise on species, as well as contribution of species observation data.

At the conclusion of the discussion, three opportunities were identified to be given further consideration:

1. **Options for industry to access IUCN Red List spatial data** (noting that IUCN are currently looking at how to include and price species range maps via IBAT)
2. **Options for industry to provide input to the Red List** from their own assessments (noting that these are often carried out by consultants and large engineering firms – who were not present at the table)
3. **Options for IUCN to facilitate access to experts** within the species specialist groups in-country, to support industry understanding of the Red List data and local or regional knowledge on individual taxa and species groups.

# Minutes: Proteus Annual Meeting

---

## Proteus Partnership Annual Meeting 2014: Tuesday 12th May

8:30 - 17:30

Jesus College Upper Hall, Cambridge, CB5 8BL

### Objectives of the meeting

- Share updates on progress in the Proteus workplan
- Gather feedback on direction of Proteus workplan
- Provide contextual information for the data provided through Proteus
- Discuss developments in protected areas and engagement at the World Parks Congress
- Consider Proteus data and resources in the context of business approaches to biodiversity management
- Discuss data access and sharing

### Introductory Session

Presentations are available [here](#).<sup>1</sup>

**Welcome – Mark Johnston (Group Ecologist, BP)** started the day by welcoming everyone to the BP-hosted meeting with a “biodiversity moment”.

**Welcome and participant introductions – Jon Hutton (Director, UNEP-WCMC)** invited participants to introduce themselves and welcomed two new Partners who joined in early 2014: BG Group and Woodside Petroleum. He then opened the meeting with a brief history of the Proteus Partnership and a reminder of its objectives. Jon highlighted the creation of the authoritative version of the Word Database of Protected Areas as one of the Partnership’s most notable achievements to date.

Jon highlighted that the acquisition of new datasets was a key development objective for the next 10 years of Proteus and that this will require the development of new partnerships, with both conservation organisations (e.g. IUCN) and industry groups (e.g. consultants). Jon described the options considered by UNEP-WCMC to make data more accessible to consultants. Partners stated their willingness to help in these endeavours, as it is in their interest to work with consultants that use biodiversity data correctly.

---

<sup>1</sup> Presentations are available in the Partner area of the Proteus website – the password is “pose1don”

**Proteus Achievements 2013-2014 – Melissa Tolley, Matt Jones and Ruth Fletcher (Business and Biodiversity, UNEP-WCMC)** jointly provided an overview of achievements and progress in the Proteus workplan over the last 12 months and the expenditure and budget for 2013 and 2014. Melissa stated the meeting objectives and introduced the key achievements of the Partnership in 2013 and the start of 2014. Matt reported on the finances for 2013 and the budget for 2014. He described the financing model of Proteus, highlighting that the impact of the Partnership is amplified because it enables the leveraging of funds from other sources. He went on to describe progress in updating protected area records in the WDPA, explaining the development of the UN List of Protected Areas in 2014 and updates to the WDPA structure and web-delivery. He also presented on new reports and quality indicators on protected areas, and provided a sneak preview of the new IBAT layout, which is scheduled for launch at the end of 2014/early 2015. Finally, Ruth summarized recent developments around marine data, including the new Manual of Marine and Coastal Data launched at the meeting and updates on the marine Critical Habitat layer created by UNEP-WCMC.

After the presentation, Partners first asked for clarifications on the feedback mechanism between UNEP-WCMC and Proteus Partners with regards to the tools, layers and knowledge products developed as part of the Partnership. Melissa emphasized that feedback is extremely valuable to UNEP-WCMC, and welcome at any time, in any form. The ensuing Q&A revolved around two main topics: the WDPA and marine data and resources.

#### **The WDPA:**

- Partners were interested in the difference between “authoritative” and “unvalidated” data in the WDPA. Naomi Kingston (Head of Protected Areas, UNEP-WCMC) explained that under the new WDPA structure *unvalidated data* will refer to data received from non government sources, but which are considered reliable by UNEP-WCMC (e.g. sourced from NGOs working closely with national governments in the management of their protected area information). The data is unvalidated, because they have not been confirmed by a national government body.
- Partners asked whether **Ecologically and Biologically Significant Areas (EBSAs)** are to be included within the WDPA. Damon Stanwell-Smith clarified that EBSA data do not exist yet, and it is a designation identifying areas in the marine realm according to a set of scientific criteria developed by the CBD. The designation is not linked to a commitment for protection. While the designation is important, these areas do not meet the definition of a protected area.
- Partners expressed their need for easily accessible information on **protected area management effectiveness**. Neil Burgess (Head of Science, UNEP-WCMC) pointed out that this is one of the key challenges for the conservation community. As such it will be a key discussion point at this year’s World Parks Congress (WPC) in Sydney, Australia. Naomi Kingston elaborated that the management effectiveness assessment is done at country-level, often using the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) which is designed to use the WDPA ID. A shortcoming of the METT process is the lack of information on biodiversity outcomes.

#### **Marine data and resources:**

- Partners asked whether data available on the **Ocean Data Viewer (ODV)** could be integrated into IBAT, and whether the ODV data is open-access for Proteus Partners. Jon Hutton clarified that whilst the majority of datasets available on the ODV are available to the Proteus Partners, there are a few for which appropriate permissions are still being sought from the data providers. IBAT has a focus on providing information on protected areas, Key Biodiversity Areas and the

species grid. This supports IBAT's goal of providing a clear, global view of areas important for biodiversity as agreed between the four IBAT Partners. There are no current plans to incorporate other layers (such as those from the ODV) where these do not directly contribute to that goal.

- Partners requested clarifications on the **marine Critical Habitat Layer**. It was emphasized that the Critical Habitat layer does not map Critical Habitat in itself, but the likelihood of habitats qualifying as Critical Habitat. It should therefore be considered as an advisory tool. Melissa clarified that it is UNEP-WCMC's intention to share the Critical Habitat data layer with the Proteus Partners. Negotiations are underway to acquire permissions for commercial use of the underlying datasets for this purpose.
- The Partners also discussed **marine mammal data**. Ruth highlighted that UNEP-WCMC were keen to hear which species were of greatest interest to Proteus Partners in order that data for those species could be prioritised.

Finally, Partners asked about the **myPolygon** tool. Melissa explained that further development of myPolygon would require substantial investment since UNEP-WCMC had experienced technology challenges in live data processing of information within the WDPA due to the large size of the dataset.

## Session 1: A new agenda for Protected Areas? The next 10 years

Presentations are available [here](#).

***Marine Protected Areas, Ecosystem-based management and Blue Growth - Richard Kenchington (Professor, Environment and Natural Resource Management, Australian National centre for Ocean Resources & Security)***. Richard described the uniqueness of governance in marine systems, illustrated with lessons learned from development of the Great Barrier Reef as a mixed used protected area, incorporating oil and gas activities. He concluded that Marine Protected Areas may be meaningless if not part of a wider ecosystem-based management framework.

The ensuing Q&A addressed the possible contributions of the extractives industry to Ecosystem-based management (EBM). Richard stated the need to maintain equally high standards across countries, regardless of differences in the severity of the regulatory framework.

The discussion then turned to the aim within Aichi Target 11 relating to Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) that "by 2020...10% of coastal and marine areas...are conserved...". Richard noted that, given current developments, it is unlikely that the target will be achieved. He noted that it is false to interpret the target as a prediction that 10% of coastal and marine areas will be sustainably managed, or will be managed as no take areas. In his opinion, MPAs are needed closest to land and the large majority of these should be IUCN Category VI. A major difficulty in the implementation of the target will be to ensure good enforcement over large areas.

***Protected areas over the next decade – Neil Burgess (Head of Science, UNEP-WCMC)***. Neil reviewed trends in protected area designations, leading to predictions on the types of protected areas which might proliferate and where they may expand in the future. In particular, Neil described trends for Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCAs) and private protected areas.

The subsequent discussion focussed on private protected areas. Some countries have documented large numbers of private protected areas (e.g. UK, USA, Canada, Chile and South Africa). Private ownership does not guarantee long-term persistence of the protected area status. Governments may also tender out the management of protected areas to private conservation organisations and institutions.

***KBAs new and old – supporting protected areas and biodiversity conservation – Leon Bennun (Director of Science, Policy and Information, Birdlife International)***. Leon presented on the new process for identifying Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs), including the implications for existing and new sites, the data available and how this will evolve and the next steps once the process is launched. In particular, Leon pointed out that the inventory of Marine Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas (IBAs) is completed and available through the Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool.

Two questions were raised following the talk: (1) How are KBAs applicable to Critical Habitat (IFC PS6)? (2) Are KBAs identified as potential candidate sites for protected areas?

(1) Leon noted that there are several possible criteria for KBA identification and many of the criteria of KBA identification are aligned with Critical Habitat criteria. However, some are identified on the basis of Vulnerable (VU) species which would not qualify them as Critical Habitat as the IFC PS6 criteria for Critical Habitat only references Critically Endangered (CR) and Endangered (EN) species (this information on KBA triggers is specified in the data attributes).

(2) Leon further highlighted that there is some (often significant) overlap of KBAs with protected areas and they are designated on the basis of a standardised approach to identifying biodiversity value that is widely accepted globally. Therefore they provide a good selection of sites for expansion of the protected area network that cover important ecological values. However, in general, there is no formal process at the national level to protect KBAs in national legislation and they are not delineated with that intention. In reality, there are countries where some or all KBAs are protected due to overlap with protected area designations.

***UNEP-WCMC involvement in the World Parks Congress and opportunities for private sector engagement – Naomi Kingston (Head of Protected Areas, UNEP-WCMC)***. Naomi described the significance of the current and previous World Parks Congress's (WPC) for the global development of protected area management. She provided an overview of the Congress programme, and outlined options for the involvement of Proteus Partners.

In the ensuing discussion Proteus Partners asked for clarification as to what their involvement at WPC would effectively mean. Melissa Tolley commented that the Proteus Partnership would be represented at the event by UNEP-WCMC through their support of the WDPA. There was consideration of whether a dedicated Proteus event should be organized. This could take the form of an information session on the contributions of the Proteus Partnership to conservation, or an industry event on the challenges and benefits of companies working in and around protected areas. A side discussion took place following the main meeting, in which it was agreed that UNEP-WCMC would write to each of the Proteus Partners to lay out the options.

## Session 2: Support for biodiversity management: Governance and knowledge

Presentations are available [here](#).

***Governance of the oceans and Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction – Kristian Teleki (Director of Global Engagement, Global Ocean Commission)***. Kristian presented on the work of the Global Ocean Commission, specifically how the Commission is addressing threats and challenges, and emerging uses, in the high seas. He highlighted sea bed mining as a potential industry which might be faced with the governance challenges of Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction in the medium term. He finished by discussing some of the options for changes in ocean governance as identified by the Commission.

In answer to the Partners' questions on progress through global political processes, Kristian elaborated that the post-Rio<sup>2</sup> failure to address marine governance most likely stemmed from a lack of a scientific evidence-base and a concern that the implementation of an agreement would undermine sovereign authority (limiting claims on Exclusive Economic Zones).

***Marine data: past, present and future – Damon Stanwell-Smith (Head of Marine Programme, UNEP-WCMC)***. Damon provided an overview of how marine data is generated and which specific marine datasets are developed and managed by UNEP-WCMC. He highlighted the uniqueness of the recently completed marine gap analysis (published as the [Manual of marine and coastal datasets of biodiversity importance](#)). Emerging work by UNEP-WCMC's Marine programme relates to area based planning by multiple industry sectors in Areas Beyond National Jurisdictions (ABNJ). Damon requested feedback from the Partners on whether they had further interest in participating in this work. Further, he noted that the new layout of the Ocean Data Viewer (ODV) is schedule for launch on June 23rd, 2014.

The ensuing discussion elaborated on the stewardship for maintaining ecosystem services in the marine realm. Richard Kenchington highlighted that the valuation of ecosystem services is commonly undertaken, however the attribution of responsibilities for their safeguard is very difficult.

***The value of conservation modelling – Lucas Joppa (Head of Conservation Science Research Unit, Microsoft Research)***. Lucas's presentation provided guidance on the use of conservation models. Models are a simplified substitute of a complex real system. Based on the premise that "all models are wrong but some are useful", Lucas emphasized that the main consideration when selecting a model for use is whether it will be useful to the purpose of the individual user. The point is all the more valid given the vast number of conservation models currently being developed and used.

The ensuing discussion revolved around the value of species distribution models in identifying on-ground species presence. Lucas highlighted that the IUCN Red List spatial data could not be used in this way. One of the Partners noted that their current methodology to flag possible species presence is to use Extent of Occurrence (EOO) data from the Red List in conjunction with metadata indicating their preferred habitat type to filter the species range data to those areas where appropriate habitat still exists.

---

<sup>2</sup> Rio+20 is the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (UNCSD), held in 2012, which took place 20 years after the Rio Earth Summit which was held in 1992.

## Session 3: Implementation and information: Private sector support for conservation

Presentations available [here](#).

***The billion dollar leap of faith: do biodiversity offsets work? – Joe Bull (Director, Wild Business)***. Joe provided insight into debates surrounding the use of biodiversity offsets. He emphasized that a vast knowledge gap exists even among experts, with lack of information on the location of offsetting sites and a lack of evidence-base as to their success. He concluded that currently the theory of the practice still outweighs the evidence.

The subsequent Q&A revolved around the time period over which an offset can be considered successful. Joe noted the unrealistic nature of the theoretical objective to offset biodiversity impacts in ‘perpetuity’. Currently biodiversity offset management plans tend to be set up over time periods up to 100 years.

The discussion then turned to the experience with biodiversity offsets collected by Proteus Partners. Partners confirmed the need for more evidence on the successful application of the approach. The group also discussed the perception of the offsetting approach by the public and the media. Partners noted that offsets cannot be marketed as a perfectly identical replacement of biodiversity, but represent a realistic and pragmatic solution. Neil Burgess noted that the RSPB and other conservation organisations have accumulated a significant body of knowledge on the feasibility of recreating habitats, which can contribute to the assessment of viability of offsetting strategies.

***Sharing biodiversity data from the private sector – Tim Hirsch (Deputy Director and Head of Participation, GBIF Secretariat)***. Tim presented an overview of the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF). He described the way GBIF collates data, the growth in records over time and explained the process by which data are published and repatriated through the GBIF portal. He went on to discuss how the private sector can contribute data to GBIF.

## Close of meeting

***Summary, Review and Close of Meeting – Jon Hutton (Director, UNEP-WCMC)***.

Jon concluded the meeting by thanking BP for hosting the event, thanking the speakers for their excellent presentations and thanking the Partners for their contributions to the discussions during the day. He reiterated a few key messages from the day, including that there will be a need to stay apprised of the developments from the World Parks Congress in November, the likely evolution of KBAs following the launch of the new standard later in 2014, and the ways that emerging issues in the marine realm are being addressed through efforts to improve data.

After the meeting, BP hosted a walking tour of Cambridge and dinner in the College for all participants.

# Minutes: Proteus and CSBI Workshop on protected areas - mitigating impacts and identifying opportunities

---

**Proteus Partnership Annual Meeting 2014: Wednesday 14<sup>th</sup> May**

8:00 – 18:00

Jesus College Upper Hall, Cambridge, CB5 8BL

## Objectives of the meeting

1. To provide information on protected areas that supports the development of company biodiversity management and impact mitigation approaches (linked to one of the key objectives of the Proteus Partnership)
2. To provide a secure forum for industry to share and learn from mutual experiences of operations in or near protected areas, facilitated by the protected areas experts of UNEP-WCMC and feeding into discussion of these topics at the World Parks Congress
3. To support the CSBI work streams through the sharing of knowledge and experience from industry and the protected areas community, contributing to the body of information on good practice approaches for screening, impact mitigation and managing activity in and around protected areas

The objectives of the workshop are described in greater detail in a document circulated before the meeting, available [here](#).

## Introductory Session

**Welcome and introductions from UNEP-WCMC and CSBI - Jon Hutton (Director, UNEP-WCMC) and Gertjan Roseboom (CSBI representative, Shell).** Jon Hutton opened the meeting by thanking BP for hosting, welcoming back the Proteus Partners to the second day of the annual Proteus meeting, and welcoming colleagues from CSBI to the joint workshop. Gertjan echoed Jon's welcome and gave a brief overview of CSBI and the value of the day.

**Overview and objectives of the protected areas workshop – Melissa Tolley (Head of Business and Biodiversity, UNEP-WCMC).** Melissa outlined the objectives of the meeting, explained the format of the day and the intended content of the planned sessions. She also led a round of participant introductions. See annex 2.

Melissa highlighted that the meeting was being held under Chatham House Rule.

## Session 1: Demystifying Protected Areas

**101 on protected areas – Naomi Kingston (Head of Protected Areas, UNEP-WCMC).** Naomi gave an overview to protected area definitions, designations and categorisations and highlighted how this information was stored within protected area records in the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA). She discussed common misconceptions and misunderstandings relating to protected areas. The presentation is available [here](#).

Discussion following the presentation highlighted the following points:

- WDPA data mostly comes from national governments and it is a long and time-consuming process to identify the correct department/individual to approach and to access data.
- Information relating to designation and categorisation is provided by national governments to the WDPA together with spatial location and boundary data.
- Training is available from UNEP-WCMC on interpretation of protected areas information and use of the WDPA.
- The WDPA is a commercially restricted dataset and is available to Proteus Partners and through IBAT subscription.
- Proposed protected areas should also be recognised by practitioners and included in company and finance sector approaches to protected area screening and management.

**Finance sector approaches to protected areas and tools for assessment – Giulia Guidi (JP Morgan).** Giulia provided an introduction to the finance sector's approach to protected areas and use of protected area data.

**Q&A and discussion on the use of protected area designations and categories in industry screening approaches and indicators.**

After the session, discussion covered the following points:

- **Finance institutions require clients to recognise potential biodiversity impacts at an early stage** and request effective mitigation approaches to be identified. Refusing finance is a last resort and rarely realised as companies tend to respond to requests to detail biodiversity and protected area impacts through the provision of the appropriate information.
- **No-go policies are used by a number of financial institutions** (particularly in relation to World Heritage sites) but are rarer in company approaches. It was recognised that to make no-go approaches effective, they need to be implemented by governments as part of protected area enforcement.
- **Biodiversity extends beyond protected area boundaries.** Protected areas are not always a good proxy for biodiversity as their delineation has political, economic and social drivers as well as being for the purpose of nature conservation. If companies want to ensure they manage potential impacts on biodiversity they should also consider other biodiversity features. It is therefore useful for companies to use additional approaches to recognising biodiversity value, such as Key Biodiversity Area (KBA) designations or the identification of Critical Habitat.

## Session 2: Impact mitigation approaches for operations in and around protected areas

**Session overview – Melissa Tolley (Head of Business and Biodiversity, UNEP-WCMC).** Melissa gave an overview to the impact mitigation session, highlighting that whilst governments often allow development in protected areas, potential impacts can be significant and therefore there is a need for effective mitigation approaches to be implemented by industry. The session focused on the following questions:

- 1) How are companies currently mitigating impact?
- 2) What additional activities or approaches could be undertaken to mitigate impact and how feasible are these to implement effectively?

Industry presentations:

- *ICMM's no-go commitment to World Heritage Sites – Ruth Thomas (ICMM).*
- *Managing impacts from oil and gas extraction in the Wadden Sea (Netherlands) – Gertjan Roseboom (Shell).*
- *Rio Tinto Exploration's methodology for accessing protected areas and mitigation activity in Namib-Naukluft National Park (Namibia) – Peter Harvey (Rio Tinto).*
- *Monitoring impacts and planning mitigation in Yasuni National Park (Ecuador) – Oriol Lopez (Repsol).*
- *Supporting monitoring and environmental awareness in Halimun Salak National Park – Andrea Steffke (Chevron).*

Discussions in smaller break-out groups focused on the following topics:

1. **No-go commitments** - Company commitments to avoiding developments in protected areas (either all protected areas or specified protected area designations or categories)
2. **No Net Loss and Net Positive Impact approaches**- Company commitments to achieving NNL or NPI on biodiversity when operating within protected areas
3. **Risk-based assessment and adaptive response** – Company approaches to determining risk using a site-based assessment of a number of biodiversity criteria, which may include the type of protected area and management objectives as well as biodiversity features present
4. **No defined approach or innovative alternatives** - Companies do not apply a specific management response when operating within protected areas. This group discussed the benefits, challenges and impacts of excluding explicit policies and approaches to mitigating impact in protected areas and what alternative strategies could be used.

Five questions were posed for discussion within each break-out group:

1. Are there any examples of using the approach which can be shared by the group participants?
2. What are the benefits and impacts for biodiversity and protected areas of taking this approach? (Impacts may be positive or negative).
3. What are the benefits to the company associated with adopting the approach both in terms of the policy commitment and the practical aspects of implementation?
4. What are the challenges or barriers associated with taking this approach both in terms of the policy commitment and the practical aspects of implementation?
5. What support would be needed to improve and increase the application of this approach? (Examples of support may include access to data, guidance materials, external expertise, and finance).

### *Group 1: No-go commitments*

There were several companies operating no-go policies, most of which referred to World Heritage Sites, and only one of which included other types of protected areas (Ramsar sites). Generally the group felt that no-go commitments pose significant difficulties for business development and the conservation of biodiversity. No-go commitments can only work effectively if they are adopted industry-wide or are part of a national policy applied to all operators. Variability in government application of the protection of protected areas results in potentially less 'biodiversity aware' companies working within these sites while the companies who have potentially better capacity or willingness to manage the risks are excluded due to their no-go commitment.

### *Group 2: NNL and NPI approaches*

Many companies are starting to adopt commitments to achieving NNL or NPI, either across the company or at the project level in response to financial lending requirements. While the benefits to a company of adopting sustainable approaches are increasingly clear, there is little current evidence of the added value of an NPI/NNL approach and there continues to be a potential risk to companies that fail to meet such quantifiable commitments. As a result of a lack of consensus around metrics and methodologies, this approach is currently requiring significant resources that in some cases may be better invested in impact mitigation techniques. This approach does however hold great potential and is leading to greater efforts to measure and monitor biodiversity. Its future success will require both the development of standardised yet context specific methodologies and metrics, and support from national governments in terms of land-use planning efforts and legal frameworks.

### *Group 3: Risk-based assessment and adaptive response*

The group agreed that across their collective experience and among the majority of companies, a risk-based approach is the standard way to deal with operations in or near protected areas. It was considered possible to adopt a risk-based approach without necessarily excluding other options alongside or in addition. The benefits to the company were clear, not least in being well accepted internally for many other (non-biodiversity) processes. Benefits to biodiversity were considered to be equally strong, including the ability to be flexible and adaptive to conditions on the ground, and responding to the identified needs and priorities for conservation.

### *Group 4: No defined approach or innovative alternatives*

This group found this topic particularly challenging to discuss because of its open ended nature and the difficulty in interpreting the idea of 'no' defined approach. There is always 'some' approach. The approaches that the other break-out groups discussed (no-go, NNL and NPI, risk based) were all applied to some extent by the companies in the group, as were use of IFC's Critical Habitat concept and biodiversity feature-based approaches. The group used the concept of a landscape scale approach to discuss the subsequent questions as it was viewed as non-specific in the context of protected areas. Landscape scale approaches were considered to be interesting because of their flexibility but very difficult to apply because it is not clear where the company's responsibility ends.

### *Summary of the discussion after break-out group feedback*

Much of the group discussion focused around the issue of no-go. No-go was viewed as distinct from avoidance because it is a blanket commitment not to access an area as opposed to a decision made following assessment of specific site-based biodiversity features in the case of avoidance. It was felt that governments should be targeted with lobbying over no-go approaches to protected areas, rather than the private sector, as industry no-go approaches would not be necessary if protected area legislation was effectively enforced or governments viewed these sites as off-limits to development when undertaking landscape planning. One of the key problems with no-go commitments adopted by companies is that unless they are applicable to every company in the sector, they achieve little more than allowing companies with less stringent approaches to biodiversity management to operate in sensitive areas rather than those with more advanced impact mitigation strategies. It was recognised that discussion about industry no-go commitments is likely to be high on the agenda of the development stream at the World Parks Congress in November 2014 and that it would be highly valuable to have industry represented in these discussions to provide pragmatic arguments to the debate.

## Session 3: Opportunities for industry to support protected area management

**Session overview – Melissa Tolley (Head of Business and Biodiversity, UNEP-WCMC).** Melissa gave an overview to the opportunities session, explaining that the context was to consider support that companies could offer to protected area management above and beyond the requirements of impact mitigation or where the protected area in question is not impacted. The session focused on the following questions:

- 1) How are companies currently supporting protected areas?
- 2) What options exist for engagement of the private sector in protected area management and how feasible are these to implement?

Industry Presentations:

- *Monte Cristo offset: collaborative approach to enhanced offsetting, contributing to protected area management in Australia – Richard Head (BG).*
- *Existing protected areas as offset sites – experiences from the Dominican Republic and Panama – Gail Ross (Barrick Gold).*
- *Enhancement and creation of protected areas through biodiversity offsetting in Papua New Guinea – Lucie N'Guessan (ExxonMobil).*
- *A landscape approach to impact management, supporting biodiversity conservation in the San Juan National Forest (Colorado, US) – Mark Johnston (BP).*

Discussions in smaller break-out groups focused on the following topics:

1. **Creation or extension of protected areas** - Companies invest in the creation of a new protected area or the expansion of an existing protected area. This may be as part of an offset scheme or as an independent conservation initiative.
2. **Provision of resources** - Companies provide resources to support the management of a protected area. This could be an unallocated financial contribution, investment in research in or around the park, contribution of non-monetary resources (e.g. vehicles, fencing, infrastructure, supplies), or investment in staff costs or staff training among other options.
3. **Support for conservation objectives** - Companies provide support to the site's management agency for the implementation or development of the protected area's management plans (where this is the conservation planning tool in use), or support for other planned activities aimed at fulfilling a site's conservation objectives and maintaining and enhancing the biodiversity features for which the site was originally designated. This includes working with local managers and other stakeholders to set, achieve and monitor activities contained within local management plans and may also involve some degree of financial investment in the implementation and monitoring of the plan.

4. ***Support local community environmental stewardship*** - Companies engage with local communities in and around protected areas to provide financial or other support for activities that will incentivise local support for the protected area and relieve local pressures. This may include investment and support for livelihood diversification (e.g. nature based tourism, trade in local crafts) and livelihood support (e.g. improved farming methods / market access), as well as environmental education and awareness campaigns on the ecosystem service values of protected areas.

The same five questions as posed in Session 2 were again addressed in the break-out groups.

#### ***Group 1: Creation or extension of protected areas***

The group recognised the many potential benefits to biodiversity of supporting the creation or extension of protected areas. The group also saw creating or extending protected areas as presenting considerable opportunities to support company approaches to impact mitigation. This included improving the resilience of the local environment to disturbance; providing future offset locations and helping companies to obtain a social licence to operate. Creation of protected areas was considered to be a relatively simple activity if there is support from an in-country partner to undertake subsequent long term management. However, in countries where governance is weak the task is likely to be significantly more complicated. Barriers to supporting new/extended protected areas as a mitigation approach include problems with existing land tenure and lack of government support or capacity to undertake the necessary legal process and subsequent protected area management. Government, local NGO and local community support is necessary for success.

#### ***Group 2: Provision of resources***

All businesses in the group had examples of their companies contributing resources to protected areas. Such contributions were considered to be extremely important for both business and biodiversity. However, in order to ensure the full value of contributions is recognised, it is necessary to develop better indicators and metrics to monitor the outcomes of the contributions.

#### ***Group 3: Support for conservation objectives***

The group considered that any opportunities to support protected areas would be tied back to support for the conservation objectives. Specific examples were given where companies had referred to the management objectives when designing their impact mitigation approaches. The benefits to a company included the presence of a robust framework on which to base actions, as well as some confidence that their support was being well targeted. Conservation benefits were seen to be dependent on the quality of the management plan or process to develop it. The key challenge was perceived to be associated with poor plans, leading to poor outcomes.

#### ***Group 4: Support local community environmental stewardship***

There are often very clear biodiversity benefits to be realised through supporting local communities in and around protected areas, both in terms of reducing local impacts and creating a sense of “ownership” leading to greater protection of areas. However, despite this link many of the company efforts that support local communities are in response to the company’s social policies. Such efforts are therefore often not connected to conservation activities. This typically results from the separation of social and environmental departments within many large companies. Greater effort

may be needed to understand local impacts and dependencies and the value of local knowledge that would require greater cooperation with local NGOs. A more cohesive approach may be supported through guidance on the 'easy to achieve' ways in which community support can benefit biodiversity and protected areas.

## Close of Meeting

**Summary, outputs and next steps – Melissa Tolley (Head of Business and Biodiversity, UNEP-WCMC).** After the session, Melissa led a discussion on the potential outputs that could be generated from the workshop and next steps. She explained that UNEP-WCMC were keen to share industry perspectives with a wider audience, even if anonymous and generically expressed, and highlighted that there had been discussion around the following options:

- **Meeting Minutes:** to be distributed following the workshop
- **White Paper on industry involvement with protected areas:** to collate the findings from the workshop into a report on impact mitigation approaches and opportunities to support the management objectives of protected areas. This could be for internal (Proteus/CSBI) or broader circulation. Ideally, information captured in this report could feed into discussions on development activity held at the World Parks Congress.

Discussion on this option considered whether there is currently enough information available from industry to challenge no-go advocacy and whether it would be possible for companies to discuss this issue at the World Parks Congress in a useful debate.

- **Scientific Response:** An opinion piece in one of the scientific journals for conservation.

Melissa concluded the workshop by thanking the participants and colleagues at UNEP-WCMC and highlighting the great value UNEP-WCMC saw in collaboration with CSBI to discuss issues surrounding protected areas and how pleased they were to have generated broader industry engagement in these discussions through this partnership.

**Final comments and close of meeting – Jon Hutton (Director, UNEP-WCMC) and Gertjan Roseboom (CSBI representative, Shell)** closed the meeting with final words of thanks.

A drinks reception was held for all participants in the Rooftop Bar of the Varsity Hotel in Cambridge, hosted by JP Morgan and Barrick Gold, on behalf of CSBI.