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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Society</strong></td>
<td>Resettlement</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of access to resources &amp; CH</td>
<td>Foreign investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biodiversity</strong></td>
<td>Clearance</td>
<td>Artificial reefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pollution</td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recognizing that there was no clear and reliable regard to the mitigation hierarchy and the use of appropriate methodologies can do more harm to biodiversity, communities and to companies than it does good. Over 90 collaborators in the Business and Biodiversity Offsets Programme (BBOP) have developed a Standard on Biodiversity Offsets. The aim of the Standard is to help companies, lenders, and governments, civil society, and auditors navigate enough, over 90 collaborators in the Business and Biodiversity Offsets Programme.

This overview document provides an introduction to the BBOP’s work to date in helping companies meet these new challenges and opportunities, and ways to compare their performance with peers in their sector. It is an update of the overview published in 2009.

Figure 1: The Mitigation Hierarchy

\[\begin{align*}
\text{PI} &= \text{Predicted Impact} \\
\text{Av} &= \text{Avoidance} \\
\text{Min} &= \text{Minimisation} \\
\text{R} &= \text{Rehabilitation/Restoration} \\
\text{Offset} &= \text{Offset} \\
\text{ACA} &= \text{Additional Conservation Actions (not related to footprint)}
\end{align*}\]
Social impacts of offsetting

• People’s use and cultural values associated with biodiversity?

• Costs – social disparity and inequity

• Benefits – improved livelihood options

• Local communities should be “no worse off”
  (BBOP 2012, Guidance Notes)

  o What does this actually mean?

  o Who decides on what is acceptable?
Research aim

- Expand NNL to include people’s social and cultural values associated with biodiversity
- NNL for both people and nature?
- NNL policies: achieve a NNL of biodiversity and a social NNL

1. NNL of what?
2. NNL for whom?
3. NNL compared to what?
1. NNL of what?

- Metric for social gain and loss?
- Ecosystem services - essential for wellbeing
- Wellbeing changes with ecosystem quality
1. NNL of what?

Subjective
How you feel about what you have and what you can do

Material
What you have

WELLBEING

Relational
What you can do with what you have

White 2009
1. NNL of what?

• Perceptions influence wellbeing

• Include local people in the decision-making process!

• Preferences for offset activities can influence its social acceptability
2. NNL for whom?

- Project-affected Persons (PAPs):
  - Directly / indirectly affected by changed access to natural resources
  - At **both** development and offset sites

- Distribution of costs and benefits amongst PAPs (spatially and temporally)

Adapted from the World Bank 2015
2. NNL for whom?

Spatial gains and losses

Before development of the dam

After development of the dam

Griffiths et al. in review
2. NNL for whom?

- What level should social NNL be aggregated?
2. NNL for whom?

Social NNL at regional level (aggregating villages)

Before development of the dam

After development of the dam

All HHs: free access to natural resources

Overall NNL at regional level

Griffiths et al. in review
2. NNL for whom?

Social NNL at village level (aggregating HHs in village)

Before development of the dam:
- All 4 HHs have free access to natural resources

After development of the dam:
- All HHs lose access to natural resources
  - HHs in A get compensation
  - HHs in B get no compensation

Overall NNL for village
2. NNL for whom?

Measuring NNL at these levels is **difficult**

Measuring NNL at these levels is **easier**

**BUT**

Social and economic inequity arises

- ID PAPs and understand inequality in the system

Griffiths et al. in review
2. NNL for whom?

Temporal gains and losses

- People also tend to place more value on what they have now
  - Feel immediate loss of biodiversity much more than future gains
- Compensate PAPs throughout the project lifecycle
3. NNL compared to what?

- Frame of reference (baseline or counterfactual) needed

**Perceived baselines**

**Objective baselines**

- Selected baseline – acceptable to external parties but reflect PAPs lived experience
Conclusion: defining social NNL

Project-affected people (appropriately aggregated) should perceive their wellbeing to be at least as good as a result of the development project and associated biodiversity offset, throughout the project lifecycle, than if the development had not been implemented.
Thank you and questions?
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