

# Minutes of the Proteus Meeting 2012

---

Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> June 2012, Shell Centre, UK

## Participants:

---

### PROTEUS PARTNERS

---

Tom Steytler	Anglo American
Shelley Currin	Anglo American
Melissa Barbanell	Barrick Gold
Mark Johnston	BP
Sarah Connick	Chevron
Sarah Terry	ConocoPhillips
Khalid Soofi	ConocoPhillips
Paola Pedroni	eni
Elena Pavanel	eni
Anita George-Ares	ExxonMobil
Carmen Sanchez	Repsol
Isaac Nájera	Repsol
Jo Cochrane	Shell
Gertjan Roseboom	Shell
Anne-Claire Hopman	Shell
Steinar Eldøy	Statoil
Patricia Mani	Total

---

### TECHNICAL PARTNERS

---

Lorien Innes	Esri
Paul Weight	WellData

---

### GUEST SPEAKERS AND OBSERVERS (\*)

---

Kristin Kaschner	Albert-Ludwigs University
Nigel Dudley	Equilibrium Research
Anne-Marie Fleury	ICMM
William Bulmer	IFC
Simon Stuart	IUCN
Richard Jenkins *	IUCN
Brian Sullivan *	IPIECA
Peter Bridgewater	Joint Nature Conservation Committee

---

### APOLOGIES

---

Erika Korosi	BHP Biliton
Ana Paula Ramos	Petrobras
Peter Harvey	Rio Tinto

---

### UNEP-WCMC STAFF

---

Jon Hutton	Jörn Scharlemann
Tim Johnson	Amy Milam
Melissa Tolley	Claire Fitzgerald
Matt Jones	Liz Farmer
Craig Mills	Chloë Strevens

---

## Objectives of the Meeting:

1. Present an update on the three main objectives of Proteus.
2. Report on Proteus finances and achievements.
3. Report on the consultation with Partners on priorities for the future of Proteus.
4. Provide a series of informative presentations from external speakers on topics relevant to the context of Proteus and biodiversity for the extractives industry.

## Agenda:

The meeting started at 9am

## Introduction

**Welcome, introduction and agenda - Jon Hutton** opened the meeting and welcomed the participants. Noting that there have been several changes to the focal points from each partner company and there were a number of guest speakers, each of the attendees was asked to introduce themselves.

## Session 1: Protected Areas and the Extractive Sector (Proteus Objective 1)

**Wet, Dry and everything in between – how can business live with the international site-based agreements? - Peter Bridgewater** gave a brief overview of the history of the progression from the concept of Natural History to Biodiversity, including more recently ecosystem services. He covered the main conventions of relevance and their significance to businesses and finished by discussing the need for joined-up conservation strategies outside of protected areas.

**Improvements to the accuracy, completeness and currency of the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA) - Amy Milam** presented the progress made since 2006 in upgrading the World Database on Protected Areas. The presentation provided a background and history on the WDPA, and why it was a focus area for Proteus, before detailing how the data have been improved, presenting the increase in size of the dataset along with improvements in quality since 2006.

Following the presentation, discussion turned to the content of the WDPA, including the need to provide an overview of the designations presently included in the WDPA. Quality of data and variance across different countries is a concern for Partners, especially when they nominate priorities. Quality assessments should be made more readily available and information on countries with poor data coverage in the WDPA should be provided. A request was made for the priority update list to be made available, so that Partners can understand where resources for WDPA updates are being focused. Emphasis should be placed on accessing management plans to support quality improvements.

**World Heritage and Extractives Industries Project - Anne-Marie Fleury** discussed the World Heritage Convention and the process through which ICMM have engaged with the convention. Presenting a joint study undertaken with IUCN, JP Morgan, Shell and UNESCO, Anne-Marie

described the key findings of the draft report, including looking at the threats to Outstanding Universal Value (OUV).

Following the presentation, discussion turned to the relevance of the World Heritage Convention, considering that the wording of the convention is now over 40 years old. In particular it was noted that we should now know where OUV exists, and efforts to increase the number of sites may be counterproductive. The impact of extractive activity appears to be very small and decreasing as a result of efforts by the industry and governments to avoid these areas. The length of time that sites can remain on the tentative list was raised as a significant issue for the sector, as the tentative list can effectively block any operational development for in excess of 10 years.

## Session 2: Areas not (yet) protected (Proteus Objective 2)

**Recent developments in the IBAT - Jon Hutton** presented on the recent upgrades made to the Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool, and previewed the upcoming enhancements, including the ability to upload and save location data points, and the reporting function.

Following the presentation, discussion turned to the IBAT governance committee, the structure and organisation of which was described (representatives of all 4 organisations, meeting at least twice per year). A request for planned changes to IBAT to be announced in advance of implementation was made. It was recommended that IBAT continue its focus on alignment with IFC PS6, including critical habitat requirements. The importance and availability of training for Partners who want to increase uptake and use of the tool internally was reiterated.

**10 things business should know about the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species - Simon Stuart** explained the evolution and influence of the IUCN Red List, addressing issues of coverage, the comprehensive assessment process, standard criteria and the process for conducting assessments and partners involved. He went on to discuss the need to make the dataset more representative, but noted that universal coverage of all species is not the goal of IUCN.

Following the presentation, discussion turned to the increasing coverage of Taxa within the Red List, noting that listing a species as threatened leads to more fieldwork and more data on that species. Information on national “Red Lists” is also needed by Partners, the availability of such lists varies widely by country. The quality and reliability of the IUCN Red List data were questioned, in particular the sources and methodology for creating range maps. Also, abundance data was noted as useful for decision making although there are no plans for IUCN to collect such data and abundance data is not available for the vast majority of species. Clarity was sought on the presentation of the Red List data in Protected Planet and IBAT. The added detail provided by access to Red List species range data versus the information extracted from the IBAT species grid was queried in terms of ability to identify species presence on ground.

**IUCN process to create a standard for the identification of biodiversity priority areas - Jorn Scharlemann** described the current process underway to create a set of globally consistent criteria to be used to identify areas important for biodiversity. He reported on the joint task force, recent meetings, planned process, and opportunities for business to engage.

Following the presentation, discussion turned to the objectives of the proposed global standard, intended to be applied at country-level to produce a consistent set of internationally important sites,

which would allow end-users to be confident that decisions are based on internationally standardised criteria. The level of participation in the process by national governments was queried. Governments are involved through the World Conservation Congress and through their membership of IUCN. It is also expected that this standard will be relevant to CBD negotiations where government involvement will be guaranteed. Finally, the distinction between “important”, “sensitive” and “threatened” was raised, noting that confusion over the purpose of the standard will make its eventual application more difficult.

### Session 3: The Marine Realm (Proteus Objective 3)

**Modelling and mapping global marine mammal distributions and densities using the AquaMaps approach - Kristin Kaschner** presented on AquaMaps, an online marine atlas of species distribution and modelling tool. She described the need for such a tool, how it works, the uses to which it can be put and the on-going efforts to improve marine species data.

Following the presentation, discussion turned to the advantages offered by AquaMaps in allowing assumptions to be changed to see their effect on the model. It was noted that the tool currently offers more than just marine mammal data – some 11,500 species of fishes, marine mammals and invertebrates are covered, with an ongoing project to include seabirds.

**Marine and Coastal Habitat Data and Validation Tools - Claire Fitzgerald** discussed the efforts underway to improve marine and coastal data, delivery of data through the Ocean Data Viewer, and new tools to allow experts to provide validation.

Following the presentation, discussion noted concerns over validation of contributions provided through the on-line tool. It was explained that a parallel reference dataset would be maintained so that the edited dataset could be compared with the original, unvalidated data.

### Session 4: Tools for data access and analysis

**LifeWeb and enhancements to the MyPolygon data upload tool - Craig Mills** described the myPolygon tool beta version, presented at earlier Proteus meetings, which was designed in response to needs for simple online analysis. He discussed recent developments in technology which will be implemented in response to Partner feedback, to create a working version of the tool.

Following the presentation, discussion turned to confidentiality of corporate data uploaded for the online analysis. Partners were assured that no corporate data is stored from the process and so there are no concerns about confidentiality.

**Development of a marine biodiversity priority areas tool - Jon Hutton** reported on the approach being pioneered by UNEP-WCMC to look at sensitivity in the marine realm, noting that many of the necessary datasets are collated and maintained at UNEP-WCMC.

Following the presentation, Partners expressed interest in a marine tool and noted their interest also in having in-shore issues covered as well as off-shore. It was noted that the simple recording of presence/absence of key marine habitats would add considerable value.

## Session 5: Business standards for biodiversity and ecosystem services

**Performance Standard 6: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Management of Living Natural Resources** - William Bulmer presented on IFC's Performance Standards framework, focussing on PS6. He covered the major changes to PS6 in the latest version, which came into force in January 2012, including the Mitigation Hierarchy, Offsets, Critical Habitat and Ecosystem Services.

Following the presentation, discussion turned to the duration of set-asides, recognising that the benefits of implementing PS6 should be to enhance natural capital beyond an expected baseline. IFC encourage links with local partners and capacity building to ensure the longevity of benefits beyond the involvement of IFC. The relationship between critical habitat and other definitions was discussed. IFC expect the client to take the lead on giving consideration to appropriate local and global definitions when identifying critical habitat. It was stressed that critical habitat is intended to highlight areas without formal protection or international recognition. IFC was asked whether there was an intention to revise the guidance note for PS6 to suggest methodologies for implementation. IFC intend to produce a good practice document, highlighting case studies of adherence to the standard. The appropriateness of EIAs for PS6 assessment was questioned, since EIAs focus on possible impacts, whereas PS6 requires a baseline for biodiversity to be developed, alongside which impacts should also be considered, to assess actions necessary to achieve criteria such as no net loss or a positive gain.

**Defining and describing protected areas: processes and implications for industry** - Nigel Dudley described the IUCN Guidelines for Applying Protected Area Management Categories, discussing the different categories at length, and presenting the importance of the Governance Type assigned to protected areas.

Following the presentation, discussion turned to the inclusion of the words "to achieve" in the definition of a protected area. The original purpose of the definition was to look at why a site was created. The move towards assessing whether conservation is being achieved is a step away from that.

**Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (BES) Safeguards in Performance Standards for Business** - Chloë Strevens presented an update on UNEP-WCMC's work on strengthening BES safeguards contained within performance standards, focussing on a subset of the results drawn from the finance sector. By comparing the language and approach used to safeguard BES in four of the largest Multilateral Development Banks (IFC, EIB, IDB, and ADB), the commonalities and differences between standards were identified; the advantages and opportunities for greater alignment were proposed; and the recommendations to strengthen biodiversity safeguards, which were developed and published in partnership with the CBD in 2011, were discussed. Finally, on-going work undertaken with the CBD to develop best practice guidance for strengthening and aligning BES safeguards, which will be used to support discussions on a draft decision on business engagement at COP 11, was introduced.

Following the presentation, discussion turned to the outcomes of the work and recommendations, and whether they were intended to stimulate a full review of current practice by standards organisations. Interest was shown in how this work will influence CBD COP11 decisions and the process for CBD ratification and also the level of stakeholder engagement that would be undertaken in developing best practice guidance.

## Session 6: Proteus 2012 and the Next Phase (2013 – 2015) – Closed Business Session

**Proteus update – workplan and budget - Tim Johnson** reported on the full year results for 2011, year to date results for 2012 and the investment and achievements in the current phase of Proteus (2008 to 2012).

In discussion it was noted that Proteus had achieved significant progress in its current phase. Partners expressed their support for the overall levels of investment and the leveraged funds that Proteus has attracted, and their interest in using aspects of the presentation to underpin the value of their contributions (see discussion point below).

**Proteus 2013 – 2015 - Melissa Tolley** led a session to discuss the plan for Proteus in 2013-2015, which had been circulated several months ago. She described the feedback already received from the Partners on individual areas, presented the intended content of the three focus areas for the next phase (Global Biodiversity Agenda, Knowledge Products, Technical Assistance) and discussed the possibility of expanding the partnership.

The following discussion addressed the three focus areas and specific discussion on the inclusion of IUCN Red List data in the Proteus offering. The overall view of the proposed workplan was considered to be good, and although UNEP-WCMC were asked to prepare a document to describe better the business case, for use by the Proteus focal points within their companies, there was consensus on the way forward for the next three years as per the proposal. The further expansion of the Partnership was supported providing there was a vetting process and the existing partners were consulted.

### ***Global Biodiversity Agenda:***

Providing a “heads up” on emerging issues and trends, including the presentations at Proteus meetings has proven very useful, but more frequent updates would be helpful, especially in a format that could be distributed internally within companies. A quarterly news update would achieve this.

It was proposed that the evolution of market-based mechanisms and marine and marine spatial planning information should be included in the topics to be covered.

### ***Knowledge Products***

Knowledge product development (including further development of existing datasets and tools) should be guided by the experiences of Partners to date. It was suggested that bilateral meetings and workshops take place to ensure that UNEP-WCMC is well informed about how and when Partners use the Knowledge Products in the life cycle of their projects.

The need for water data was discussed. Landscape-scale data are available, but nothing for site-scale assessment.

There was a question on the consistency of KBA data, and application at a national level. KBA data show areas of international importance, but similar data are needed to show information on areas of national importance.

Habitat data, especially data relating to critical habitat should be brought together to create greater coordination between landscape and species data. It was noted that there is good data at landscape scale for the US and in preparation for Africa from Landsat but that there is no existing global standard.

### ***Technical Assistance***

Technical assistance in addition to the 20 hours presently included in membership of the Partnership should be available separately for those Partners who want further support.

### ***Red List Data***

Coverage – Plant data are a clear gap in the existing coverage. It was recognised that the Red List will always be used for high-level screening only, as the coverage can never be complete.

Currency – At present it is difficult to access the Red List metadata however the age and source of data being presented is very important to inform decision making. This must be addressed.

Inclusion in Proteus – There was some support for the option of the Red List raw data being available to Partners, although several Partners also stated that they were not interested in accessing data of this much detail. Any inclusion of the Red List in Proteus must be seen as an additional tier, and should not be allowed to divert resources or funding away from the existing work programme, especially the WDPA. There was interest in a simplified form of the Red List dataset and provision of key metadata. It was recognised that to create biodiversity management plans, companies need more than a species list (which is the current output they can access from IBAT). Interest was also expressed in whether it would be possible to filter information such as endemism from the Red List data.

Gap analysis - IUCN needs to demonstrate exactly what is being offered, at what cost, and compare this to what is available elsewhere (online to view on the Red List website and in IBAT). It is not clear what IBAT currently provides. IUCN should prepare a gap analysis of the available data to allow Partners to understand what is currently available and what might be included under a second tier of Proteus under IUCN's proposal. The outcome of this gap analysis could be presented to Partners at regional workshops in the US and Europe.

### ***Next Steps***

It was proposed that comments from the meeting would be incorporated into a final draft of the Proteus Next Phase document, which would be circulated to the Partners with a new MOU for 2013-2015. Options for the next annual meeting were discussed and the decision made to return to a two-day meeting.

## **Close of the Meeting**

**Jon Hutton** thanked the Partners for joining the meeting, and the speakers for their excellent presentations.

The meeting closed at 6:15pm.