

**Minutes of the Extraordinary Proteus Partners' Meeting  
30 March, 2007  
StatOil House, London**

*Attendees:*

**Proteus Partners**

Steinar Eldøy	Statoil (host)
John Groom	Anglo American
Keenan Jennings	Anglo American
Dan McLaughlin	BHP Billiton
Toby Croucher	BP
Jim Clarke	BP
Jennifer Michael	Chevron
Richard Jones	Premier Oil
Sachin Kapila	Shell
Jean-François Vidalie	The Total Foundation
James Burton	Earthwatch
James Crafts	ESRI UK
Stuart Wood	IHS Energy
Mike Turnill	Oracle

**UNEP-WCMC**

Jon Hutton  
Tim Johnson  
Charles Besancon  
Claire Brown

**Invited NGOs**

Leon Bennun	BirdLife International
Tom Brooks	Conservation International (CI)
Conrad Savey	Conservation International (CI)
Assheton Carter	Conservation International (CI)
Simon Stuart	IUCN/CI

Meeting started at 10.30am

1. Steinar Eldøy, StatOil host, welcomed representatives to the meeting. During his welcome Steinar reconfirmed StatOil's recognition of the importance of the Conservation Commons and its objectives, as well as the contribution the Proteus initiative makes to these objectives. Steinar also noted that Proteus is an important initiative for Statoil and that he was delighted by the progress of the redevelopment of the WDPA. StatOil welcomed the single minded focus on the WDPA from the Proteus initiative but was excited about the broader focus and involvement in Proteus by other important conservation partners who bring different data to the table.
2. Jon Hutton introduced a letter from Achim Steiner to the Proteus Partners. In this letter the UNEP Executive Director expressed his strong appreciation that the private sector has been providing through the Proteus Partners and outlined UNEP's support to and larger conservation and private sector coalition.

Jon Hutton then made a presentation on **Private Sector, Biodiversity and Proteus 2012** (see presentation on the Proteus website).

This presentation covered an update on the coverage of the WDPA, expansion of the extractive industry, what the vision for Proteus 2012 is and how this may work and what it would mean to add new biodiversity data into the mix.

3. Simon Stuart made a presentation on **IUCN Species Assessments and Red Listing** (see presentation on the Proteus website).

Simon Stuart introduced the work of the Species Survival Commission and the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. He also introduced the Global Red List Assessments, of which the Global Reptile assessment requires serious investment, and the evolution of the presentation of the data. How the data has been used was also outlined: conservation planning, environmental impact, measuring trends in achieving targets, resource allocations and scientific research. It was also stressed that the data includes non-threatened and threatened species.

4. Assheton Carter and Leon Bennun made a presentation on **IBAT – CI and BirdLife Collaboration Progress to Date** (see presentation on the Proteus website).

Assheton Carter introduced the concept of the Industry Biodiversity Assessment Tool (IBAT) and why it is needed. It was stressed that IBAT was a web-based prototype and would assist in addressing the lack of access to good data by many corporations, influence the design of projects before the company incurs large costs. Leon Bennun then introduced the concept of important bird areas (IBAs) and the Alliance for Zero Extinction sites. Assheton Carter then completed the presentation by explaining how IBAT would work, for example IBAT offers a distributed network of data collections.

The Partners discussed the lack of available IBA data for the USA and Australia in particular. There was concern that KBAs were just a reflection of NGO interest. Leon noted that despite the fact that they often have no formal status, IBAs are driven by biodiversity data, unlike some legally protected areas. Protected areas tell you about the legal status and not about the actual biodiversity. IBAs and KBAs add an important biodiversity element and can help define boundaries. While some IBAs and KBAs are protected, generally speaking they can be viewed as protected areas of the future. It was also noted there was not global coverage for KBAs. Interest was shown from some Partners on whether ‘EDGE’ species were contained within these datasets. The Institute of Zoology, London’s initiative on edge species was explained (i.e. this initiative does not contain a spatial element, unlike the KBAs).

Partners also expressed an interest in removing the raw data on species so they could be integrated into their own systems, as currently happens with the WDPA. They also asked if their biodiversity data could be incorporated into IBAT. ECOiSHARE was mentioned as one way to fill this need. CI said that data collected by companies did not always meet key standards. However, home pages can be tailored to the individual company’s needs, to access IBAT. Again, a majority of Partners indicated that they would also need to download the raw data to incorporate into their own GIS systems or link straight into the databases through their own systems.

Partners displayed a concern that there are getting to be too many datasets and at some point business just needs to know what is critical for them. There is a danger of IBAT supplying too much information. A simple tool is needed for decision-makers.

Assheton expressed an interest to receive feedback from Proteus Partners on IBAT through their formalised survey mechanism. Partners agreed that this could be possible and Jon was to ensure they received the ‘Survey Monkey’.

5. Simon Stuart made the final presentation on **From Proteus and IBAT to a common vision for biodiversity data** (see presentation on Proteus website).

Simon Stuart outline the issues involved in moving towards a common vision for biodiversity as well as the concepts and principles involved in such an initiative. He noted that we are now talking about more than a common tool but a broader common vision, with more open access to data. To achieve this common vision there is also a need to increase interoperability between datasets and move to a common ground between the NGOs involved. However there is a real need for investment to maintain and continually increase the scope of the datasets.

6. Jon Hutton chaired an **Open discussion**, reiterating that there is now a parallel process between Proteus 2012 and the IBAT, but that there is a vision to bring these together. This is complex and there are deeply vested interests to address, something that will need independent facilitation.

Partners discussed how a larger project could be funded (e.g. corporate funding, government funding) and what actually needs to be funded, such as data collection, dataset design, database building and maintenance, and building tools. Note was made of the efforts and considerable costs that have already be made to data collection and analysis.

Partners felt that a utopian ‘one-stop-shop’ might be hard to achieve and recognised that there were big issues regarding data sharing and free access that need to be discussed at another time.

A number of Partners where interested in the possibility of increased access to marine and coastal zone data, as this is where their footprint is the greatest. The possibility of marine (high seas) IBAs in the future was discussed. Partners noted the importance of seasonal data as often their activities in these ecosystems was seasonal, not year round.

Partners said a business plan was essential including costs (including operational costs), marketing, customer profiles, identification of other potential users and clear goals with targets (a work plan). Partners would also be invited to assist in setting priorities for data collections by identify countries or interest. Potential other tools were mentioned, including repatriation of data back to countries tool, in which UNEP has expressed particular interest.

It was also recognised by the NGOs present that the Proteus Partners have made a valuable contribution through their support of the WDPA, enforcing it’s position as a key global dataset.

Partners where encouraged by the move for a collaborative approach between relevant NGOs, even though there were challenges ahead, it had to be good news for many sectors and they looked forward to hearing more in the not to distant future regarding the broader vision.

Meeting ended at 3.00pm

