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Social aspects of biodiversity NNL

What is our goal?
Social outcomes from NNL are sustainable & equitable.
Example A
Biodiversity No Net Loss is achieved

- People at development lose biodiversity
- Different people benefit from the offset
- Fewer people benefit
Example B
Biodiversity No Net Loss is achieved

- People at development lose biodiversity
- People at offset site lose access to biodiversity
Biodiversity offsets should achieve no net loss of biodiversity with respect to species composition, habitat structure, ecosystem function and *people’s use and cultural values associated with biodiversity*. 

Ensure *local people are no worse off; considering local needs*. 

[BBOP logo]
Mandates NNL in certain situations, requiring implementers to consider *how their project affects ecosystem services*
**PROVISIONING**
products obtained from nature, such as food and timber

**REGULATING**
services provided by nature that regulate our environment, such as water and air cleaning services

**CULTURAL**
non material benefits provided by nature which enrich lives such as recreation, learning and tranquillity

**SUPPORTING**
the underpinning (or supporting) services which enable other services to function, such as soil formation and nutrient recycling
Many standards, guidelines & legislation protecting local people

- International Finance Corporation Performance Standard 8 (IFC 2012)
- UNESCO 1872 Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage
- Convention on Biological Diversity requires “to protect and encourage the customary use of biological resources in accordance with traditional cultural practices that are compatible with conservation or sustainable use”
what's the Problem?
No detailed guidance on achieving social outcomes from No Net Loss

What social outcomes to achieve?

Ad-hoc at best, limited consideration at worst
Today’s training

• Potential impacts from NNL on people

• Social outcomes from NNL to achieve

• How to achieve these outcomes
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Potential NNL impacts on people

• People & biodiversity:
  o Use e.g. firewood
  o Value e.g. cultural sites, social cohesion
  o Depend e.g. subsistence, livelihoods

• A development’s biodiversity impact & its offset

• Direct loss & lost access
List potential impacts on people from tree loss

Who?

How affected?

- Some men (family of hunters) undertake illegal hunting bushmeat for subsistence purposes & to sell surplus locally
- Specialists collect medicinal plants when sickness (paid)
- All households collect firewood
- In groups, women visit cultural sites within the forest
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>How affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some men undertake illegal hunting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialists collecting medicinal plants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All households (women) collect firewood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women visiting cultural sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some men undertake illegal hunting</td>
<td>Individual, specific households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialists collecting medicinal plants</td>
<td>Individual, specific households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All households (women) collect firewood</td>
<td>Village-level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women visiting cultural sites</td>
<td>Individual women</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential NNL impacts on people

- **Who:** households, village, interest group, gender

- **Where:** development site & offset

- **How affected:** use, value, dependency, social cohesion, lose biodiversity, lose access

Better your understanding = the better your NNL design
Today’s training
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Development seeking biodiversity NNL should achieve an outcome whereby:

People, appropriately aggregated, perceive their wellbeing to be at least as good as a result of NNL than if the development & offset had not been implemented.
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Social impact assessment

• All people (directly & indirectly) affected by a development’s biodiversity impact & offset

• Assess social impacts from NNL at a scale of potentially significant impacts:
  – Village level
  – Interest group
  – Gender

• Aggregation level might differ between development site & offset

• Justify aggregation level (evidence?)
Social impact assessment

• All people (directly & indirectly) affected by a development’s biodiversity impact & offset

• **Assess social impacts from NNL** at a scale of potentially significant impacts:
  – Village level
  – Interest group
  – Gender

• **Thresholds: unacceptable impacts (cannot compensate for)**
Social impact assessment

Justify aggregation level(s) – evidence?

Examples of unacceptable social impacts from NNL

What if unacceptable social impacts?
## Social impact assessment

### Check list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Households, village, interest group, gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>Development site &amp; offset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Use, value, dependency, social cohesion, lose biodiversity, loss access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thresholds of unacceptable impacts – apply Mitigation Hierarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriately aggregated</td>
<td>At scale of significant impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justify aggregation level(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
People, appropriately aggregated, perceive their wellbeing to be at least as good as a result of NNL than if the development & offset had not been implemented.

- **Measurement**
  - Simple social or economic indicators unacceptable
  - Consider individual components of wellbeing
What is wellbeing?

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

Material
What you have

Relational
What you can do with what you have
Measuring wellbeing

Can wellbeing be measured (skills?)

What are suitable alternatives to measure social outcomes from NNL?

What’s needed to mainstream wellbeing measurements within NNL?
# Measuring social outcomes

**Check list**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure social outcomes from NNL</th>
<th>Individual components of wellbeing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Or a justified alternative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Direction of travel**
People, appropriately aggregated, perceive their wellbeing to be at least as good as a result of NNL than if the development & offset had not been implemented.
Designing social outcomes from NNL – WHO

- Affected people receive commensurable benefits
  - At site of biodiversity loss
  - At offset site if negative impacts

- Equitable at the aggregated level:
  - Village level
  - Interest group
  - Gender
People, appropriately aggregated, perceive their wellbeing to be at least as good as a result of NNL than if the development & offset had not been implemented.

- **Reference scenario**

- **Compared with no development or offset**

- **Establish the ‘no development or offset’ scenario (existing data?)**
Designing social outcomes from NNL – TIMESCALES

• Throughout the project lifecycle

• Time-lags not good practice

• Transitional activities while long-term outcomes are realised (e.g. tree planting for firewood)

• Design for the long term (minimum of 25 years) – address uncertainties, monitoring for adaptive management
People, appropriately aggregated, perceive their wellbeing to be at least as good as a result of NNL than if the development & offset had not been implemented.

- Who decides?

- Feasibility test the design
  - Affected people surveys
  - Specialist socio-economic input
  - Same aggregation level as impact assessment
Designing social outcomes from NNL

✓ Affected people receive commensurable benefits
✓ Equitable at the aggregated level
✓ Compared with the no development & offset scenario
✓ Time-lags are not good practice
✓ Design for the long-term
✓ Demonstrate feasibility tested including surveys of affected people
Designing social outcomes from NNL

What data can be used for the reference scenario?

How aim for long-term outcomes?

What evidence is needed for feasibility test?

Who decides – commensurable & equitable?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check list – designing social outcomes from NNL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wellbeing is at least as good</strong></td>
<td>Impact assessment &amp; feasibility tests at same aggregation level(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compared to no development or offset scenario</strong></td>
<td>Establish reference scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No time-lag</strong></td>
<td>Transitional activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long-term</strong></td>
<td>Identify uncertainties; incorporate adaptive management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feasibility test</strong></td>
<td>Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surveys of affected people: same aggregation level &amp; same measurement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who decides</strong></td>
<td>Justified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
People, appropriately aggregated, perceive their wellbeing to be at least as good as a result of NNL than if the development & offset had not been implemented.
What to communicate & when

- Design: predicted social outcomes
- Implementation: actual social outcomes

*Monitoring to demonstrate actual outcomes & to feed into adaptive management*
People, appropriately aggregated, perceive their wellbeing to be at least as good as a result of NNL than if the development & offset had not been implemented
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Biodiversity No Net Loss</th>
<th>Social No Net Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Currency</strong></td>
<td>Choose from a wide range of possible metrics</td>
<td>Specific metric (‘wellbeing’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Net Loss</strong></td>
<td>Evaluate against a reference scenario (normally ‘no development’)</td>
<td>Evaluate against a reference scenario (normally ‘no development’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equivalence</strong></td>
<td>Sometimes allow ‘out of kind’ compensation</td>
<td>Compensation must always be commensurate, and for the same stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Longevity</strong></td>
<td>NNL should be achieved for at least as long as the impacts of development</td>
<td>NNL should be achieved for at least one generation (~ 25 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Lag</strong></td>
<td>Time lags permitted between impacts and realisation of compensation measures</td>
<td>Time lags NOT permitted between impacts and realisation of compensation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uncertainty</strong></td>
<td>Incorporate consideration of uncertainties</td>
<td>Incorporate consideration of uncertainties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thresholds</strong></td>
<td>Certain biodiversity impacts are not permitted</td>
<td>Certain social impacts are not permitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
People, appropriately aggregated, perceive their wellbeing to be at least as good as a result of NNL than if the development & offset had not been implemented.

Cohort Discussion