

# Minutes of the Proteus Meeting 2013

Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> to Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> June 2013, ConocoPhillips, Houston, Texas

## Participants

Name	Organisation	Title
<b>Proteus Partners</b>		
Gail Ross	Barrick Gold	Manager, Biological and Ecological Sciences
Jorge Briceno	BHP Billiton Petroleum	Lead Environmental Specialist
Becky Keogh	BHP Billiton Petroleum	Environmental and Regulatory Affairs Supervisor
Mark Johnston	BP	Group Ecology Expert
Samuel Walker	BP	Group Marine Science Expert
Brian Boulmay	BP	Geomatics Team Lead
Sarah Connick	Chevron	Manager, Environment
Maxine Madison	ConocoPhillips	Environmental Consultant
Sarah Terry	ConocoPhillips	Senior Principal Environmental Consultant
Karl Fennessey	ConocoPhillips	Director, Water and Biodiversity
Jennifer Barringer	ConocoPhillips	Environmental Assurance Manager
Sabrina Watkins	ConocoPhillips	Sustainable Development Manager
Paola Pedroni	eni	Senior Advisor Environment
Richard Davi	ExxonMobil	Scientific Associate
Carmen Santamaria	Repsol	Environmental Specialist
Oriol Lopez	Repsol	HSE Technician
Mercedes del Rio	Repsol	GIS Co-ordinator
Jooske van de Graaf	Shell	Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Advisor
Raymond Valente	Shell	Marine Scientist / HSSE Consultant
Steinar Eldøy	Statoil	Leading Advisor Impact Assessment
Stan McBride	Total	Manager Environment and Social Department
<b>Observers</b>		
Julia Vidonish	Esri	Energy Sales Associate
Diana Connett	Hess	Senior Specialist, Environmental Policy and Engagement
Anne-Marie Fleury	ICMM	Director of Environment

Guest speakers		
Daniel Dunn	Duke University	Research Associate, Marine Geospatial Ecology Lab
Conrad Savy	IFC	Biodiversity Specialist
Tom Brooks	IUCN	Head of Science and Knowledge
Jon-Paul Rodriguez	IUCN Species Survival Commission	Vice-Chair
Jon Ekstrom	The Biodiversity Consultancy	Director
Derek Tittensor	UNEP-WCMC / Microsoft Research	Senior Marine Biodiversity Scientist
Ernesto Enkerlin-Hoeflich	World Commission on Protected Areas (IUCN)	Chair
UNEP-WCMC		
Jon Hutton	UNEP-WCMC	Director
Matt Walpole	UNEP-WCMC	Head of Science, Economics, Policy and Partnerships
Melissa Tolley	UNEP-WCMC	Head of Business, Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services
Naomi Kingston	UNEP-WCMC	Head of Protected Areas
Matt Jones	UNEP-WCMC	Senior Programme Officer, Business, Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services

## Objectives of the Meeting

1. Provide an overview of progress in the Proteus workplan and report back on finances.
2. Update partners on plans for the WDPA & provide information on IBAT developments and marine and coastal data.
3. Provide political and institutional context around the growing biodiversity agenda.
4. Provide an update on IFC Performance Standard 6, Critical Habitat and relevant data.
5. Hear about Partners' use of biodiversity data & obtain Partner feedback. Tuesday 18<sup>th</sup> June

## Introduction

**Welcome and Introductions - Jon Hutton** opened the meeting by thanking ConocoPhillips for kindly offering to host the first Proteus meeting in the US. Maxine Madison and Jennifer Barringer introduced ConocoPhillips and discussed the ways ConocoPhillips engages in the Proteus Partnership. Jon Hutton then led a round of introductions, recognising that there were many participants who had not attended a Proteus meeting before. He then went on to present an overview of UNEP-WCMC and the history of the Proteus Partnership.

**Report on Progress - Melissa Tolley** presented on the progress to date under the current workplan as part of the new phase from 2013-2015 which was successfully renewed with the Partners. Melissa introduced the newest Partner, JOGMEC, who were unfortunately unable to attend. She went on to report on the finances for 2012 and budget for 2013. Melissa provided highlights of activities currently underway, including improvements to the WDPA, priority country data reports and country factsheets, updates to IBAT data and improvements in marine and coastal data. Finally, the new objective on the Global Biodiversity Agenda, and the associated materials, support, tutorials and factsheets were introduced.

After the session discussion turned to the quality of data, and how this is presented to the Partners, noting that the map of a single quality score per country is difficult to interpret. It was acknowledged that the country data factsheets which are now provided give excellent information for individual countries – but it is important also to see a global comparison of data quality. UNEP-WCMC agreed to develop an improved data quality indicator to communicate to the Partners.

The availability of the data to download was clarified, with an explanation that through the Partnership there are several options to access the available data. The need to alert Partners of updates was highlighted.

## Session 1: Protected Areas and the WDPA

**Improving the WDPA - Naomi Kingston** presented on the World Database on Protected Areas. The presentation covered progress and improvements in the WDPA and discussed how the Centre is tackling updating data for countries where the data access is complicated. She presented on her interest in assessing the processes and structure of the WDPA and announced a review of the framework for the WDPA to be carried out in 2013/2014.

After the session, discussion turned to the way UNEP-WCMC engages with governments, especially in relation to data disputes. The policy which addresses possible copyright infringements and subsequent removal or data (UNEP-WCMC's Take Down Policy) was explained, and Jon Hutton confirmed that issues are dealt with on a case-by-case basis with the relevant authorities.

Partners questioned whether the ad-hoc feedback they provided on data was useful and how their data queries were investigated. UNEP-WCMC explained that this feedback was useful in improving data records and led to investigations on protected area boundaries, identification of duplicate records, and research into original sources of data. A question was raised over protected area boundary disputes and how these were reflected in the WDPA. Jon Hutton noted that there may be differing interpretations, and that those differences manifest in compliance risk and operational risk. He stressed that the WDPA is unlikely to be able to present every permutation or boundary dispute, but that it can present official information along with flags and alerts of alternative boundary interpretations.

The issue of companies sharing data with UNEP-WCMC and others was discussed. For protected areas data, this can be provided direct to UNEP-WCMC. In reference to the broader issue of sharing biodiversity data, an old UNEP-WCMC project, Ecoishare, designed to collect EIA data, was explained. Ecoishare was developed with industry partners but faced problems accessing data. Private sector interest in such a sharing programme has recently been growing and it was noted that UNEP-WCMC may wish to look into this concept again. The Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF) was also highlighted as an avenue to share biodiversity data.

Further information was requested on plans to make more detailed data on protected areas available. Naomi Kingston explained that she would like to see links to national sources but noted the real challenge this presents for a dataset encompassing 234 countries/territories and 197,000 records.

Data for marine protected areas was also discussed with the principle issues being related to relatively slow designation of marine areas compared to terrestrial areas, and the capacity in conventions to provide digital data.

***World Parks Congress (WPC) and the World Commission on Protected Areas – Ernesto Enkerlin-Hoeflich*** presented on the vision for the WPC in Sydney 2014. The presentation covered how the WPC will relate to the Aichi Target 11, discussed the focus on implementation, and made an open call to industry to become more involved.

After the presentation, discussion turned to the big issues expected to be evident at the World Parks Congress. Ernesto Enkerlin-Hoeflich outlined the importance of the IUCN business plan which focuses on:

- Effective and equitable governance of nature's uses
- Deploying nature-based solutions to climate, food and development
- Valuing and conserving biodiversity

It was noted that this business plan has been in place for some time and is already active. An 80% focus of effort on implementation was explained, with the remaining 20% directed to new activities. The opportunities for new partners to support implementation was discussed, including IUCN's intention to approach the development finance community to make protected areas a core part of the development agenda.

The negative response towards the extractives sector involvement at the previous WPC in Durban was highlighted as a serious barrier to industry participation. Ernesto highlighted that the next congress is expected to be much more receptive to industry involvement. The Partners noted that they need to decide if they should attend as individuals or with representation through an industry association. UNEP-WCMC's role in convening this dialogue was noted.

## Session 2: Important Biodiversity Areas, Ecosystems and Integrated Data

***Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool Review - Jon Hutton*** presented on the recent review carried out into the structure, governance and direction of the IBAT. Jon presented on the key findings of the review related to governance, data and technology.

After the session, discussion turned to the availability of species data in IBAT. Thomas Brooks (IUCN) noted that the Red List polygons were not being made available partly because of the business case for separate delivery.

Partners asked if anything surprising had come from the review. Jon Hutton noted that he was pleasantly surprised that the Alliance seemed to be working so well, especially since the Alliance Partners have to align the interests, missions and objectives of four different organisations to make IBAT successful. Jon noted that there is unanimous support for the continued delivery of the tool.

***A Global Standard for KBAs - Thomas Brooks*** presented on the process to create an umbrella standard for Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs). Thomas covered the draft criteria, thresholds and delineation. He went on to explain that the process will be complete and presented at the World Parks Congress in 2014.

After the session, discussion turned to the relationship between designations and it was noted that the emerging standard needs to add value to, and not take value from, existing approaches. The process aims to find ways in which criteria can be combined and aggregated to allow the overall standard to embrace the existing standards. In relation to protected areas, it was highlighted that many legally protected areas qualify as KBAs so the data on protected areas is directly relevant, however not all existing protected areas have global significance for biodiversity, and would in these instances not be designated as KBAs.

Thomas explained the expected differences between KBAs before the implementation of the new standard and after, noting that in the marine realm there will likely be additional sites incorporated whereas the overall coverage in terrestrial areas is unlikely to differ too greatly from the current KBA network.

**Red List of Ecosystems – Jon Paul Rodriguez** presented on the proposed IUCN Red List of Ecosystems intended to be developed by 2025. Jon Paul described the conceptual framework being developed and the alignment to the categories and criteria of the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species.

After the session, discussion turned to the implementation of the process and its timeframes. Jon Paul noted that the most difficult element was the data development. The issue of the marine realm was raised and it was noted that classification of marine ecosystems was an additional complexity.

## Session 3: Marine and Coastal Biodiversity and Emerging Data

**Knowledge and uncertainty in the Marine Realm – Derek Tittensor** presented on marine data, the difficulties faced in data collection, the limitations this places on analysis and understanding, and solutions being trialled to improve knowledge in the future.

After the session discussion turned to the data and the focus on species which was acknowledged to be a starting point rather than the final objective for marine data development. The likelihood of modelled good-quality data becoming available in response to data deficiencies in the marine realm was highlighted. The issue of sourcing data from EIAs was raised, noting that as these data are public records and therefore available for use. However, data access issues, data quality and consistency in collection methodologies were recognised as problems. IPIECA's Marine Geospatial Bibliography (<http://mgb.ipieca.org/>) was noted as a good example of a repository for sharing marine data and information.

**Marine critical habitat mapping – Melissa Tolley** presented on an approach being trialled at UNEP-WCMC to map Critical Habitat in the marine realm according to IFC PS6 criteria. Melissa detailed the development of a marine Critical Habitat data layer from global datasets and its applicability as an initial screening guide and proposed a concept for a tool to allow companies to consider overlap of areas of interest with this layer, seeking feedback from the Partners as to the usefulness of such a tool.

After the session discussion turned to the level of detail shown in the tool. It was explained that the layer is expected to be static and show the component which may trigger Critical Habitat, but it would not be possible to disaggregate the various data included. The use of data in IBAT to create a terrestrial version was identified as a priority for the Partners, noting that the data availability differs between both realms. Melissa explained the lessons from creating this methodology in the marine realm could readily be applied to a terrestrial layer.

***The CBD EBSA Process - Daniel Dunn*** presented on Ecologically or Biologically Significant Areas (EBSA). The presentation looked at the process under the Convention on Biological Diversity to establish EBSAs, highlighted the lack of management implications associated with EBSA designation, discussed how EBSAs overlap with other prioritisation schemes, and how they can contribute to these approaches. Finally the way the EBSA process has come under the auspices of the UN General Assembly was explained.

After the session discussion turned to how the EBSA process deals with identified data deficiencies, especially when identifying uniqueness and rarity. Daniel noted that for some features there is a good level of understanding but that this varies significantly. The status of EBSAs was emphasised, noting that they are not considered to be protected areas, rather as a flag for specific issues and sensitivities which require management.

## Session 4: Business and Biodiversity

***Biodiversity in National and International Policy - Matt Walpole*** provided an overview of the status of policies addressing biodiversity. The presentation focussed on the way countries are being encouraged to identify priority areas and meet targets, re-frame policies around the concept of “natural capital” and mainstream biodiversity into financial and development planning.

After the session discussion turned to reporting, noting a move towards natural capital reporting, especially through the Carbon Disclosure Project. The practicalities of reporting in this way were discussed, particularly in relation to a push for more transparent reporting. The idea that policy is beginning to catch up with 20 years of environmental and biodiversity science was highlighted.

***Biodiversity offset policies - Jon Ekstrom*** presented on emerging government offset policies and their implications for business. Jon discussed which countries have offset policies in place, how rapidly they are emerging at the global level, differences being seen in offset requirements and the associated risks and opportunities for businesses.

After the session discussion turned to aggregated offsets and how many countries are applying these as a policy. Jon Ekstrom noted that there are presently very few, although some countries have these in place through conservation banking measures. Jon further clarified that while National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) are helpful to countries when applying an aggregated offset policy, they are by no means a pre-requisite.

## Wednesday 19th June

Day two of the meeting focused on implementation of IFC Performance Standard 6 and use of biodiversity data by the Proteus Partners.

### Session 1: Data Needs for IFC Performance Standard 6

**Introducing IFC PS6** – *Conrad Savy* presented on the IFC safeguards, PS6 and the concept of Critical Habitat. The presentation introduced PS6 in the context of the World Bank, Equator Banks and the other IFC Performance Standards, before moving on to describe the way the standard stipulates the identification of Critical Habitat. Finally, the presentation covered the key issues in Critical Habitat definition and discussed expected future trends.

**Application of PS6 within the Extractives Industry** – *Jon Ekstrom* presented on a case study for the first mine-site to publicly release PS6 compliance documentation. The presentation introduced the practical steps of a PS6 assessment in general before placing these into the context of the Oyu Tolgoi case study. The presentation also looked in detail at the concepts of Critical Habitat Screening and Assessment (desk-based versus field-based) and their common steps:

- Define spatial unit of analysis: The “Discrete Management Unit”
- Collect and verify baseline data: desktop and field
- Apply Critical Habitat criteria to data
- Determine whether Tier 1 or Tier 2 Critical Habitat

Each step was expanded upon and illustrated using the case study.

**Biodiversity Data Needs for IFC PS6** – *Jon Ekstrom and Conrad Savy* presented on the types of data available and their use in the project lifecycle, the data needs for Critical Habitat assessment and data needs for offset design. The types of data included a discussion on desktop versus field survey data and where each data type fits into the stages of determining and achieving compliance with PS6.

Following the session, the meeting split into break-out groups to discuss the issues and questions raised in the presentations, followed by a report-back session in plenary. The feedback from these discussions is recorded in *Annex: Outputs from Break-out Groups*

## Session 2: Company presentations

*Company Approaches to Biodiversity – the Partners* presented on their own approaches to biodiversity, including how Proteus is embedded within their business practices; use of biodiversity data and tools; internal data systems; biodiversity policies and approaches and organisational structure for biodiversity; and specific case-studies on biodiversity management at operating locations.

Following the presentations, some of the common elements and emerging themes were summarised by Melissa Tolley, with recognition that UNEP-WCMC would consider these issues in the development and improvement of the Proteus resources. Key issues arising included:

- Data gaps and the challenges presented by these and data quality issues
- The importance of accurate data and knowledge of the accuracy of individual datasets in order to assess fitness for use
- The relevance of biodiversity information and data at different stages of the project lifecycle

Melissa also noted an interest in investigating appropriate responses to various biodiversity designations and biodiversity sensitivities and the value of “no-go” commitments. With recognition that within the extractives industry, no-go commitments have been made with regards to World Heritage sites, Matt Jones gave a brief overview of an analysis project being undertaken by UNEP-WCMC (in partnership with IUCN, WWF and ICMM) to look at extractives activities taking place in and in the vicinity of World Heritage sites.

**Close – Matt Walpole** closed the meeting by thanking the hosts, ConocoPhillips, the speakers, and all who attended.

## Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> June

Following the main Proteus meeting, a 1-day training workshop was held with participants from ConocoPhillips, ExxonMobil, Shell and Repsol. The training day covered protected areas and the WDPA, sensitive sites and the Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool, and marine and coastal data.

## Annex: Outputs from Break-out Groups

### What are the key challenges companies have found in using and implementing PS6?

**Implementation** is the biggest challenge – even once all the hurdles of assessment are completed – the project/company still needs to follow-through with the requirements and recommendations of the Performance Standard for biodiversity management.

**Expertise** both internal and external, including finding, and then having access to, the right expertise, especially where contracts may stipulate the use of in-country consultants, who may not be suitably training and experienced.

**Data availability** to inform an assessment of Critical Habitat and biodiversity values.

**Consistency of terminology** across different investors and programmes, particularly where they are using same/similar terminology without common definitions.

**Timeline to implement the full methodology**, which may be justifiable for a very large project, but not for smaller, less profitable projects.

**Cultural issues** which differ between countries.

**Embedding tools in company processes.** IBAT is useful for initial screening but it needs to be brought into current company methodology.

**Need for fieldwork and ground-truthing.** The need to validate means that implementation of PS6 methodology faces all the same problems as any other assessment.

**Defining the area of influence**, especially for linear infrastructure projects.

**Limited experience and internal acceptance of PS6.** There needs to be greater internal awareness-raising.

**Knowing when is it applicable to apply PS6 if it is not required.** Some countries are beginning to follow PS6, even where financing from IFC/Equator banks is not taking place - but which countries? Would be helpful to know which countries are looking at recommending PS6 for major projects.

**Working with project partners or JVs** and convincing them that they should follow PS6 – especially given the need to start early.

**Timing.** When do you start?

**PS6 itself is still very new;** it has only been in place for 18 months. That has implications for scheduling the process as there is not an evidence base or much experience to rely on.

**There are questions about whether it really creates a level playing field,** because PS6 is not required in OECD countries, this assumes that OECD countries have good requirements.

**Quality of impact assessments and competency of consultants** is very important for alignment to PS6 – without good quality ground work; an EIA is not helpful in meeting PS6 compliance. Is the gap between EIAs and PS6 a lack of data or a lack of knowledge?

**Which of these assessment components are currently being carried out by companies through already established risk and impact identification processes (such as ESIA)? Which require additional work?**

Most components may be covered to some degree. While some elements are well covered, it may not necessarily be in a formal way. The degree of coverage is largely dependent on national regulation for EIA. Critical Habitats and cumulative impacts are given least coverage at present.

**Where do companies currently seek guidance (e.g. expertise, partners, methods, data) on what is required for a PS6 assessment?**

**Guidance documents** are available from IPIECA and OGP and the PS6 Guidance Notes.

**NGOs** may have better experience than consultants.

**Consulting firms** often provide useful guidance in consultation with banks.

**Training and information sessions**, such as this session in the Proteus meeting, are a useful platform to discuss PS6 in more detail and seek guidance and clarification.

**More guidance, case studies and training is needed**, as PS6 grows, there may be a lack of expertise to deliver the necessary support – this capacity should be addressed.

## **Which data are companies currently using for PS6 Critical Habitat determination, mitigation and offset design?**

**Local and National Data**, including watersheds and habitats, and any data collected for other projects. Any available local or National Data is considered to be a useful resource.

**Local expertise** in communities, in Community Based Organisations and from academics and other experts.

**Globally available data**, such as IBAT, the IUCN Red List, WDPA, habitat modelling, WWF Arctic data.

**Tools and resources**, such as the IPIECA Marine Geospatial Bibliography.

**Field surveys** remain important, especially recognising that many data layers have omissions and gaps.

## **Do companies agree with the usefulness of data suggested in the presentation? Are there other datasets seen as being relevant?**

Yes – but with questions over reliability/quality and availability for commercial use.