
Draft Minutes of the Proteus Meeting
June 15th and 16th 2011

Statoil, Stavanger, Norway

Participants:

Proteus Partners

Barrick Gold	John Martshuck
	Lauree Tanner
BP	Jim Clarke
Chevron	Sarah Connick
ConocoPhillips	Robert Ramos
	Maxine Madison (by phone)
Eni	Diana Palliggiano
ExxonMobil	Anita George-Ares
ESRI	Lorien Innes
	Kurt Eckerstrom (by phone)
RioTinto	Heliuss Guimarães (by phone)
Shell	Koen Broker
Statoil	Steinar Eldøy
	Mathijs G.D. Smit
Total	Laurence Pinturier
Petrobras	Mônica Linhares

Guests and Observers

University of Oxford	Kathy Willis
----------------------	--------------

UNEP-WCMC Staff

Jon Hutton
Tim Johnson
Craig Mills
Mônica Barcellos Harris
Matt Jones
Louisa Wood
Charles Besancon
Jörn Scharlemann
Claire Brown

Apologies

Anglo American
BHP Billiton
IHS
Repsol

Objectives of the meeting:

- Present the biodiversity and ecosystem services data and tools landscape for 2012 and beyond
- Reporting back on Proteus achievements
- Update information on current and future data acquisition for the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA) and the Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool (IBAT)
- Present the new MyPolygon tool

DAY 1: Wednesday 16th June

The meeting started at 9am

1. *Welcome and Introductions*

Proteus refresher and agenda – **Jon Hutton** welcomed the Partners in particular the new participants from Barrick Gold and Petrobras, and presented a refresher on the Proteus Partnership and UNEP-WCMC for the benefit of the new participants.

Biodiversity Initiatives – **Steinar Eldøy** (presented on the biodiversity policies and programmes at Statoil. Beginning with a brief history and introduction, he went on to describe the partnerships and initiatives in which Statoil has been involved. He then presented on how Statoil's corporate policy of "Zero Harm" relates to biodiversity. Finally he presented practical case studies showing how Statoil has addressed biodiversity issues relating to various projects. The partners at the table were very interested to hear about Statoil's experiences, and the discussion turned to how data is handled after impact assessments. MBH noted that a previous project known as Ecoishare was designed to draw together EIA data. UNEP-WCMC is currently seeking to re-kindle this project to respond to data needs. The partners noted that government restrictions on data access can be problematic, and that efforts to address this were welcome.

Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) implementation, what we've seen so far – **Charles Besançon** presented on the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and explained how the outcomes of the last Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Convention in Nagoya Japan may impact on business in the short and longer term. He described how the efforts to meet Target 11 of the COP to expand protected area coverage are likely to focus on areas important for biodiversity, those high in carbon, and those important for connectivity. On the subject of Access and Benefit sharing, the initial interpretations of this objective to be purely genetically focussed are

being revised, with emphasis also being placed on equity for local people as well as the adoption of “biocultural protocols”. Finally, he noted that renewed interest in National Biodiversity Strategies and Actions Plans are a key opportunity for business involvement. The partners were very interested to hear about how Access and Benefit sharing is being addressed, and how different organisations, countries and sectors compare in their current position and approaches.

ACTION: CB to investigate and feedback on biocultural protocols and what actions have specific countries adopted.

2. Standards and reporting: Current and future status of biodiversity criteria of environmental safeguards

Standards, the current state of affairs: Our work across sectors – Matt Jones shared the latest findings of UNEP-WCMC’s work looking at the biodiversity criteria adopted in environmental safeguards. He presented the view that Standards and Certification schemes are an important non-regulatory means of impacting on company performance, and that different standards have much in common in terms of coverage. He noted that there are significant differences in approach and that greater convergence might aid compatibility and take-up. In line with this, development of Standards might be expected to follow a common trajectory. Finally, UNEP-WCMC sees its role as one of supporting the setting and compliance processes through data provision and interpretation. Partners were interested to hear how ecosystem services were included and if there was help on tools, but also that as ecosystem services are still an embryonic concept they might not be appropriate for the standards process – suggesting that the approaches to ecosystems services are presently at a point of divergence and not yet ready to reach convergence. MJ noted that UNEP-WCMC intends to review the treatment of ecosystem services in a second phase review of standards.

Emerging environmental standards and Reporting: How the global reporting landscape is evolving on Ecosystem services, Biodiversity and G4 – Mônica Barcellos Harris provided an update on work with the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) to develop indicators for ecosystem services reporting, an update on new indicators adopted in the Oil and Gas and Mining and Metals Sector Supplements to the GRI reporting guidelines and a look ahead at what to expect from the revisions to be made under G4. She noted that two approaches are to be recommended; with reporting at strategic, narrative level describing policy and management approach; and with specific indicators that can aggregate and show trends in site level data. Describing the sector supplement process, she highlighted the main additions for Oil and Gas (under development) and Mining and Metals (complete), noting that both biodiversity offsets and ecosystem services are included in each supplement, with additional indicators also looking at biodiversity risk assessment and

action planning. Previewing G4, she highlighted the process for development being adopted by GRI, and noted the possible ways that UNEP-WCMC's work may be included. JH asked about the pressures to report against GRI, with Partners noting that Carbon Disclosure Project (CDP) and CDP Water Disclosure Project are often given more prominence by investors, and that IPIECA guidance is also often followed instead (for O&G). MJ noted that the new O&G sector supplement development process has closely followed the IPIECA guidance. SE mentioned that in his opinion a narrative on ecosystem services would be the right level to report.

3. Emerging data, technology and planning

CBD and National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAPs), how they are building pressure for better National data – Jon Hutton described the pressures building from the Convention on Biological Diversity relating to renewed needs for improvements in National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans and how these are leading to a global need for better data at the national level. He went on to describe a recent pilot study by UNEP-WCMC into the national prioritisation in 10 countries and UNEP-WCMC's plans for a national data portal. Partner were interested in how a National Data Portal might integrate with IBAT – JH noted that IBAT focuses on global priority and that this is therefore not currently possible, however a Portal would focus on supporting countries in uploading their data to a single location which is a step towards better integration of data.

4. Data, assessments and mapping on ecosystem services

Sub-global assessments, The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) and the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) – UNEP-WCMC's role – Claire Brown provided a briefing on the latest initiatives to assess and value ecosystems and their services and UNEP-WCMC's role in these initiatives. She introduced the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA), TEEB and IPBES and described how these relate to Sub-global Assessments before expanding on UNEP-WCMC's role as a convener of these processes. She concluded by discussing the opportunities for private sector to engage and the ways in which this might impact on business.

The state of the art –results of the United Kingdom National Ecosystem Assessment – Claire Brown gave an update on how the latest economic thinking on ecosystem services can be incorporated into an ecosystem assessment, describing in detail the UK's National Ecosystem Assessment (NEA) and how this may go on to influence best practice in ecosystem assessments in other countries and regions. She re-iterated how the findings of

the NEA are already making their way into policy, and described the impact the NEA is likely to have, as the first national assessment of its kind.

A look at ecosystem services tools to help business (InVEST, CEV, ARIES)

– **Jörn Scharlemann** described some of the frameworks and tools to support ecosystem assessment and valuation for businesses. He explained the Guide to Corporate Ecosystem Valuation (CEV) framework developed by WBCSD and went on to look at two tools which are spatially-explicit and focus on mapping of ecosystem services flows in a particular landscape or watershed (InVEST and ARIES). Partners were very interested to have guidance on availability of tools, and noted that valuation of ecosystem services must sit alongside valuation of subterranean resources. This is an important area on which extractives can engage more widely. The way different tools originally sought to monetise ecosystem services but are now moving towards more qualitative assessment was highlighted, as was the need for calibration and validation.

5. Tools for Prioritising at different scales

IBAT – Its place as a tool for developing NBSAPS – Jon Hutton provided an update on the Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool and explained its role in repatriating data and supporting the development of NBSAPs and associated data. He went into detail on the background and development journey of IBAT, including the partner organisations and the role of the Proteus Partners in developing and supporting the project. He then described the research and conservation tool, and how it is being used to help governments place national priorities in a global context through availability of data contained in the World Database on Protected Areas and IUCN Red List species.

Local Ecological Footprint Tool – Kathy Willis (University of Oxford)

introduced a joint research project undertaken between the University of Oxford and Statoil to develop a site-level tool able to map the ecological footprint of a potential development area or exploration block. Partners were interested in the development process and if the tool was proprietary – Statoil currently own the tool. Validation was discussed, this is being undertaken at present, the tool is not a “black-box” - layers and data will all be provided. Questions were asked about the reliability and sustainability – with overestimation of species presence being noted. Questions were also asked about potential mechanisms for accessing the tool in future and whether Proteus would allow that. It was decided that a discussion between Statoil, University of Oxford and UNEP-WCMC would need to take place to investigate the possibilities.

Day 2

6. *Workplan and Future*

2011 Workplan and budget report – Tim Johnson presented the financial report for 2010 and the year-to-date financial report for 2011 too 31st May. He explained that the small overspend against budget in 2010 has been absorbed by UNEP-WCMC and not carried over to 2011. Expenditure in 2011 is in line with the progress made against the workplan, with several activities well underway and other planned to begin in the coming months. There is a possibility of a shortfall in income compared to the plan, but UNEP-WCMC is looking at ways to address this. He also noted the positive progress made by UNEP-WCMC accessing co-financing for projects in 2011, noting a significant improvement on 2010.

Beyond 2012: Discussing priorities for the future – Jon Hutton led a discussion on the process currently underway to decide priorities for Proteus beyond 2012 when the current workplan will need to be renewed. He described the history of Proteus, the achievements to date and outlined the areas of potential work for the future. The partners noted that financial planning takes place in early 2012 for the 2013 financial year and expressed a desire to see planning documents as soon as possible to allow for proper discussions and internal engagement. They noted that at least 1 month is needed for internal discussions, and that 3 months would be a preferred timescale. A request was made for the planning documents and business plan to re-iterate the value to partners from Proteus membership.

ACTION: Develop and distribute business plan for beyond 2012 for Partner comment

7. *Update on workplan progress*

WDPA data and latest functionalities update in Protected Planet – Charles Besançon introduced the significant data improvements in the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA), especially since the advent of the Proteus Partnership, and explained how “Protected Planet” is expected to improve the data further and how it is beginning to increase the efficiency of updates to data. He noted how the WDPA has improved dramatically and highlighted the importance of political issues associated with data access. Partners were very interested in the way priorities for data collection are set. Priorities are developed based on Proteus partner requests, existing agreements with countries, countries with poor data quality and high-biodiversity countries. The discussion turned to the way community versions are managed in protectedplanet.net and how these are made available through the site. Finally management effectiveness of protected areas was highlighted as

important information to have, and how this is the ultimate goal of some of UNEP-WCMC's work on protected areas.

Data standards for protected areas – Charles Besançon demonstrated how UNEP-WCMC currently use data standards to improve efficiency and overall data quality for protected areas. He went on to present how this work will be strengthened in the near future through projects such as BIOPAMA and the INSPIRE Directive of the European Union. He described the normative standards provided by IUCN and how UNEP-WCMC promotes these data standards alongside engaging in processes with as INSPIRE to be a global integrator pushing for harmonisation of standards. Partners were interested to hear about Natura2000 sites and how many of these areas are recognised as protected even if they do not fit the IUCN definition.

Marine data needs for industry and conservation – synergies and gaps - Louisa Wood provided an overview of similarities in data needs for marine industries and conservation to be effective, gave some recent examples of new data products from the conservation community that may be of direct relevance to industry planning and used these examples to highlight some gaps. The discussion highlighted the need for a baseline on which to build and noted the impacts on aggregation and spawning as requiring data.

Marine and Coastal workplan update – Louisa Wood gave a brief summary of the work carried out in 2010 before recapping on the objectives for 2011 and giving an update on progress so far. In discussing the updates in 2011, she focussed on the need to establish baselines for spatial and temporal resolution and how best to engage citizen science to support improved data. A factsheet developed by UNEP-WCMC was distributed to Partners for comment. Partners were interested in data on marine mammals and the way in which the extractives industry can contribute to data collection. A project under the NEREUS programme will improve mammal data. The need to develop the right community was highlighted as essential for data and tool development.

Action: UNEP-WCMC invites the Proteus partners to send comments to the factsheet by July 04th

Legacy data being made available – Louisa Wood went on to describe the efforts being made to make available legacy data held at UNEP-WCMC. She explained the efforts to make over 40 datasets available, including the means through which this might be possible. The partners noted that even older datasets are useful as these support temporal analysis. Links provided to further data sources were welcomed.

8. *Update on Workplan Progress continued: Interactive - Partners Support*

Training on tools – Mônica Barcellos Harris introduced the training that has been made available to partners as part of their technical assistance and described some of the ways in which partners have been provided with training. There followed a sessions where Partners described the benefits they have realised through training and explained their own organisations experiences. BP explained how they have attracted staff internally and particularly aimed to attract engineers showing how applicable and relevant the tools were to their work. The sessions were carried out through WebEx. Statoil also explained how their computer lab style training session was positive for the team to be actively using the tools and asking questions.

There was then a discussion on the way in which further training materials might be made available, including which media might be most appropriate. UNEP-WCMC has a small project with other Cambridge-based organisations, including the university, to develop training materials on biodiversity tailored to the private sector and views were sought on how best to develop materials in the context of this project. SC mentioned that water is an issue of great interest to the sector and that perhaps an interesting area of focus.

ACTION: Develop ideas/proposal for the materials contents and how they may be made available for Partner comment

Case-study on risk assessment – Mônica Barcellos Harris, Matt Jones and Louisa Wood gave presentations on three case studies describing different ways of analysing, using and combining data to solve specific problems. The first case study focussed on a traditional tenement analysis overlaying data on exploration blocks with biodiversity information to identify potential risks and the associated business, regulatory and biodiversity implications. The second case study looked at a methodology developed for prioritisation of operating sites based on multiple factors and ranking against a matrix of threatened biodiversity and protected biodiversity to create a shortlist of priority sites for further investigation. The final case study described an adapted protocol for coastal sensitivity assessment. It introduced a methodology adapted to a specific area based on existing guidance and suggested next steps for addressing data needs to support detailed sensitivity mapping. Partners welcomed the “step-up” from some of the normal work carried out by UNEP-WCMC, it was noted that this type of work focuses on the data held by UNEP-WCMC and making use of the familiarity and expertise with the data hosted in the Centre and help the Centre understand business needs.

9. Interactive Session: Getting the most from data and tools

IBAT and Red List integration –Craig Mills presented the new species layer which has been added to the IBAT tool and went into detail on how this layer has been developed. He then demonstrated the new look mapping tools to be launched later in 2011, including the improved baselayer maps provided by Google. Partners were very interested in the red list data – but requested access

to all species (not just threatened) and to be able to download. JH noted that it is unlikely that IUCN will be willing to change their terms of use to allow download in the near future. It was confirmed that Marine mammals are included in the IBAT data. The relationship between KBAs and AZEs was questioned.

ACTION: Are AZEs downloadable within the KBA layer from IBAT?

Access to data, how to deal with synchronising data when working offline – Craig Mills opened a discussion among the partners to understand how they are struggling with off-line data access and synchronisation. Partners described their experiences, including access to data where internet access is limited and where bandwidth is limited. CM noted that Amazon cloud syncing is difficult, KE noted that ESRI may be able to develop downloadable maps or data packages. CM suggested that Geopdfs are a useful way of exporting maps with layers, use of online tools such as Dropbox which supports version control to manage data, or more traditional methods of sending information by mail in CD form. CM further noted that UNEP-WCMC are working to make their online tools more compatible with low-bandwidth environments.

MyPolygon: presentation on progress and feedback – Craig Mills previewed the new myPolygon tool giving partners an explanation of the background and how the tool seeks to address concerns about tenement analysis where the user does not have access to GIS skills or software. He highlighted the reporting function which could be expanded to include pdf reports and explained the security measures taken to ensure any uploaded data is deleted when the browser is closed. Partners were pleased with the amount of development and work on this tool.

10. Next Meeting and Wrap-up

Jon Hutton summarised the meeting, thanked the partners for joining both in person and by teleconference and particularly thanked the hosts Statoil for their hospitality.

ACTION: Next meeting date and venue to be proposed and circulated by e-mail