

Addressing biodiversity in the Environmental Footprint pilots

Version 2.3 final

Technical Helpdesk

Mark Goedkoop, PRé

With inputs from Carsten Wachholz (EEB); Martha Stevenson (WWF-US); Emmanuelle Neyroumande (WWF-Int)

20-May-2015

Status of implementation of the TAB issue paper in March 2016: Insights from a quick scan across almost all draft PEFCRs by WWF and EEB

What did the TAB agree for the use of the additional information option?

1. Each pilot shall make an assessment about the relevance to report biodiversity impacts caused by the sector and its supply chain on land based, fresh and marine water ecosystems, which should be considered as an environmental hotspot. This assessment shall be done independent of the results of the LCIA methodology. The sector shall describe this and document with sufficient evidence if it finds that it does not cause significant impacts on biodiversity.
2. Each pilot that has determined that there are significant impacts, shall describe how that impact shall be assessed and reported for each study based on the PEF CR. The findings shall be reported under additional information.

What have we found in the draft PEFCRs available on the Wiki pages by end of February?

- Few pilots have asked to report Biodiversity so far under Additional environmental information.
- Those who have not done so, have not justified why it is not addressed. This is the case for: Leather, T shirt, IT storage, copper, photovoltaic, metal sheets, UPS, Thermal insulation, paints, Liquid laundry detergents.
- There is a place holder under environmental information in Pasta, shoes, packed water and batteries which still needs to be substantiated after the supporting studies.
- Those pilots who have made it compulsory and made reference to proxies like independent certification are the Coffee and Intermediate Paper pilots.
- Reporting on biodiversity is also compulsory in the Dairy pilot with a quantitative method (FAO Leap).

What have we found in the draft PEFCRs available on the Wiki pages by end of February?

- Some pilots recommend to use quantitative methods (like feed, red meat and fish for human consumption) but it is never compulsory.
- Any References to certification is absent from beer, dairy, meat, feed, leather, pasta, fish for human consumption although well-known certification schemes like organic, RSPO, RTRS, MSC and/or ASC could have been used.
- Sometimes biodiversity is seen as being covered by reporting on Land-use, while it covers only carbon flows.

Our conclusions at this stage

- There is no harmonization between obvious pilots like feed, fish, leather, dairy, red meat by now;
- The metal related pilots seem to be behind on addressing the issue;
- Participation of NGOs in Technical Secretariats of pilots tends to lead to additional environmental information on biodiversity becoming mandatory;
- We noticed that pilots supported by certain consultants tend to mention at least biodiversity while others don't.

Our recommendations

- Put updated PEFCRs on the Wiki pages in order to be able to track progress.
- The time is too short to test quantitative methods. Where credible certification exist, we recommend to reference it as proxy.
- The TAB issue paper on biodiversity should become part of the official PEF guide.
- Biodiversity needs be screened as part of the horizontal evaluation done by the help desk and included in potential webinars.
- Make sure that the issue paper is implemented by all pilots before the final round of public consultation starts.
- Where deemed relevant and appropriate, include rules in 2nd draft of the PEFCRs how additional information on biodiversity impacts could be included in communication vehicles.

Contact

- Emmanuelle Neyroumande, WWF International
Co-chair of the Intermediate Paper Pilot
eneyroumande@wwfint.org, Phone: + 33 6 62 10 74 78
- Carsten Wachholz, European Environmental Bureau (EEB)
SC/TAB member
carsten.wachholz@eeb.org, Phone: +32 2 289 10 90