

Technical Workshop on Aligning Biodiversity Measurement Approaches for Business – Minutes Days 2 & 3

October 30 & 31 2019 in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Workshop Objectives

This document is a record of the discussions held for Technical Workshop 2 of the [Aligning Biodiversity Measures for Business](#) initiative on October 30- 31, 2019 in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. The workshop was organised and run jointly by the Boticário Group Foundation and the UN Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP – WCMC), and generously hosted at Lab de Cocriação, Casa Firjan. It followed a larger non-technical workshop on the 29th October aimed at information exchange (day 1) for which there are separate minutes. Workshop objectives followed from conversations held at Workshop 1 in Brussels in March, 2019 – meeting minutes for this event can be found [here](#). The workshop aimed to:

- Explore the methodologies behind emerging biodiversity measures for business, identifying areas of common ground and divergence in order to define common ground principles for biodiversity measurement approaches and the potential for a set of measurement approaches that meet the needs of the private sector
- Produce recommendations and guidance for the developers of measurement approaches, business and policy makers

Twenty-six participants attended, more than half of these were developers of biodiversity measurement approaches but business users, government and NGOs were also represented. See annex 1 for a participant list.

Discussions were based around two pre-read documents:

- UNEP-WCMC (on behalf of the Aligning Biodiversity Measures for Business initiative). 2019. Discussion Paper 1 for the Technical Workshop on Aligning Biodiversity Measures for Business: Identifying common ground between corporate biodiversity measurement approaches. [Available online here](#).
- UNEP-WCMC. 2019. Corporate biodiversity measurement approaches within the current and future global policy context (A discussion paper - [available online here](#)).

Minutes

Day 2

All presentations can be accessed [online here](#).

Welcome (Annelisa Grigg, UNEP-WCMC)

Participants were asked to identify the primary messages from Day 1. Participants recognized the need for simple metrics (that are not too simple) and acknowledged that there are a range of measurement approaches that can be used right now. A need for the tools in development to be aligned through a unifying framework was identified. There was recognition of the good work being done, which needs to remain focused on end user needs.

Session 1: Technical Discussion - Sub Group 1 (Business Applications & Targets)

Presentation: *Identifying and selecting appropriate measurement approaches (Johan Lammerant, Arcadis – sub-group 1 Chair)*

Three elements need to be considered in defining suitable biodiversity measurement approaches: business application, targets and organisational focus. Discussions focused primarily on a draft Decision Tree and matrix categorising biodiversity measurement approaches based on organisational focus and business application. Feedback from participants is provided below.

Business applications (Table 1 in Discussion Paper 1)

- Participants were supportive of the typology of business applications with a few additions: it was agreed that accounting for biodiversity impacts should be added as an additional business application, merging of applications 5 and 6 was discussed and dismissed.

Business applications matrix (Figure 1 in Discussion Paper 1)

- Some felt the matrix a valuable contribution to help users identify where their methodology fits, others felt that it was currently quite complex. Part of the complexity of the matrix is derived from over-reporting of measurement approaches across a range of business applications for which they could potentially be used (rather than are actually being used). External review and challenge of the matrix is required, perhaps only those approaches that can demonstrate use cases for an application should be shown against that application.
- The matrix could be refined to add more information e.g. to separate out quantitative versus qualitative approaches, to classify approaches according to the nature of the metric used e.g. species based/ mean species abundance/ potentially disappeared fraction. Colour coding could be used in a different way to the current approach to differentiate different types of approach.
- Should the Biodiversity Indicators for Extractives methodology fit into the sector or portfolio organisational focus? The method was designed to operate primarily at site level but with a view to enabling results consolidation to corporate level.

Decision tree (Figure 2, discussion paper 1)

- Focus of the decision tree is on impacts rather than dependencies. It is proposed that the decision tree be placed within a broader decision tree that is being developed by the Capitals Coalition and Cambridge Conservation Initiative as supplementary guidance on biodiversity to the Natural Capital Protocol.
- Similar decision tree tools have been developed before and should inform the development of this tree e.g. WBCSD's Eco4Biz (noting that the IUCN is still developing tools related to this)
- Additional criteria could be added to the decision tree to help select a measurement tool:
 - A starting question could be whether the user of the decision tree was interested in impacts, dependencies or both (whilst noting that the decision tree currently focuses on dependencies)
 - Include a question that enables the user to narrow down on their specific circumstance e.g. where does the lifecycle analysis department go to within the decision tree to answer their questions? The tree could include a box that filters the user according to the department they are working for.
 - Granularity and nature of data available (e.g. If only relying on pressure data then tools x,y,z are available) and/ or required. Nature of data (modelled versus measured). An option to change selection based on these resource needs would be helpful.
 - Level of accuracy (or inaccuracy you want to accept – note that this is related to organisational focus)
 - Split the tools via sector (box 3)
 - Insight into the resources/ requirements to run the different measurement approaches would be helpful
- A number of comments were made on the ordering of the questions asked in the decision tree:
 - First question could be organisational focus rather than starting with business applications
 - May be important to merge questions 2 / 3 as they are related

- Questions 1 and 3 are related, 3 could come first
- Suggest adding additional boxes for category number 5 of decision tree - suggestions of additional tools for measurement approaches
- Clarify whether item 3 relates to product use or production
- Order of questions was suggested one group to be 1, 3 and then 4, a second group suggested 2-3-1 was a better order
- Concerns were raised regarding the answers raised in question 4, both external and user derived data could be used in combination, the decision tree doesn't allow for this
- After question 5 a matrix of tools and descriptions could be helpful
- A web based tool would be particularly helpful.
- It would be useful to illustrate tools with assessed/validated case studies presented in simple way e.g. on a website

Sub Group 1 (Business Applications & Targets) Action Items:

Actions	Owner	Due Date
Incorporate the points above and relevant elements of discussion paper 1 into the EU Business and Biodiversity platform update report 'Assessment of biodiversity measurement approaches for business and financial institutions' (the EU B@B Platform Report), adjusting the list of business applications and matrix of approaches to reflect feedback above and to only highlight measurement approaches that have been designed specifically to serve that business application.	Arcadis	Dec 2019
Adjust the decision tree to take into account the feedback above and incorporate in the decision tree for the biodiversity supplement to the Natural Capital Protocol.	UNEP-WCMC & Arcadis	January 2020

Session 2: Technical Discussion - Sub Group 2 (Scope, Boundaries & Baselines)

Presentation: Common ground on scope, boundaries and baselines (Julie Dimitrijevic, UNEP-WCMC)

Sub group aims were outlined i.e. to determine how scope, boundaries, and baselines are treated between measurement approaches and the implications of any differences, agree on common vocabulary of relevant terms and identify common ground principles in setting boundaries. A number of definitions were presented and discussed. Group feedback is provided below:

- A number of participants noted that the sub group discussion paper and pre-read had not captured all comments made to date.
- Different measurement approaches are based in different disciplines e.g. Lifecycle analysis, hence the same terms are used in different ways by different approaches. There is conflicting terminology for boundaries, scope, baselines. For some participants the term 'upstream' meant exploration and 'downstream' meant refining activities. For others 'upstream' meant product use and 'downstream' meant raw materials sourcing. A mapping of these terms could be helpful.
- This difference should be acknowledged and accepted, but further work on definitions is not required. Instead guidance on application of the definition would be more beneficial
- Participants noted that the Natural Capital Protocol had developed a common understanding of relevant definitions (scope, baselines, organisational focus) which should underpin discussions on biodiversity measurement. The Biological Diversity Protocol is similarly developing agreement on scope and boundaries.

Scope, perimeter and boundaries

- Caution is required with regards to the use of the term scope – in the Brussels workshop, a number of participants raised concerns in the use of scope to encompass issues such as ecosystems/species. This was reiterated in Brazil. Scope should be used to refer to organisational focus and used in line with its use in the Natural Capital Protocol.
- The different ways of defining scope should be set out. For example, scope 1, 2 and 3 used for greenhouse gas emissions does not capture all considerations relevant to biodiversity such as indirect and cumulative impacts.
- Organisational focus and value chain boundaries are different terms and should not be merged. The terms used in this sub group should link back to the terminology and definitions in sub group 1 on organisational focus.
- Boundary is not a single concept across all measurement approaches. For site based approaches assessment boundaries may be largely legislatively driven. However, this poses a challenge for multinationals where nationally driven requirements for assessments differ and there is misalignment between different approaches in different countries.
- Some issues relating to boundaries are more relevant for some measurement approaches than others. The Biodiversity Indicator for Extractives methodology has several different boundary issues: 1) where should the buffers be drawn around locations in global risk screening of potentially sensitive sites for biodiversity? and 2) what indirect/ cumulative impacts should be considered within the site area of influence/ impact?
- Reaching agreement on a definition of area of influence, for example, is quite sector specific and was seen by participants as being an issue more relevant for extractive companies. The definition presented on area of influence was considered fine, but further guidance may be required.

Baselines and reference points

- The paper does not yet clearly set out the concepts of baselines and reference points. Rather than stipulating that approaches adopt a specific baseline, the discussion paper should outline the range of potential baselines possible and the pros and cons of each.
- A baseline is simply a starting point for assessment. Transparency on the baseline set and the rationale behind it is important. Counterfactual may be particularly important to bend the curve of biodiversity. Measurement approaches need to be able to adapt to the range of potential baselines that could be selected.
- Site based measurement approaches may use local regulatory requirements to select baselines e.g. LIFE.
- There are implications for decision making if two companies using the same measurement approach use different baseline definitions this might lead to non-comparable results.
- Baselines should be conceptualised in the context of no net loss/ net gain commitments.

Sub Group 2 (Scope, Boundaries & Baseline) Action Items:

Actions	Owner	Due Date
It was agreed not to update the sub group discussion paper but to focus on incorporating the points above into the EU B@B Platform update report.	UNEP-WCMC	Dec 2019
Communicate work done to date into revisions to the Biological Diversity Protocol and draft supplementary guidance to the Natural Capital Protocol on biodiversity.	UNEP-WCMC	Jan 2020

Session 3: Technical Discussion - Sub Group 4 (Mainstreaming)

Presentation: Corporate biodiversity measurement approaches within the current and future global policy context (Joël Houdet, Endangered Wildlife Trust)

Sub group aimed to examine drivers, frameworks and current practice on corporate disclosure and identify gaps for driving improved performance and demonstrating contribution to global goals. Current reporting on biodiversity is poor with limited reporting against biodiversity related sustainable development goals or the Aichi targets. Reporting that does occur is limited and focused on narrative/ qualitative disclosures. Some countries e.g. France will require corporate disclosure of biodiversity. Biodiversity measurement approaches are evolving, but need to be placed within an accounting/ disclosure framework to aid broader uptake. Disclosure principles could assist with this, as proposed by the Biological Diversity Protocol. Group feedback is provided below.

1. How can the quality and uptake of corporate biodiversity disclosure/ voluntary frameworks and approaches be enhanced and encouraged?

- Some felt a mandatory reporting requirement was needed to drive progress and that companies should be committing to No Net Loss of biodiversity. External pressures from stakeholders, shareholders, the public and NGOs were also considered important drivers.
- Voluntary commitments can drive good practice, the IFC Performance Standard 6 which has increased biodiversity safeguards over project finance was cited as an example of this. The Global Reporting Initiative has a significant reach, with thousands of companies using it to report. Biodiversity is often not reported within this framework because it is not identified as a material issue.
- Barriers to current uptake of frameworks include lack of: perceived materiality of biodiversity, awareness of biodiversity issues in government, knowledge of the economic value of biodiversity and consistency in metrics.
- Potential avenues to increase uptake include:
 - Integration of biodiversity into existing issues considered material e.g. water and climate to strengthen the business case for reporting and disclosure on biodiversity
 - Need to make it easier for companies to understand that biodiversity can be material (links with financial revenues/expenses, assets/liabilities) and communicate potential materiality of biodiversity as an issue on a sectoral basis
 - Enhanced non regulatory drivers, for example sector specific requirements could drive action e.g. the proposed statement from the finance sector before the 15th Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity or inclusion of biodiversity requirements in stock exchange sustainability indices.
- Not all measurement approaches use the same type of data or can be expected to give the same level of robustness from a disclosure perspective. Companies using them need to be aware of the implications of this for external disclosure. Voluntary mechanisms should set out stricter requirements on disclosure to ensure consistency of biodiversity accounting approaches
- Clarity on the quality of the measurement approaches could assist in user uptake, their ability to meet requirements set out in emerging standards such as the Biological Diversity Protocol could provide this clarity. The principles set out within the BD Protocol in particular could help users to understand how a measurement approach can enable public disclosure on biodiversity performance.

2. How can existing biodiversity measurement approaches and frameworks help to improve corporate disclosure and reporting against national/global policy targets?

- In the CBD COP 13 in Cancun a broad call was made to incorporate business impacts into biodiversity policy and disclosures. Recommendations made in 2016¹ encouraged governments to enhance corporate transparency disclosing information on commitments, engagement and measurement. Measurement approaches can help provide a means for companies to demonstrate progress in implementing these recommendations. More than half of the existing

¹ At the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, Decision XII/10, on business engagement, invited Parties and businesses to take steps to increase the degree of reporting by businesses and requested the Executive Secretary to establish a typology of actions.

measurement approaches claim that they can be used to demonstrate attainment of societal goals e.g. the SDGs or Aichi targets.

- Submitting information on the measurement approaches to policy makers through the CBD process could help governments to implement this recommendation, but participants raised the question whether this would be enough to ensure transformational change?
- Recommendations could encourage adoption of phased approach within companies, setting out the minimum disclosure requirements e.g. outlining how assess the materiality of biodiversity impacts and what would be considered best practice e.g. calculating corporate/ product biodiversity footprints. With respect to climate change, reporting initially focused on disclosing GHG emissions of direct operations (scope 1 of GHG Protocol) and purchased energy (scope 2 of GHG Protocol). GHG emissions from the supply chain of organisations have been assessed and disclosed more recently. Broad qualitative commitments could be promoted through the Global Biodiversity Partnership of the CBD.

3. Examples of countries proactively encouraging voluntary and mandatory reporting and measurement

- France was identified as proactively encouraging corporate biodiversity impact disclosure. Some national governments have encouraged the uptake of the Global Reporting Initiative standards.
- Reporting schemes can be very context specific – the example of the Brazilian agribusiness responding to forest fires in the Amazon was given.
- National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans need to better engage business, notably in terms of target-setting for impact measurement and disclosure.

4. What would make an appropriate target for business in the absence of broadly agreed measurement approach?

- A quantitative target for biodiversity was considered important to drive action, lessons could be learned from the Paris agreement. Some felt that if a clear goal was set, the ability to measure would follow drawing from the example of zero deforestation commitments.
- Potential private sector targets could include:
 - Zero deforestation/ avoidance of deforestation/ use of native forest
 - Avoidance of impact on protected areas/ key biodiversity areas
 - Identification of material impacts and dependencies and actions to address them e.g. knowing sourcing locations/ key supply inputs
 - Land based/ species based targets e.g. phase out threatened species use
- Over time a more sophisticated approach to measurement could be adopted with a commitment for companies to understand their biodiversity footprint by a certain date
- A biodiversity based science based target is under discussion that has both a species and ecosystems component.
- A simple set of recommendations based on discussion paper 2 could demonstrate progress made in developing robust biodiversity measurement approaches to business in answer to the recommendations made to policy makers by the CBD in 2016.

Sub Group 4 (Mainstreaming) Action Items:

Actions	Owner	Due Date
Incorporate the points above and key elements of discussion paper 2 into the EU B@B Platform report.	EWT/UNEP-WCMC/Arcadis	December 2019
Update discussion paper 2 and finalise. Amend to include recommendations to policy makers and submit into the CBD political process as an information document.	UNEP-WCMC/ EWT	December 2019

Day 3

All presentations can be accessed [online here](#).

Welcome

Participants reflections on day 2 acknowledged the significant work that had been done, but noted that further efforts to align between different measurement approaches are required. A number of biodiversity measurement tools are available, but leadership is required to continue the progress made in securing alignment between these approaches. The opportunity and timing is right for having a large impact on guidelines and mainstreaming biodiversity into the business sector by linking to the post-2020 goals. It was highlighted that the work of ABMB needs to connect with the SDGs and work with companies to convince them to disclose information on biodiversity impacts.

Session 1: Technical discussion - Sub Group 3A (Data Sets)

Presentation: *Determining common data needs across measurement approaches (Joshua Berger, CDC Biodiversité)*

The focus of the sub group discussion was on work to map the data sets required by each methodology, identify common input data sets and agree on a limited set of input indicators and formats and a data accuracy scale. A database has been built by UNEP-WCMC and participants to the Gaining Consensus workshop in May 2019 in Cambridge, UK. It was refined to map the data sets used by approaches followed by the ABMB initiative and can be found here:

<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/ym0agydw9haz40/AABhLuktuXNy3Ue8qfWv696Ca?dl=0>

Data mapping

- The data mapping spreadsheet was welcomed as a comprehensive piece of work
- The structure and usability of the mapping could be improved through:
 - Adding filters (agricultural impacts, climate impacts etc.)
 - Linking data sets to measurement approaches for which they could be used
 - Linking to the data quality scale
 - Adding metadata and differentiating between public or private (behind paywall or access restricted) data
 - Need greater clarity on how species data is considered
- Inclusion of national datasets e.g. for Brazil would increase its completeness
- Participants disagreed on the land categorisation. The man-made pasture vs moderately to intensively used pasture is not “future-proofed” and it would be more flexible to use “high”, “medium”, “low”
- Some felt there was a bias in the collection of data which does not take into account the availability of EIA data – for direct data measurement approaches more comprehensive data is available than suggested.
- A number of participants questioned the lack of species and habitats based data in the mapping given that the focus of their monitoring was currently around these issues. Clarity is needed on how species are represented into the assessments.

Data accuracy scale (table 7, discussion paper 1)

- Some participants had identified a need to disclose quality of data underpinning the measurement approaches. A data accuracy scale was considered useful and could link to the decision tree
- It could be used for disclosure purposes, but also to aid internal decision making. Clarity is required, however, on what level of accuracy should be aspired to, some approaches may never reach (or need to reach) a high level of accuracy.

- The basis of the scale (which derives from IPCC climate science and a similar tiers approach used in Greenhouse gas emissions inventory calculation) was queried. This derivation needs to be clear. Conservation science² and lifecycle analysis could also assist in the further development of the scale.
- Current scale suggests direct measurement is accurate, but it can be inaccurate. There is also a need to be more specific about **tier 5**. Where does Redlist data on extent of suitable habitat and likely presence fit into the table?
- The BDP team will look at the data accuracy scale and consider how to link it to their proposed disclosure principles for biodiversity. There may be some circumstances where a certain level of data quality is required to be credible, for example.
- Assessing the quality of multiple data sources is required by many measurement approaches, the Global Biodiversity Score looks at lowest score if have multiple data sources. An alternative is to look at the basis of impact factors and assign the data scale level according to major impact factors.
- We need to make it clear that for each data accuracy scale, there is also accuracy issue based on how accurate the impact factor itself is. We should link the accuracy scale with accounting principles (equivalency and accuracy in particular).
- Many measurement approaches are not yet assessing data quality, hence the quality scale is a useful contribution to consistency of approach across them.

A fundamental question was raised by groups currently monitoring species within their biodiversity programmes on how such approaches fitted with measures structured around mean species abundance and how well MSA can link to species / IUCN Red List data based approaches.

Action Items – Common Ground Principles:

Actions	Owner	Due Date
Incorporate the points above and a summary of the relevant part of discussion paper 1 into the EU B@B Platform Report	EWT/UNEP-WCMC/Arcadis	December 2019
Adjust sub group discussion paper 3A as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add references for data sets into data mapping • Add note that direct measurement is accurate but can be inaccurate as well • Provide clearer headings for data mapping • Add column describing metadata of datasets • Look at data from: land use work from Australia, including water footprint mapped and the inputs/outputs used by companies, Brazilian datasets available (species focused) • Add column describing if dataset is public or private 	CDC Biodiversité	Dec 2019
Add data sources to the data mapping spreadsheet	Developers of measurement approaches	Jan 2019
Link data accuracy to data mapping / business applications discussed in sub group 1	Joël Houdet / CDC Biodiversité	Dec 2019
Review data accuracy scale in the light of lessons learned from the Biological Diversity Protocol	Joël Houdet	Dec 2019

² <https://journals.plos.org/plosbiology/article?id=10.1371/journal.pbio.3000183>

Actions	Owner	Due Date
Explore the linkages between species/ extinction risk measurement approaches and approaches based on MSA	CDC/ UNEP-WCMC	Dec 2019

Session 2: Technical discussion - Sub Group 3B (Metrics and midpoint characterisation factors)

Presentation: *Understanding common ground and differences on metric (Joshua Berger, CDC Biodiversité)*

The session aimed to understand how metrics are best categorized, understand the implications of different metrics on decision making and set out the links between measurement approaches based on biodiversity state, pressures and economic activities. A mapping of the language of the LCA community with language used to describe a more direct measurement of biodiversity (EIA practitioners, biodiversity specialists, natural capital assessment and accounting) was presented.

1. How are the implications of the use of each metric on business decisions best communicated to decision makers?

- Communication of the impact of metric use (relevance and limitations) on business decisions was considered to be an issue for developers rather than the ABMB initiative.
- Currently used metrics do not directly cover genetic diversity or ecological functions/ complexity although the potentially disappeared fraction and mean species abundance approaches link to ecological functions – hence coverage of biodiversity is incomplete.
- Some felt that value quantification was also not well addressed. Incorporation of ecosystem services can capture cultural values and some approaches are designed to consider monetary value e.g. Kering's EP&L and the LIFE impact approach considers financial costs and benefits of conservation actions. Linking measurement approaches to valuation approaches may be useful in the future.

2. Are there some business applications for which certain metrics are not suitable?

- Aggregated methods may be more useful for companies to make decisions than impacts on taxa, habitat and pressures which may be difficult to aggregate.
- Concern was expressed by some participants regarding the fact that we are trying to say which are the right metrics – this is not the role of the ABMB initiative.
- Measurement approaches may be trying to answer different questions. What is valuable is considering how the different metrics applied to the same situation may result in different decisions (without judgement on what's good or bad as it is not our role to evaluate approaches but to simply identify the gaps)
- The example of a development choice of two forests in different locations was discussed as a means of illustrating how different measurement approaches can result in different decisions in the same situation. Participants felt the example was helpful to prompt thinking but needed refinement. It could be refined as follows: comparison should not be made between impacts on forests in Brazil and France because of the differing legislative / regulatory frameworks.

3. What further work is required, especially regarding the categorization of metrics, the implications on business decisions, and the links between measurement approaches based on biodiversity state or on pressures and economic activities?

- Figure 6 in discussion paper 1 which outlines links between approaches focusing on elementary components of biodiversity and approaches using aggregated metrics was considered useful and a helpful contribution to the Capitals Coalition's supplementary guidance to the Natural Capital Protocol on biodiversity. Under metrics focused on elementary components of biodiversity, approaches based on state should be separated from those based on pressure/ economic activities. There is a third level of data relating to economic aspects of the business

- Running different measurement approaches on the same company would be helpful to identify common ground and connections between approaches but it was concluded that it was unrealistic for a company to pay for the application of two different approaches
- Refinement of the sub group 3 b discussion paper was considered to be a useful contribution to achieving common ground between measurement approaches.

Sub Group 3B (Metrics and midpoint characterisation factors) Action Items:

Actions	Owner	Due Date
Incorporate the points above and relevant section of discussion paper 1 into the EU B@B Platform report	CDC Biodiversité	December 2019
Adjust sub group discussion paper 1 to reflect the feedback above.	CDC Biodiversité	March 2020

Session 3: Technical discussion – Common Ground Principles

Presentation: Common ground between measurement approaches (Annelisa Grigg, UNEP-WCMC)

Draft common ground principles were presented for discussion with illustrated examples. A number of participants felt that the examples were not broadly agreed and therefore should be removed from the meeting record. Key discussion points:

- There was general agreement that principles would be helpful to drive consistency, however, participants also recognised that a number of principles already exist that have been the subject of consultation in, for example, the Natural Capital Protocol – these could be interpreted for biodiversity measurement.
- However, since the Protocol was designed for internal decision making, there is a gap in relation to disclosure. The Biological Diversity Protocol can provide guidance in this area, drawing from the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and International Financial and Reporting Standards and sets out relevant principles. The principle of equivalency was considered key here.
- There was general agreement that a focus on common ground would be more helpful than developing new principles (with the exception of those relating to disclosure).
- Using existing principles as a quality checklist might be helpful for developers to self-assess or for potential users to determine whether approaches meets certain criteria for robustness

Action Items – Common Ground Principles:

Actions	Owner	Due Date
Use principles put forward by Natural Capital Protocol as a checklist for quality of biodiversity measurement approaches and reflect this within the European B@B Platform report.	UNEP-WCMC	Dec 2019
Adjust the BDP disclosure principles based on the discussions in Brazil.	EWT	Ongoing
Review and adopt the BDP disclosure principles where approach is designed for external disclosure	All developers	Ongoing
Remove supporting examples of the draft principles from the slide deck	UNEP-WCMC	Nov 2019

Closing Remarks

Participants welcomed the chance to come together to discuss common ground. Agreeing common ground between developers, making recommendations for policy makers and convening developers and users of measurement approaches were considered an important focus for ABMB. In the short term, the discussions from the two-day workshop will be integrated into the following outputs:

- Discussions on business applications, targets, scope, boundaries, metrics, data and disclosure will be documented in an update of a co-branded report with the European Business and Biodiversity Platform on biodiversity measurement approaches (Dec 2019)
- Feedback on the decision tree will be used to create a draft decision tree for consultation that will be part of a biodiversity supplement to the Natural Capital Protocol (Jan 2020)
- UNEP-WCMC. 2019. Corporate biodiversity measurement approaches within the current and future global policy context (A discussion paper) will be adjusted for submission into the CBD political process (December 2019).
- Sub-group discussion papers on metrics and data will be reviewed, updated and finalised with one final sub-group webinar conducted in 2020 (March 2020)
- The current phase of funding for ABMB ends in 2019. Further funding will be sought to enable continued exchange of knowledge and identification of common ground and assistance is invited from the participants for this. In the meantime, UNEP-WCMC and other ABMB partners will seek to convene meetings at the World Conservation Congress in Marseille, France in June 2020 and at the 15th Conference of the Parties of the CBD in China in the fourth quarter of 2020.

Annex 1: Participants

Name	Name
Alice Alexandre (Life Institute)	Julie Dimitrijevic (UNEP-WCMC)
Ana Pante Brador (Equinor)	Karen Barbosa (LIFE Institute)
Andrea Lopes (Firjan)	Leah Gerber (Arizona State University)
Andrea Santos Arantes (Posigraf)	Leonardo Viana (Conservation International)
Andrew Caudwell (Fauna & Flora Intl)	Lisen Runsten (UNEP-WCMC)
Anke Manuela Salzmänn (Boticário Group Foundation)	Luiz Almeida (Partnerships For Forests)
Annelisa Grigg (UNEP-WCMC)	Marcelo Medeiros (Shell)
Bianca Brasil (CBD Secretariat)	Mark Goedkoop (Pre - Remote Attendee)
Braulio Dias (University of Brasília)	Matheus Couto (UNEP-WCMC)
Cath Tayleur (Cambridge Institute For Sustainability Leadership)	Matheus Figueira (CEBDS)
Claudiana Sales (Anglo American no Brasil)	Mulumba Agaba (Remote Attendee)
Clément Surun (Ecological Accounting Chair)	Octavio Nogueira (Cooperação Internacional Alemã (GIZ))
David Álvarez (Ecoacsa Reserva De Biodiversidad)	Patrícia Machado (Brazilian Tree Industry)
Debora Drucker (Remote Attendee)	Rafael Loyola (Brazilian Foundation For Sustainable Development)
Elisa Romano (Ministry Of Environment)	Regiane Borsato (LIFE Institute)
Flavia Pessoa (Santa Rosa)	Regiane Salata (LIFE Institute)
Frineia Rezende (Reservas Votorantim)	Renato Rocha (Suzano Sa)
Guilherme Karam (Boticário Group Foundation)	Rodrigo Cassola (CDP- Remote Attendee)
Henrique Luz (CEBDS)	Shane Sparg (BirdLife - Remote Attendee)
Jane Mauro (Petrobras)	Susana Silva (Remote Attendee)
Joel Houdet (EWT)	Thaís Zuccolotto (Suzano)
Johan Lammerant (Arcadis -Remote Attendee)	Thiago Valente (Boticário Group Foundation)
John Finisdore (Remote Attendee)	Victor Alvarado (Remote Attendee)
Joshua Berger (CDC Biodiversité)	Vinicius Burigo (Petrobras)
Juliana Almeida-Rocha (Intl Institute for Sustainability)	Wendy Francesconi (CIAT)
	Wijnand Broer (CREM - Remote Attendee)