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What is the biodiversity benchmark?

- Framework describing best practice in the management of biodiversity by companies, produced by Insight and FFI.
- Based on business risk and opportunity.
- Includes 34 standard and 7 leadership aspects of management.
- Establishes criteria for different scores on each aspect, so each company can be marked on the quality of cradle to grave management of biodiversity.
- Allows the comparison of companies’ risk management and performance.
What does the benchmark do?

- Provides an **objective**, consistent basis for examining the comparative risk exposure and management of companies on biodiversity.
- Helps answer the question “how does the CBD translate into **specific responsibilities** for companies”.
- Reveals specific **strengths** and **weaknesses** of **companies** on biodiversity.
- Allows mainstream investors to consider biodiversity in their **investment decisions**.
- Offers companies **peer comparison**, a **framework** and specific suggestions for continual **improvement** on management of biodiversity.
- **Transparency and public visibility** of results offers companies incentive for further improvement.
- Provides detailed **information** to civil society on companies’ performance.
How does the benchmarking exercise take place?

- Information from **publicly available corporate literature** matched against benchmark criteria for **initial results**.

- Initial results sent to each company for correction and addition of **supplementary information** which is not in the public domain.

- Discussions/meetings with companies for any necessary **clarification**.

- Benchmark **results finalised**. General **report published**.

- **Specific results sent to each company** together with “engagement” letter **requesting changes** in governance, policy/strategy, management and disclosure.
Biodiversity Benchmark

Elements of the biodiversity benchmark:

- Governance structures
- Policy and strategy
- Management and implementation
- Assurance and reporting
- Leadership
### How do the participants perform?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Companies engaged and actively managing (Score &gt;66%)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mining and Minerals</th>
<th>Oil and Gas</th>
<th>Utilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Biodiversity is acknowledged as a potential business risk and opportunity ▪ Biodiversity risk has been formally assessed ▪ Specific related policy commitments and management tools in place</td>
<td>Rio Tinto Anglo American BHP Billiton Alcoa#</td>
<td>BG Group BP Shell Total#</td>
<td>Northumbrian Water* Severn Trent Water United Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companies aware and mobilising (Score 33% - 66%)</td>
<td>▪ Awareness demonstrated through acknowledgement of company’s impact on biodiversity, its inclusion within certain aspects of risk management and/or some reference within policy documents and/or management tools</td>
<td>CEMEX# Lafarge# Lonmin* Xstrata†</td>
<td>Cairn Energy*† ENI# Norsk Hydro# Premier Oil* Statoil# Venture*†</td>
<td>Centrica National Grid Scottish Power# Scottish &amp; Southern# Kelda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companies in early stages (Score &lt; 33%)</td>
<td>▪ Little or no evidence that potential risks relating to biodiversity have been formally assessed ▪ No publicly expressed rationale provided for any conclusion that biodiversity is not a business risk ▪ Policy for biodiversity risk management is limited in geographical and/or business function scope or does not exist at all</td>
<td>Alcan# Antofagasta Aquarius Platinum* Holcim# Vedanta#</td>
<td>OMV# Soco*† Tullow*†</td>
<td>E.ON# Suez#</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Companies with market capitalisation of £2 billion or less (source: Datastream, as at 31 December 2004)
# Companies that are new to the benchmark of 2005
† Companies that improved their scores by more than 100% from the 2004 benchmark
Power for Change?

"My question is: Are we making an impact?"
Encouraging change

Average scores show overall trend of improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mining and metals</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil and gas</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cairn Energy, Xstrata, Venture, Soco & Tullow more than doubled their performance

Ongoing dialogue and key engagement points beginning to be addressed

A number of companies actively tracking and participating in initiatives to address emerging issues e.g. offsets, landscape level planning

Areas of significant weakness remain (risk evaluation, policy and strategy, assurance and reporting)
Mining and minerals sector

- Scored highest in stakeholder engagement, ESIA, training
- Lowest scores for corporate risk management, strategy, site level BAPs, reporting, assurance
- Largest score increase from 2004 in stakeholder engagement, policy and internal auditing

- Best practice examples:
  - Rio Tinto (strategy)
  - Anglo American (auditing)
  - Lafarge (toolkit)
Oil and gas sector

- Scored highest in assignment of responsibility for biodiversity risk management, ESIA, training
- Lowest scores for commitments regarding sensitive sites, strategy, site level BAPs, reporting, assurance
- Largest score increase from 2004 in risk management, policy & strategy and training

- Best practice examples:
  - Shell (training/ site selection)
  - BG (strategic risk review)
  - ENI (EBI)
Utilities sector

• Scored highest in integration of biodiversity into business processes, KPIs, partnerships, ESIAs, policy

• Lowest scores for commitments regarding sensitive sites, strategy, site level BAPs, assurance

• Largest score increase from 2004 in BAP development

• Best practice examples:
  • Kelda (policy)
  • United Utilities (risk management)
Recommendations

- Report sets out series of minimum and best practice recommendations for biodiversity management
- As a minimum companies should report outcome of biodiversity risk evaluation, policy commitments and site level management activities
- Companies are encouraged to pay particular attention to
  - Making clear policy and strategy commitments
  - Undergoing robust risk assessment processes and creating linked biodiversity management activities
  - Development of biodiversity performance indicators
  - Addressing gaps in assurance processes
  - Participating in effective integrated land use planning
What are the limitations of the benchmark?

- So far, only designed for **direct footprint impacts**, not supply chain impacts.

- **Relies** largely on **corporate information** (eg existence of policies and management tools on biodiversity) and companies’ statement on how these management tools are applied. (But does require some evidence to back up assertions.)

- Doesn’t provide detailed, technical **“how to”** information, but points companies to examples of best practice.

- **Human and financial resources** required to do the analysis and communicate with companies.
Vision for the future

- Wider uptake of benchmarking approach: finance sector, collaboration with NGOs and business schools
- Promote consistency of approach and enhance data quality
- Focus on sectors deemed material in terms of biodiversity impacts: design a supply-chain benchmark to complement this direct footprint one.
- Interest from CBD community, UNEPFI, NGOs and business schools.
Some responses to the benchmark

- Company use of the benchmark as a framework to audit approaches to biodiversity management
- Logical framework for approaching biodiversity management for small and large companies
- Means of securing senior attention on biodiversity, builds the internal business case
- Takes a significant amount of time to complete – resource intensive

Over to our panel for their views
Additional information
Governance structures

- **Responsibilities** for biodiversity performance assigned at all levels including 1) Group / Divisional level and 2) Site level

- **Risk management** Implications of key biodiversity impacts and issues factored into risk evaluation within the lifecycle of operations and supply chain.

- **Stakeholder engagement** to inform understanding of biodiversity issues and impacts at local and global level.

- **Integration** biodiversity integrated into corporate decision-making.
Policy and strategy

- Policy commitment to:
  - understand, avoid, minimise and mitigate impact throughout life cycle of operations (across value chain and temporally)
  - contribute to legal & policy framework
  - work in partnership
  - offset impact
  - integrate into core business processes
  - monitor & report
  - continuous improvement

- Strategy to drive biodiversity performance:
  - vision, SMART objectives and targets
Management and implementation

- **Environmental management system** includes consideration of biodiversity

- **Site selection tool** to ensure biodiversity factored into initial decision on siting of new locations / activities

- **Environmental and social impact assessments (ESIA)** for any new capital project and any substantial modification of existing projects as early as possible in the project lifecycle and iterative

- **Biodiversity Action Plans** at site level for all sites of high biodiversity value or risk of significant impact on biodiversity. OR: Integration of biodiversity into (other) site plans, e.g. site management plans, community development plans, closure plans, water management plan, waste rock management plans etc.

- **Partnerships** partners involved in setting vision and goals; designed to support corporate goals and NBSAP and other national/ community biodiversity priorities; measurable outcomes are reported

- **Competency & Employee awareness** Key staff competency ensured by recruitment or training and mechanisms in place to raise awareness of employees in key positions on issues relating to biodiversity
Assurance and reporting

Site level & corporate level audits
- Internal & external audits to determine extent policy and procedures at site and corporate level.
- Progress against BAPs or site management plans.

Management information
- Internal & external audits to determine whether information used is complete, accurate and reliable.
- External audits refer to report verification

Key performance indicators
- Qualitative indicators (measures effectiveness of management systems e.g. proportion of BAPs in place at high risk sites)
- Quantitative/outcome indicators (for example catastrophic event recorded, reclassification of location as site of special conservation (e.g. SSSI, IUCN protected areas)
- Process indicators relate to management systems, outcome refer directly to performance

Sensitive sites
- Commitment to understand and manage impact on sensitive sites
- Acknowledgement of business risks
- Disclosure of key operations in/adjacent to sensitive sites
Leadership

- Level of conservation activity commensurate with risk exposure
- Activities address external underlying causes
- Clarity on third party involvement
  - Are joint ventures influenced by company standards
  - Do contractors follow company standards
- Closure or sale managed to protect reputation by ensuring biodiversity management continues
- Track emerging issues
- Share knowledge/information with conservation community
## Detailed results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Mining and Minerals</th>
<th>Oil and Gas</th>
<th>Utilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong risk assessment processes are in place at the site and the corporate level</td>
<td>3/13 (23%)</td>
<td>7/13 (54%)</td>
<td>3/10 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy frameworks are strong and cover all types of business functions, containing specific biodiversity commitments</td>
<td>3/13 (23%)</td>
<td>3/13 (23%)</td>
<td>4/10 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity strategy in place or under development which covers all types of operations and business functions and includes a range of specific strategic commitments</td>
<td>8/13 (61%)</td>
<td>6/13 (46%)</td>
<td>6/10 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity Action Plans or equivalent site management plans in place for all high risk sites</td>
<td>4/13 (31%)</td>
<td>4/13 (31%)</td>
<td>4/10 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal and external assurance processes in place that cover biodiversity related management systems and all key risk areas</td>
<td>0/13 (0%)</td>
<td>2/13 (15%)</td>
<td>3/10 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robust biodiversity performance indicators developed</td>
<td>0/13 (0%)</td>
<td>0/13 (0%)</td>
<td>0/10 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on all operations which contain, are in or near sensitive sites, and the potential impacts and activities undertaken to manage those impacts</td>
<td>2/13 (15%)</td>
<td>3/13 (23%)</td>
<td>1/10 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>