

**Wales Biodiversity Policy Group  
Workshop – 08 December 2009**

**Progressing Beyond 2010**

Chair: Katie-Jo Luxton, Director, RSPB Cymru

Co-chair: Stephen Bladwell, Biodiversity Manager, RSPB Cymru

**Workshop Outputs**

---

**Rules/Criteria for Assessing Solutions**

The following criteria were identified as being important in assessing the solutions that would be identified in the second part of the workshop.

- SMART (Specific Measurable Achievable Realistic Timeframed)
- Cost effectiveness (resource context)
  - Cost/benefit
  - Partnership
  - Does it achieve our shared vision!
- Ease of implementation
  - Quick wins
  - levels of change
- Logical Framework Approach – Log Frame (an approach to frame and assess; see attached paper)
- Clearly assignable
- Existing toolbox (first step) – what is currently available
- Responsibility linked to resource.
- Urgency/Timing
- Visibility of outcome
  - Publicly relevant
  - Political appeal/relevance
  - Long-term sustainability
  - Early start time
  - Degree of understanding
- Evidence base (is it measurable-in terms of outcome)
- Clearly deliver BAP targets
- Broad based
  - Sectoral engagement
  - Public engagement
- Opportunities for mainstreaming.
- Sustainability
- Adaptive (looking backwards in terms of baselines).

## Identifying Possible Solutions

### Net Gain Solutions

- Promoting and making the NERC duty more explicit.
- Are organizations doing enough now – how is this monitored/assessed? Specific targets – organisational culture – biodiversity is separated – not core.
- Extending the duty to ‘further’
- Limited by understanding / knowledge / competence
- Key performance indicators of a new project to drive it.
- Clarity of vision – often relies on a few key individuals.
- All policies should be able to deliver gain – already there in policy context just making it happen. People we will want a process to feel less exposed/accountable.
- Smaller developments – ecological consultancy could do more to promote opportunities for active gain.
- Clarity of policy context.
- Direction / steer from the top for ecology professionals that gain is required – Director level.
- Spatial mapping of BAP targets – spatial plan links.
- Community infrastructure levy.
- Green infrastructure concept.
- LDP's
  - Should identify habitat restoration + “allocate” for nature conservation just as allocations for housing etc.
  - Should not identify sensitive habitats (e.g. mudflats) for development- (should not be able to).
- Need for more opportunity mapping (S42 species/habitats)
  - Clearer link between Glastir mapping

- International cooperation on Health and biodiversity
  - Cohab
  - projects “natural Health service”
  - mental health
  - physical inactivity.
- Public benefit / overriding public benefit.
- Localism – competitions-local challenge
  - ‘sustainable towns’
  - transition towns (where is biodiversity in this).
- All BAP habitat creation targets need greater legal underpinning.
  - More policy auditing.
  - Greater challenge at what a project has delivered for BAP targets.
- WBP website - “mechanistic tool” but only rarely used by LPA’s. Similar approach for public bodies should also be adopted and made more central to process of decision making.
- Clear links to renewable energy / climate adaptation - robustness, clarity of message. Should use clearer arguments to link the two, for example, grant funds, initiative such as TEEB.
- Bust food security myths?

### No Net Loss-solutions

*No Net Loss of critical natural capital due to anthropocentric pressures.*

- First step is to review current legislation before any progressive steps for new legislation on terms of no net loss.
- Need to deal with the human drivers and recognise biodiversity is essential to long-term human self-interest.
- Need to reinforce the use of Favourable Conservation Status not ‘favourable management’ as a measure for condition of a biodiversity resource.
- Rewrite regulation processes to match outcomes.
  - resources
  - data

- SSSI's same level of status ('principle of care') as directives (Natura 2000) and second tier (SINCS)
- EIA regulations
  - Strengthen
  - Tighten loopholes
  - Guidance
  - Enforcement
- All decisions start from a 'no net loss' basis.
- Strong biodiversity teams within local authorities (ecologists, planners etc.)
- Organisational policies need to be reviewed and rewritten in the framework of 'no net loss'.
- Centralised source of information operating effectively.  
BARS→NBN→LRC's
- Coherent knowledge management system.
  - Infiltration exercise –integration
  - Service that LRC's could provide
  - One Application
- AES should look closely at the Swedish model.
- Campaign (communication change) 'biodiversity no net loss'
  - Highly targeted to major players in key sectors.
  - 'Dependency and risk' \*cost to business
  - Communication change
  - Life + possible source 'Information'
- Accommodate natural change within systems
  - Adaptive / quasi natural
- NERC Duty need to move beyond even 'further' as a underlying principle (leads to net gain).