

## Meeting Summary

### **The Role of Biodiversity Offsets in Conservation - An Open Roundtable Discussion Side Event at the 8th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity**

**Tuesday, March 21<sup>st</sup>, 2006 13:15-15:00  
Curitiba, Brazil**

A Roundtable Discussion on the Role of Biodiversity Offsets in Conservation was held on March 21st in Curitiba, Brazil, at the Eighth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (COP8). The side event was convened by a number of organizations, including: The Business and Biodiversity Offset Program (BBOP), The Cambridge Centre for Conservation Policy (CCCP), Conservation International (CI), Fauna and Flora International (FFI), Forest Trends, The International Council on Mining and Metals (ICMM), The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (US), Rio Tinto, Shell International, The World Business Council for Sustainable Development, and The World Conservation Union (IUCN).

The event was well attended with about eighty participants. They represented a wide range of sectors including government, NGO's, academia, companies, industry associations and financial lending institutions. A list of meeting participants is attached in Annex 1.

The goal of the meeting was to facilitate an exchange of information and continue a growing dialogue on biodiversity offsets and their role as a mechanism for conservation and sustainable development. This topic was particularly timely at COP 8, where, for the first time, a decision was adopted on private sector engagement, including language on biodiversity offsets. Parties of the CBD called on the private sector to deliberately engage in the implementation of the Convention. Biodiversity offsets are thus a potential mechanism for the private sector to contribute to conservation goals.

The event was moderated by Tom Hammond, Senior Program Officer, IUCN, and included a panel discussion. Proceedings opened with a welcome from Kerry ten Kate, Director of BBOP, and Andrew Parsons, Program Director of ICMM. Andrew referred to the discussion papers that ICMM had published in order to brief its members on biodiversity offsets and to set out the areas where there is ongoing discussion and debate concerning offsets [<http://www.icmm.com/newsdetail.php?rcd=67>]. He said that, although the briefing paper was written for mining company managers, it would likely be of more general interest.

Joshua Bishop, Senior Advisor for Economics and Environment, IUCN introduced the concept of offsets and setting the context with examples from around the world of where offsets fit into existing regulatory frameworks. He explained the importance of the recommendation that offsets should only be considered at the end of the mitigation hierarchy where unavoidable residual impacts remain. The business and conservation cases for using offsets were laid out and some of the uncertainties, questions and risks surrounding offsets were raised.

| Jonathan Ekstrom, from BirdLife International, provided an overview of the technical and socioeconomic issues associated with the design and implementation of biodiversity offsets and explored some of the challenges that arise including: building consensus among a broad stakeholder group; measuring biodiversity values (currencies and equivalence); determining offset locations (near or far from the impacted site); deciding on the types of offsets to be implemented (conserving land, investing in capacity building, etc); long term sustainability and financing of offsets; and the need for pilot projects and experiments.

Kerry ten Kate closed the panel discussion by explaining how biodiversity offsets are linked to the CBD agenda. As the CBD engages more with the private sector, she explained how biodiversity offsets present a viable contribution towards achieving the 2010 target and a mechanism for sustainable development. She also reached out to people in the audience to share their ideas, experiences and knowledge on offsets and challenged everyone to work together to develop best practices and continue testing the methodologies of offsets in the field.

The discussion was then opened to the audience. The majority of participants expressed appreciation for the initiative taken and also raised some questions and concerns. For example:

- Would it be difficult for companies and conservation organizations to maintain their objectivity when designing and implementing biodiversity offsets?
- The mitigation hierarchy sounds simple in theory, but in practice it is not so straightforward.
- How can indirect and cumulative impacts of development activities best be dealt with?
- Is there a conflict of interest when communities would rather have development opportunities than invest in conservation?
- What does one do when there is a lack of baseline data?

It was agreed that a broad multi-stakeholder approach would be key in resolving many of these issues. In addition, there need to be governance systems that are autonomous and independent to ensure transparency in decision making processes. Composite biodiversity offsets, which comprise activities in more than one location, can provide both economic benefits in one place and conservation outcomes in another. This may help meet different priorities that exist within communities, and promote equitable outcomes.

For more information on this event, including the presentations, please visit:  
[http://www.forest-trends.org/biodiversityoffsetprogram/ln\\_meetings.php](http://www.forest-trends.org/biodiversityoffsetprogram/ln_meetings.php)

## Annex 1 – Participant List

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>
L.G. Saw	Forest Research Inst., Malaysia
Dr. V.B. Mathur	Wildlife Institute of India, Derikadra
Andre Rocha Ferretti	Fundacao O Boticario de Protecao a Natureza
Rita C.R. de Souza	SRU/MMA
Steinar Eldoy	Statoil
Jeroem Huising	TSBF- CIAT
Claudio Klemz	FSEP
Lars Dinesa	Carl Bro, DK
Madame Cecilia W. Bilito	Inst. Florestal
Manuel Ruiz	SPDU
Robert Filho	Conservation International
Jose Roberto Lima	MMA, Brazil
Rachel Biderman	FGV- Sust. Center
Silvana A. Kampel	INPE/MCT
	Eco-Feco
Erica Dholoo	IPIECA
Daniel Caye	Tillo
Francis Vorhies	Earthmind
Sulcar Sono	ICEHATI, Indonesia
Claire Rhodes	Ecoagriculture Partners
J.H. Seyani	MHBG, Malawi
Laurant Ntahugo	IUCN - EARO
Alejandro Martin	Ibens
Marcia Soanes	Funbio
Carol Padilla Carestrao	El Salvador
Amra Velloso	CVRD
Paulo Van Deor Ven	CVRD
Janviera Vulli	RCT, Argentina
William Dent	Natural Partners
Erica Polverari	Funbio
Margit Hauer	IAP
Karina von Plantz	Funbio
Simone Lovera	Global Forest Coalition, Paraguay
Aline T. Bunarde	Biodiversity Foundation
Deric Quaile	IUCN
Juan Carlos Chavez	Fundacion Puma
Don Proebstel	ATAA, Int.
Jolanda van Schaik	CREM
Wijnand Broer	CREM
Jeff McNeely	IUCN
Steven de Bie	Shell Int.
Beto Msequita	Instituto Bioatlantica
Jessica Dempsey	ELCI
R.D. Smitt	RBG - Kew
Risa Smith	Environment Canada

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Emily Robinson	IRACAMBI
Amanda Nickson	WWF
Gustineo Jaurron	ACADEMA
Ricardo M. de Saitez	SPUS
Audrey Laletin	GFC
Daniel Arrik	TNC
Ralph Wells	UBC
Robbie Robinson	ZSL
Linda Hedlund	CEPF
Lindsey Fransen	WRI
Claudia Yep	RedLac
Roberto Cavalcanti	Conservation International
Miriam Miller	MMA
Luiz Faraco	IBAMA- Brazil
Orlei Negrello	MARBRAZIL
Jonathan Baillie	ZSL
	SPOS
Martin Hollands	CCCP
Susan Hollands	CCCP
Stella Simiyu	SCBD/
Fred Fortien	IIFB
Erin Sollander	Swedish Forest Agency
Karin Kaechele	USP Brazil
Monica Harris	CI- Brazil
Ricardo Machado	CI- Brazil
Maiko Nashi	UNO-IAS, IZERC
Taiki Kobayashi	Japan