The world currently faces an unprecedented rate of biodiversity loss, with some scientists claiming we have entered a sixth mass extinction event. This loss is being attributed to human activities and impacts on habitat and ecosystems.

Global biodiversity initiatives such as the World Conservation Congress Recommendations, the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Aichi Biodiversity targets play a key role in solving this challenge. But to be successful these initiatives require application of appropriate biodiversity metrics since only what gets measured gets managed. Metrics are also key to a growing number of companies that are evaluating ways to minimize their operational footprint or making additional conservation investments. Credibly demonstrating the effectiveness of these conservation actions and investments has proved consistently difficult with metrics that have commonly been used to date.

BHP recently established new corporate biodiversity targets: a five-year biodiversity performance target (FY2018-FY2022), complemented by a longer-term goal (2030). The 5-year biodiversity target focuses on the contribution toward conservation of an area of land greater than its operational footprint, with the longer-term goal be aligned to UN SDG 14 (Life Below Water) and UN SDG 15 (Life On Land), which articulate expectations including conservation, restoration and sustainable use of marine and terrestrial ecosystems.

During the process of developing the biodiversity target, stakeholder engagement highlighted diverse understanding and views on how biodiversity impacts and benefits should be measured, resulting in an additional element of the five-year target that focuses on developing, with external partners, a more robust assessment methodology.

Conservation International (CI) and BHP have started to work on this assessment methodology by developing a multi-step Biodiversity Impacts and Benefits Framework that considers site specific biological complexity and aims to evaluate the effectiveness of the biodiversity focused activities undertaken by BHP, both ‘inside the fence’ as a part of mitigating its operational activities and ‘outside the fence’ as a part of its broader social investment contributions.
**APPROACH**

The Framework is being developed in two phases.

Phase 1 (now complete) identified a set of suitable biodiversity indicator categories that holistically evaluate marine, land and freshwater biodiversity impacts.

Phase 2 (in progress) involves development of the framework to capture the context-specific nature of biodiversity at sites, identify site-level indicators to track over time and meaningfully aggregate this information at a corporate level to assess biodiversity related impacts and benefits.

To do this, CI leveraged biodiversity components of scape-level assessment tools developed by CI and its partners — including the Ocean Health Index (OHI), the Landscape Assessment Framework (LAF) and the Freshwater Health Index (FHI) — and reviewed the findings against existing indicator attributes. Results in Phase 1 yielded “habitat” and “species” as broad indicator categories, and results in Phase 2 yielded the development and piloting of a six-step Framework.

CI and BHP are also collaborating in this with the United Nations Environment World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) via the Proteus Partnership, which is developing a biodiversity Indicator framework for the extractives sector more broadly. The framework will use pressure/state/response (P/S/R) measures of biodiversity impact and provide site level indicators of biodiversity performance which can be aggregated at a corporate level.

---

**FRAMEWORK STEPS**

A six-step Framework is under development to organize decision-making and actions by scope, from the broadest level (global) at Step 1, to the narrowest level (site-specific) at Step 2, onward to Step 3 indicator selection and implementation, assessment and adaptive management, in successive steps.

- **Step 1:** Global screening and scoping of sites using tools such as the Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool (IBAT) to identify habitats and species of important and threatened status. This step also allows initial categorization of a site into a high biodiversity importance “tier 1” or less concerning “tier 2” site, based upon the identified threatened habitats and/or species.

- **Step 2:** A site level assessment that seeks to validate the biodiversity ‘tier’ categorization obtained in Step 1 by using additional regional and field-based information.

- **Step 3:** Select indicators by analyzing the information from Steps 1 and 2 to identify the most appropriate indicators to be carried forward.

- In the future, **Steps 4-6** will include implementing indicator use, assessing effectiveness over time and reporting and applying adaptive management.

---

**WHAT’S NEXT**

Further refinement of Steps 1 to 3 will be undertaken to assist in consistent application of key concepts such as area of influence, buffers and adjacency. Work on Steps 4 to 6 will include developing a process for aggregating site-level data into an indicator of biodiversity performance at an enterprise or corporate level. Tracking these indicators using a pressure/state/response model will be essential to ensure multiple aspects are being considered such as drivers of biodiversity loss, and the effectiveness of mitigatory or beneficial social investment actions.

*Our aim is to continue to work collaboratively with others to finalize the Framework and help implement it in order to help guide and inform BHP — and the broader sector — with regards to the effectiveness of actions which can contribute to biodiversity conservation.*
STEP 1: SCREENING / SCOPING

- **GLOBAL LEVEL DATASETS ASSESSMENT**
  - Selection Criteria: (1) Species—IUCN Red List and Habitats—IUCN Category I-IV; (2) IFC Critical Habitat; and (3) BHP’s Our Requirements for Environment and Climate Change standard

TIER 1
- Includes threatened or endangered species or habitat

TIER 2
- Does not include threatened or endangered species or habitat

Implemented by:
- Corporate-level environmental staff

Outcome: All sites grouped into either Tier 1 or Tier 2

STEP 2: SITE ASSESSMENT

- **TIER 1**
  - Conduct additional localized assessments using local datasets, stakeholder engagement, information and regional and local regulatory/permitting requirements

- **TIER 2**
  - Use additional site-level assessments to confirm Step 1 findings (e.g. local data, stakeholder consultation, regional and local regulatory/permitting requirements)

 Implemented by:
- Site-level environmental managers

Outcome: Refinement of Step 1 findings based on local data

STEP 3: SELECT INDICATORS

- **TIER 1**
  - Apply P/S/R indicators to identified sites and biodiversity components

- **TIER 2**
  - Apply Response indicators to identified sites (e.g. baseline assessments, EMP†, BAP‡, BHP company commitments)

 Implemented by:
- Site-level managers

NEXT PHASE

STEP 4: IMPLEMENT INDICATOR USE

NEXT PHASE

STEP 5: ASSESS EFFECTIVENESS OVER TIME / REPORT

NEXT PHASE

STEP 6: APPLY ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

*Site level assessments including national or regional Red Lists and expert opinion may re-classify a Tier 2 site, based on global datasets, as a Tier 1 site or vice versa.

† Environmental Management Plan (EMP), Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP)

For more information, please contact Leonardo Viana at lviana@conservation.org

Learn more: [www.conservation.org/bhp](http://www.conservation.org/bhp)