

# Biodiversity proofing

Iván Gyulai  
2014

# The aim of biodiversity proofing

- Ensure that spending under the EU budget is not harmful to biodiversity
- Avoid of negative impacts
- Reduce of negative impacts
- Rehabilitate/restore
- compensate

# The problem with the aim

- To avoid negative **impacts** we have to reduce the **pressures**
- Pressures are three folds:
  - Consuming natural resources
  - Pollute environment
  - Change natural habitats

All spending programmes under the EU budget  
should be compliment with the biodiversity  
related EU law

# The problem with biodiversity related EU law

- Birds and Habitat Directive, Water Framework Directive, Marine Strategy Framework Directive are particular, do not consider biodiversity in a holistic view
  - e.g. soil diversity
  - unprotected species and habitats
  - nothing is done with driving forces of biodiversity loss
  - insignificant negative impacts are not considered

# Procedural instruments supporting the Directives

- EIA, SEA
- Environmental selection criteria for projects
- Cost-benefit analyses taking account ecosystem services values
- Environmental indicators
- Midterm and ex post policy evaluation

# Problem with the instruments

- EIA consider significant negative environmental impacts
- SEA does not consider all policies in one system
- Valuing ecosystem services are impossible
- Postponed negative impacts cannot be indicated/ or too late
- Policy evaluations have no/minimal impact on decision makers

# Common Framework for Biodiversity Proofing in EU Budget

- Prepare specific biodiversity proofing guidance documents
- Guidance documents are available
- Standardised approach – general guidance
- Fund specific guidance docs: call for proposals, project development and selection, project execution, monitoring and evaluation



# But...

- Nothing ensures that environmental pressures are decreased in absolute term by the end of the implementation of „development” schemes under EU budget.

# The problem with Funds and Policies

- Sectoral policies (energy, agriculture, transport, common market, etc.) override biodiversity proofing
- Three coherent networks (ecological / green infra, energy and transport) are not feasible in the same time and space
- There are no serious conditions for land management/ payments have adverse impacts: soil degradation and soil biodiversity; carbon budget of the soil

# The screening checklist/criteria for screening programmes

- „Are there projects in the core network corridors (CEF/TEN-T) that have risks or adverse impacts on biodiversity?“
- CEF= Connecting Europe Facility
- Is this a serious question?

# Is there net biodiversity loss at all?

Biodiversity Strategy  
Target 2., action 7.,  
calls for no net loss of  
biodiversity and  
ecosystem services.

All kind of actions go  
with spending money  
and consuming  
resources

No net loss through  
compensation or  
offsetting schemes

# Can we finance biodiversity without creating further pressures?

Two questions:

Where is the money come from?

What is the cycle of the money?

Money always come from human activities, which consum natural resources, so put pressure on the environment

While resources are final, and the consumed sources might not recreated, money will remain, and will multiply consumption through its life cycle.

# Money cycle

Each spent coin will generate new consumption, apart from the aim of spending

Financing biodiversity means material consumption directly and indirectly

Petrol and car industry, mobile phone companies, etc., are the beneficiary of nature conservation field works

Funds will be turned into profit, state revenues, salaries and consumption and new investments.

# Lesson learnt

The tool of financing, that is money, will stay in the money cycle, and renew after all spending

Natural resources are limited in quantity and quality

Financial capital is growing, natural capital is shrinking

The nature of the money makes biodiversity financing impossible, without creating further negative effects – it is an essential contradiction

The concern is not that what happens to the nature without money, the concern here is what we feel without money



# How to take proofing seriously?

The cause of biodiversity loss is obvious, human made pressure exceeds the resilience of the earth self supporting system

Three cases in the future:

1. increasing pressure
  2. same pressure
  3. decreasing pressure
- 1.,2., are not acceptable, we must reduce environmental pressure

# How to take the proofing seriously?

- How to reduce environmental pressures by using EU funds?
- The environmental pressure from new development projects will be added to the existing pressures

The only way to reduce environmental pressures is that to **replace** existing human activities with activities which have better environmental performance, and create less pressure in absolute term

# Suggestions

We must reduce the consumption of natural resources, the total amount of pollutants, and take up of natural habitats

Replacing existing activities is the key for funding

We do not need very complicated and worthless guidances, rules, assessments, just we need to ensure that a new activity reduces the environmental pressures comparing to the previous one.

# Suggestions

Let nature/ecosystems take its course for the  
benefit of humankind