



Environment Institute
of Australia and
New Zealand Inc.

The National Biodiversity Offsets Conference

Workshop Outcomes

13 September 2019



Monday 26 to Wednesday 28 August 2019

Hotel Realm, Canberra ACT 2600

Editor: Garry Middle.

Disclaimer

All information in this report was considered correct and current at the time of publication and any error or omissions are unintentional. The key data input for this report is the recordings of group deliberations as captured on butcher's paper and written by a group scribe. These recordings are taken as the consensus views of each group. Garry Middle, as workshop facilitator, translated these recordings into the text of this report. For the most part, the text of this report is the same as what was recorded, although some judgement was required where meaning was unclear. Every effort was made to accurately transcribe the recordings into the text of this report. EIANZ and Garry Middle disclaim all and any liability to any person in respect of the consequences of any action or consequence for such persons in reliance, whether wholly or partially, on this report.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	iii
List of Tables	iii
1. Introduction	1
2. Findings by jurisdiction	2
2.1 Victoria	2
2.2 NSW	3
2.3 Queensland.....	5
2.4 ACT.....	7
2.5 Commonwealth	8
2.6 WA	8
2.7 New Zealand and Tasmania.....	9
2.8 Other jurisdictions	10
3. Cross jurisdictional higher strategic level issues.....	11
4. Conference Statement	14
4.1 Methodology	14
4.2 Statement from the 2019 EIANZ National Biodiversity Offsets Conference held in Canberra	17
Appendix - Ideas and suggestions as recorded in Slido App.....	19

List of Tables

Table 1: Cross jurisdictional higher strategic level issues/topics raised in the workshop	11
Table 2: Results of the voting on the 20 key conference issue/topic/question	15
Table 3: A comparison of the top issues and topics from the third part of the workshop and the issues/topics/questions receiving the most votes	16

1. Introduction

The EIANZ National Biodiversity Offsets Conference not only provided an opportunity for delegates to learn more about the science, legislation and application of biodiversity offsets, but also to provide input as to how biodiversity offset frameworks in Australia can be improved.

Delegates were provided with an opportunity to consider their input from the conference outset with the ultimate goal of bringing ideas together at a workshop. Ideas were captured throughout the event through the use of the application Slido and on butcher's paper on the second day. Ideas were also captured during a facilitated breakfast workshop held with regulators.

The final session of the conference was a workshop which had the broad aim of answering the question "Where do we want to be with offsetting?" There were four parts to the workshop:

1. An offsets "slam" where participants were provided with the opportunity to speak for 30 seconds to either raise an issue or experience with offsetting not already raised in the conference, or state what you think is the key unresolved issue with offsetting;
2. Working in groups by jurisdiction to address the workshop question;
3. Working in cross jurisdiction groups to address the workshop question at a higher strategic level; and
4. Developing a consensus Conference Statement about the state of offsetting and how best to progress its practice in the future to ensure biodiversity outcomes are further enhanced.

This report provides the outcomes of the group work in the workshop – parts 2 and 3, and describes the process of arriving at the Conference Statement along with the final Statement. As well, a summary of comments and questions uploaded into the Conference App, Slido, are also included as an Appendix.

2. Findings by jurisdiction

Groups were set the following 3 working questions to guide participants to answer the overall workshop question:

- What is being done well?
- What areas need work?
- What do we need to do to make offsetting better?

2.1 Victoria

What is being done well?

Well defined process and well understood by community and well communicated by the Department, including the values of biodiversity.

The available data is used well.

The competency process.

Legal structure that protect offsets.

Requiring offsets before impacts realised.

Pairing impacts with proponents. Having a broker system and on-line system.

Large number of existing credit sites - >300.

Consistent scoring approach for pricing credits.

There is a compliance monitoring system of landowner's actions.

Offsetting applies to everyone and equally.

Prioritises protection of vegetation over revegetation.

TFN (Trust for Nature) act as steward.

Victoria doesn't have a payment system.

What areas need work?

Whether there are actual on-ground gains.

Compliance including Local Councils and around mitigation strategies.

No data sharing between Councils and developers.

Doesn't capture all qualitative and quantitative impact assessment measures.

Delivery of offsets objectives particularly 1st party sites.

Matching permits with offset sites and lack of transparency.

Are predicted gains being achieved?

Making management plans realistic.

Lack of training for site assessors.

Additionality and impact on voluntary market.

In perpetuity offsets funds.

Auditing.

Transparency.

Some aspects of like for like.

More coordinated stewardship.

Weed score.

Restoration and revegetation offsets – identify best places to do it.

Timeline – 12 months to get species specific offsets.

Some on-line system issues – e.g. Nature Care.

What do we need to do to make offsetting better?

Consistency in monitoring.

Audit process.

Better reporting of reviews and offsets.

Training for site assessors.

Integrate threats into the strategic biodiversity protection and planning.

More offsets in local area near where impacts experienced.

Communicating case studies (by DELWP).

2.2 NSW

What is being done well?

Legal framework and scheme architecture -

- Biodiversity Assessment Methodology (BAM) – its repeatable;
- BSAs (biodiversity stewardship agreement);
- Mandatory;
- Biodiversity Conservation Trust (BCT); and
- Robust and high level of compliance.

Systematic, consistent and robust methodology for both impacts and offsets with good supporting data sets.

Consistency between projects.

Well integrated into planning/development assessment.

In perpetuity costing of and funding for management of conservation sites with land title.

Management funds move with title when land sold.

Concept of accreditation.

The tools that are the foundation of the scheme – vegetation information system (VIS), BOAMS (Biodiversity Assessment Method?), BioNet Vegetation Classification.

Examples of where developer have avoided impacts because of the cost of offsetting.

Consideration of ecology and biodiversity elevate to project planning and delivery stages.

Process has been embraced by major proponents (e.g. Roads and Maritime Services – RMS) industry and community.

There are now real incentives for landowners to conserve biodiversity.

High level of skill and training for accredited assessors.

Wider group captured by legislation – a more level playing field.

What areas need work?

Biodiversity Offset Payment Calculator (BOPC).

Time taken to process BSAs.

Seasonal effects on site data.

More guidance documents/templates including how to apply BAM at regionally level.

Equivalence.

Credit yields on offset sites are often very low (e.g. Derived Native Grassland - DNG).

Funding for auditing stewardship sites.

Indexing for strategic location/credit type.

Land clearing by agriculture sector.

Category 1 mapping - land that was cleared of native vegetation as at 1 January 1990, or land that was lawfully cleared between 1 January 1990 and 25 August 2017.

Tools supporting Scheme (e.g. Seed data portal - Sharing and Enabling Environmental Data), PCT (Plant Community Types) classification benchmarks.

Responsiveness of agencies.

BAM tool flexibility for stewardship sites to reflect targeted management actions.

BOAMS.

Assessors' botanical skills.

Public register.

Systems maintenance.

Cost/pricing.

Connectivity assessment.

Targeting and identifying connectivity priority areas.

Land holder education.

Tracking outcomes of the Scheme and whether outcomes (objectives?) are being met.

Refine rules around species credits e.g. within same bioregion.

Monitoring of compliance.

Assistance for landowners with understanding what an agreement will entail e.g. compliance - risks etc.

Assessor training too complex for new participants.

Problem with avoidance part of management framework.

Complexity of framework.

Time for when offset required i.e. if upfront no room to reduce impact.

What do we need to do to make offsetting better?

BOPC –

- Equivalence prices between BBAM (former BioBanking Assessment Methodology) and BAM;
- Price should be so high that paying into the fund is last resort and that it doesn't put a ceiling on market price;
- Use current BSA TFD (Total Fund Deposit) amounts to inform prices; and
- More forums on BOPC until market develops.

Low credit yield addressed by allowing habitat augmentation to influence credit yield for species.

Improve market information.

Provide operational guidance.

Communications.

Greater clarity on defining species polygons (so they are consistent for impacts and conservation sites).

Guidance on litter and vegetation cover scores (HUGE variation between individuals).

Need to go beyond no net loss (NNL) and aim for net gain.

Ensure that like-for-like is achieved – e.g. problem with rare species not being found.

Include all entities that impact native vegetation – e.g. agriculture. Foster and build capacity for ecological restoration.

Focus on strategic outcomes.

2.3 Queensland

What is being done well?

Simplicity of the systems - Matters of State Environmental Significance (MSES), and ratios.

Data sets including regional ecosystem mapping and other MSES mapping are good.

Good at not duplicating.

Pooled funds are good.

Multiple mechanisms for protection.

Options in delivery – financial payments, land, advanced and combination.

Local governments do it well.

Established metrics.

The calculator.

Focusing on assessments by region and industry.

State framework.

Flexibility – broad vegetation groups (BVG) and regional ecosystems (RE).

What areas need work?

Spending the pool – need strategy on how to spend it and to spend it now!

No bilateral agreement regarding offsets.

Exemptions and referral triggers (including priority development areas - PDAs) and property map of assessable vegetation (PMAV).

Are offsets too cheap?

Security of advanced offsets.

Land holders involved/informed.

Cost of land.

Accreditation.

Audit and compliance.

Targets timeframes relative to system.

Dilution of corridor content score.

Policy stability.

What do we need to do to make offsetting better?

Monitoring.

State offsets register needs more functionality.

Need to value averted loss.

Give the funds pool to entities that can deliver (e.g. Councils).

State strategic planning and more focus on corridors.

Consistency between state and commonwealth.

Commensurate compensation for landowners for change in income.

Communication and education of landowners and banks.

2.4 ACT

What is being done well?

Managed by a single entity (mostly).

Advanced offsets.

Strategic assessments.

Innovative work to inform management.

Increased community input/activity – vocal advocacy groups.

Offsets that deliver connectivity of habitats.

High quality mapping.

Working towards robust monitoring across sites.

High level of engagement.

Extra level of scrutiny as almost all offsets in ACT come under EPBC Act.

What areas need work?

Commonwealth land vs ACT land – different managers.

Different governments need to find offsets on their own land.

More refined approach to implementing land management actions between offsets estate and greater reserve systems.

Greater connectivity between sites.

Lack of transparency.

More scope to offset native vegetation in addition to threatened species and ecosystems.

Impacts from ACT transferred outside our borders.

Running out of potential offset areas.

What do we need to do to make offsetting better?

Have a mechanism for a Trust or another type of financial fund.

Increased transparency.

Introduce stewardship as offsets for rural land holders – important habitat and Endangered Ecological Community (EEC) occur on rural land.

Increased ability to enforce offset.

Commitments/value conservation on lessee offsets site.

2.5 Commonwealth

What is being done well?

EPBC Act flexibility to establish bilaterals with States and setting high level principles.

Stability of offsets policy – reflects best practice.

Maintains focus on Matters of National Environmental Significance (MNES).

Readily identifies offsets.

What areas need work?

Transparency, especially of outcomes and decision making.

Mechanism to evaluate outcomes – approval conditions and implementation.

Interpretation of offsets policy metrics – communication from DoEE (expectations); and set out requirements in information requests.

What do we need to do to make offsetting better?

Communication – expectations and requirements.

Resource adequately including planning for change.

Stronger compliance actions.

2.6 WA

What is being done well?

Industry and regional partnerships, and good collaborations between industries.

Strategic land acquisition through fund and the Commonwealth is happy.

Offsets framework, guidelines etc register – transparency!

Process involves continuous improvement and is flexible and adaptative by both proponent and regulator, and open to discussion.

Innovation (e.g. Pilbara Environmental Offsets Fund (PEOF)) and not afraid to try something different.

Traditional Owners involvement.

Bilateral between State and Commonwealth and not double up in policy.

Working with NRM groups and not for profits.

What areas need work?

Strategic planning for best outcomes for offsets – where, priorities, best outcomes, what do we want to achieve.

Lack of funding for monitoring and reporting.

Definition of outcomes.

Spend the money on the ground – PEOF!

Achieving outcomes.

Not adaptive enough given the complexities/scales involved and particularly hard for smaller proponents.

Transparency of governance.

Baseline data (understanding ratio between impact and proposed offset).

Better reporting of what is being achieved.

Trading up like for - like and better.

Resources within government limited and reliant on key individuals.

Data and knowledge sharing.

Supporting those that want to enter the industry.

Leases and other restrictions to land purchase.

What do we need to do to make offsetting better?

Measure effectiveness holistically – monitor measure review and report.

Adding habitat.

Revisit terminology – i.e. direct and indirect offsets.

Flexibility in offsets systems.

Resourcing administration of offsets – i.e. funding management.

Independent management – i.e. conservation trust.

Test any proposed changes with other states, learn from other states.

Optimise for species.

Species specific offsets vs biodiversity offsets?

2.7 New Zealand and Tasmania

NOTE: This group was made up of participants from both Tasmania and New Zealand. The recording of the group's findings did not distinguish which matters were relevant to which particular jurisdiction. An attempt is made here to identify the likely jurisdiction relevant to particular matters.

What is being done well?

Stream ecological valuation methodology. Widely used decision making tool.

Implementation needs work (like for unlike) (NZ?)

Some useful national guidance (NZ?)

Draft national policy direction (NZ?)

Provided for under existing legislation – but no details and specifics.

What areas need work?

Guidance/descriptions in policy – for regulators and proponents and to give greater transparency.

Calculator – lack of understanding in how to use it. Practitioners don't have confidence in the calculator.

Socialisation with the public – lack of acceptance currently.

Strategic schemes – e.g. biobanks.

What do we need to do to make offsetting better?

Need a framework for local government plans.

No political will and budget in Tasmania (Tas).

Better guidance/policy/frameworks.

2.8 Other jurisdictions

There were no representatives from South Australia or Northern Territory at the workshop.

3. Cross jurisdictional higher strategic level issues

The following broad question was posed for this part of the workshop: “What can we do to improve the practice of offsetting and the offsetting community?”

As a guide, the following four topics were proposed to guide the discussions:

- Knowledge gaps,
- Expertise gaps
- Key elements of best practice
- High level barriers to better practice.

Groups were made up of participants from different jurisdictions.

The table below reports all the issues and topics raised by all the groups, with the second column showing how many groups raised that particular issue/topic. Some interpretation of the raw data on the butcher’s paper was required as the same issue/topic had different wording in different groups. The table reports the issues/topics in order of popularity.

Table 1: Cross jurisdictional higher strategic level issues/topics raised in the workshop

Topic/issue	No of Groups
Education of, and communication with, key stakeholders to improve understanding of offsets and their benefits and reduce misunderstandings – landholders, finance institutions (offsets have value), other government agencies.	12
Provide sufficient and flexibility in funding and resources for follow-up – management, management plans, compliance, auditing, monitoring of the offsets including oversight and expertise and ability to be adaptive and are outcomes being achieved and are they what is wanted, develop evaluation cycle.	12
Develop a consistent overarching framework/guidance we can all apply including standardisation where appropriate, including use of terminology – principles not methods.	9
Greater use of, and resources for, strategic offsets including for connectivity benefits and at landscape scale, having metrics that deliver both local and strategic outcomes.	8
More professional forums and discussions including sharing of expertise across and between jurisdictions, and the development of good practice case studies for example monitoring, adaptative management, strategic approaches. Development of a nation-wide community of practice.	7

Topic/issue	No of Groups
Incentives for landowners – using market credits, better education about conservation outcomes, and establish under a regulation/legislation, greater financial certainty, financial support for surveys.	5
Improved transparency, accountability and consistency – methodology, risk, weightings, losses and gains, reporting, and regulation independent of government.	5
Training and accreditation of practitioners - Identify expertise and need for training gaps, lack of accredited consultants, need for consistency with advice from accredited consultants.	4
Better research into, and knowledge of, critical areas - including better understanding of the complexity of the data, and testing of counterfactuals.	4
Strengthen legislations – e.g. cost of offsetting more than the cost of illegal clearing and penalties, enforcement of agreements.	4
Have a national offsets register – location, values, outcomes (what is offset meant to deliver), conditions of approval. Register should be easy for everyone to access and use.	2
Australia-wide high-resolution data sets for biodiversity including vegetation mapping with consistent methodology.	2
Offer university courses.	2
Better collaboration across boundaries or migratory species.	2
Resolve issues of having State and Commonwealth offsets applying to the same proposal – double offsets, different timeframes.	2
Expertise gap – success of revegetation.	2
Reassess the assumptions of losses and gains.	1
Develop a consistent way of describing the values.	1
Develop a national all jurisdictional framework for best practice.	1
Identify unacceptable impacts that cannot be offset.	1
Mandating offsets across all land tenure.	1
Look for opportunities for “like for better”.	1

Topic/issue	No of Groups
Yearly accountability.	1
Compatibility between approaches.	1
Have a strong position on standards – compliance and monitoring.	1
Better community engagement and contribution – offsets have value for the community, community access to offsets sites, can be part of delivery of outcomes/management, including Traditional Owners, formalise involvement in decision making.	1
Market needs to grow.	1
Manage political risks.	1
Expertise gap – ecothinning.	1
Expertise gap – fire ecology.	1
Key legislative barrier – decision maker at Commonwealth level.	1
Key barrier – reducing availability of offset sites.	1
Reporting at the international level of Australia’s offsets gains and losses.	1
Data collection regardless of jurisdiction.	1
Need to secure offset in perpetuity.	1
Planning for climate change.	1
High level cross jurisdictional discussions - COAG, Ministers.	1
Reducing complexity of systems.	1
Offsetting timeframes incompatible with development timeframes.	1
Expertise gap – ecosystem responses to management.	1
Standard capture of assessment data.	1
Regional gain vs loss assessment.	1
Remote sensing used for monitoring.	1
Gap analysis of offsets using evidence.	1

4. Conference Statement

4.1 Methodology

In the opening session of the conference it was announced that an attempt would be made to come up with a Conference Statement which would be a census view about the state of offsetting and how best to improve the practice. As already noted, the last part of the workshop was set aside to attempt to arrive at a Conference Statement.

The previous group discussions provided an important platform from which to have the discussion about the Statement. A second input involved an analysis of keys issues and topics raised in the non-workshop questions, both by the speakers and also the follow-up questions.

The first part of this analysis involved Garry Middle taking extensive notes of the keys issues and topics raised by the speakers. As well, the questions and discussions recorded on the Conference App were also reviewed. From this data, Garry identified 20 key issues/topics/questions for further analysis. These were:

1. Strategic offsets be preferenced over *ad hoc* offsets;
2. Value of offsets needs to consider counter-factuals;
3. Do we need an agreed set of First principles for offsetting and policy making?
4. Do we need guidance on determining or quantifying counter-factuals?
5. Is it time to rethink our focus on like for like?
6. Do we need clear guidance on what is No Net Loss?
7. Should we give more consideration to 'trading up' instead of like for like or where like for like is not available?
8. A cap is needed on the percentage of an offset that should be indirect;
9. Offset trust funds are a useful tool but their effectiveness needs to be assessed;
10. Offsets need greater legal and statutory protection;
11. We need to better educate the financial and investment sectors about the value of offsets - they are real assets;
12. Landowners (suppliers) need to be better informed about the value of the offsets market;
13. Guidelines needed for monitoring and standards of effectiveness needed;
14. Offsetting needs better transparency and accountability;
15. An offset market needs to be regulated by a credible regulator;
16. Need for a consistent national approach to offsets;
17. Need nationally consistent vegetation mapping system;
18. Offsets should also apply to agricultural sector;
19. A series of landscape scale assessments needed to provide baselines for offsetting;
and
20. Training program required.

The next step of the analysis involved conference participants voting on this list of issues/topics/questions. Each issue/topic/question was written on a separate sheet of

butcher's paper and the sheets displayed in the conference open space area during lunch and afternoon tea on the second day of the conference. Delegates were invited to put their names against what they believed were the three most important issues/topics/questions.

The votes on each sheet of butcher's paper were added up during the first part of the workshop ready to be presented to participants for the final part of the workshop. The results are shown below.

Table 2: Results of the voting on the 20 key conference issue/topic/question

Theme No	Theme	Count
1	Strategic offsets be preferred over ad hoc offsets	22
12	Landowners (suppliers) need to be better informed about the value of the offsets market	18
16	Need for a consistent national approach to offsets	17
13	Guidelines needed for monitoring and standards of effectiveness needed	15
18	Offsets should also apply to agricultural sectors	15
14	Offsetting needs better transparency and accountability	12
17	Need nationally consistent vegetation mapping system	12
4	Do we need guidance on determining or quantifying counter-factuals?	9
10	Offsets need greater legal and statutory protection	5
5	Is it time to rethink our focus on like for like?	4
3	Do we need an agreed set of First principles for offsetting and policy making?	3
11	We need to better educate the financial and investment sectors about the value of offsets - they are real assets	3
19	A series of landscape scale assessments needed to provide baselines for offsetting	3
2	Value of offsets needs to consider counter-factuals	1
6	Do we need clear guidance on what is No Net Loss?	1
8	A cap is needed on the percentage of an offset that should be indirect	1
9	Offset trust funds are a useful tool but their effectiveness needs to be assessed	1
15	An offset market needs to be regulated by a credible regulator	1
20	Training program required	1
7	Should we give more consideration to 'trading up' instead of like for like or where like for like is not available	0

There is a reasonable match of the top themes and the top topics/issues from the third workshop sessions, as shown in the table below.

Table 3: A comparison of the top issues and topics from the third part of the workshop and the issues/topics/questions receiving the most votes

Top issues/topics from third part of the workshop	No of groups	Issue/topic/question from last session	No votes
Education of and communication with key stakeholders to improve understanding of offsets and their benefits and reduce misunderstandings – landholders, finance institutions (offsets have value), other government agencies	12	Strategic offsets be preferred over ad hoc offsets	22
Provide sufficient, and flexibility in, funding and resources for follow-up – management, management plans, compliance, auditing, monitoring of the offsets including oversight and expertise and ability to be adaptive and are outcomes being achieved and are they what want, develop evaluation cycle	12	Landowners (suppliers) need to be better informed about the value of the offsets market	18
Develop a consistent overarching framework/guidance we can all apply including standardisation where appropriate, including use of terminology – principles not methods	9	Need for a consistent national approach to offsets	17
Greater use of, and resources for, strategic offsets including for connectivity benefits and at landscape scale, having metrics that deliver both local and strategic outcomes	8	Guidelines needed for monitoring and standards of effectiveness needed	15
More professional forums and discussions including sharing of expertise across and between jurisdictions, and the development of good practice case studies for example monitoring, adaptive management, strategic approaches. Development of a nation-wide community of practice	7	Offsets should also apply to agricultural sector	15
Incentives for landowners – using market credits, better education about conservation outcomes, and establish under a regulation/legislation, greater financial certainty, financial support for surveys	5	Offsetting needs better transparency and accountability	12
Improved transparency, accountability and consistency – methodology, risk, weightings, losses and gains, reporting, and regulation independent of government	5	Need nationally consistent vegetation mapping system	12

The top issue from the voting (strategic offsets preferred) is the same as the 4th issue from the third part of the workshop (Greater use of and resources for strategic offsets).

The second top issue from the voting (Landowners need to be better informed) can be seen as a subset of the top issue from the third part of the workshop (Education of and communication with key stakeholders).

The third top issue from the voting (Need for a consistent national approach to offsets) can be seen as the same as the third top issue from the third part of the workshop (Develop a consistent overarching framework/guidance).

The fourth top issue from the voting (Guidelines needed for monitoring and standards of effectiveness needed) can be seen as the almost the same as the second top issue from the third part of the workshop (Provide sufficient and flexibility in funding and resources for follow-up).

The sixth top issue from the voting (Offsetting needs better transparency and accountability) can be seen as the same as the seventh top issue from the third part of the workshop (Improved transparency, accountability and consistency).

The issues from the voting that were not picked up as priorities in the third part of the workshop are:

- Offsets should also apply to agricultural sector; and
- Need nationally consistent vegetation mapping system.

The issues from the third part of the workshop that are not picked up as priorities in the voting are:

- Incentives for landowners; and
- More professional forums and discussions.

The results of the voting and the outcomes of the third session of the workshop drove the debate about what should be contained in the final Statement. The discussion involved all participants rather than in groups. The consensus view arrived at was that the following matters should make up the final statement:

- Strategic biodiversity offsets are preferred over *ad hoc* offsetting;
- All stakeholders need to be better informed about the value of biodiversity offsets;
- There is a need for a nationally consistent and agreed to set of offset principles;
- An agreed to set of Guidelines for monitoring and standards for measuring effectiveness are required;
- Offsets should apply to all sectors impacting on biodiversity;
- The transparency and accountability of the offsetting process needs to be improved; and
- The importance of applying the mitigation hierarchy through impact assessments should be re-enforced.

After the conference the organising committee held discussions on how to refine wording of these seven matters into a cohesive final Conference Statement which is as follows.

4.2 Statement from the 2019 EIANZ National Biodiversity Offsets Conference held in Canberra

Biodiversity offsetting has evolved considerably over time, and will continue to do so. Conference delegates strongly support the continual improvement of biodiversity offsetting policy and practice by addressing the following seven matters:

- Proponents of all development proposals likely to have impacts on biodiversity should continue to demonstrate that every effort has been made to both avoid and minimise environmental impacts
- Offsets exist to maintain or improve the conservation, protection and ecological health of the affected biodiversity. Implementation models and mechanisms must never deprioritise or compromise this.
- Offsets should apply to all sectors where residual environmental impacts on biodiversity occur
- Strategic biodiversity offsets are preferred over ad hoc offsetting as they are more likely to deliver better biodiversity outcomes;
- All stakeholders, including financial institutions and landowners, need to be better informed about the costs, benefits and obligations of developing and maintaining biodiversity offsets throughout their lifecycle;
- A nationally consistent and agreed set of principles that guide biodiversity offsetting, including those for monitoring and measuring effectiveness, is required; and
- Public accessibility, transparency and accountability of offsetting processes must be lifted to a higher standard.

Appendix - Ideas and suggestions as recorded in Slido App

Ideas and suggestions	Score
One national biodiversity offset scheme spanning all states. One cross-border veg mapping system, one credit trading scheme. Offset both EPBC + state impacts.	37
One consistent national veg mapping system based on dominant species+ landzone. Extend QLD RE system across Australia. More transferrable than NSW PCT system!	36
Extend offsetting requirements to the agricultural sector. Mines/developers require offsets, but agriculture is still allowed to clear areas without offset	28
Farming and agriculture can significantly impact on the future of biodiversity. How can we better engage with these industries to promote offset on their land?	18
8 states all trying to achieve the same outcomes independently of each other. All speaking same language but can't hear each other. Reinventing the wheel in silos.	16
Has everyone noticed the Golden Sun Moth Offset / set-aside located directly across the road from this hotel? Has it served its purpose? Keen to know more.	13
Some states have well established offset schemes, others are lagging behind. Panel discussions illustrate. Taxpayer \$ wasted reinventing the wheel? #onescheme	12
EIANZ needs a position statement on offsets and need to update biodiversity position paper.	8
Local government are at the coal face of assessment and conservation delivery. They should be front and centre of any good national/state offset program.	8
EIANZ need to be a more active advocacy group for their members and the environment - they were silent when Newman government relaxed Qld land clearing laws.	8
Local government have been highly under-represented in this conference both in representation on stage, and through the acknowledgement of their work in offsets	6
Better legislation to reward farmers that are already managing their land in a sustainable way.	5
Notable absence of TO representatives at this conference. How to engage TOs in offset supply?	5
We need a national approach on how to value our ecosystems, their functions and their benefits (e.g. use environmental economics)	4
Need more financial settlement options, as governments are better placed to deliver high quality offsets than the development or minor sectors.	4
Virtually no discussion on Local Government offsets - needs to be addressed.	4
Stacking credits is essential, we need good accounting and blended finance. The current CFI legislation limits the ability to do this.	3
Tapping into the voluntary market - no longer consider it an offset, consider it a credit. ADDITIONAL	3
Bio value stacking. If my property has multiple values, in a capitalist system I should be able to value and sell each of them. Please discuss?	3
Financial offsets only if funding a transparent, strategic and scientifically robust program providing benefit for the matter.	3
https://www.afr.com/property/commercial/government-sells-moth-habitat-to-canberra-developers-20190627-p521tq	3
State and fed Gov's should invest in local gov to deliver strategic local advanced offsets with a view to making a return on that investment over time.	3
NSW Offset scheme is miles ahead of QLD. Only 4% of vegetation impacts offset. Time for QLD to step up & make offsets mandatory. Can use NSW BAM for a blueprint.	3
Qld doesn't assess when the Cmwlth does? The legislation deals with completely different matters. How much is being missed here?	3

Ideas and suggestions	Score
Methods for determining offset priorities for protected matters as many do not have recovery plans or are not up to date	3
We don't know enough about many species for habitat modelling, impact assessment, management, offsets to be meaningful and effective with quantifiable outcomes	3
We welcome ideas from delegates regarding our workshop to prepare a statement about where do we want to go with Biodiversity Offsets in Australia.	2
Growing biodiversity - fantastic	2
Can we link national biodiversity policy and strategy with State directions and link offsetting into the mix? The two frameworks are on different journeys.	2
It would be great to enable R&D funding in lieu of direct offsets. E.g. fund research into low emissions fuels and batteries instead of more forests	2
Establishment of offset sites in National Parks, targeting additional management not covered in NP management plans and/or not otherwise appropriately funded.	2
Could more value be placed on ecosystems that are under represented in the CAR Reserve system rather than looking for community type/species scarcity?	2
NSW BV Map & clearing thresholds force proponents to avoid & minimise. Many proponents redesign around BV Map/reduce clearing to avoid offset scheme. It works!	2
Nd greater consistency across jurisdictions species don't care about borders. Cwlth should facilitate consistency but leaning on state policy means dif approaches	2
If offsets are not like for like, how are alternatives assessed? Is it a premium ratio?	2
Two years into the new scheme and a single stewardship agreement. Can you comment on the impact of pricing for payment into the BCF on this supply component?	2
Seems to be a shift away from recognising risk of loss and including averted loss in offsets, but these may be important components for achieving no net loss	2
EIANZ to be the leader in providing accreditation for veg methodology (e.g. BAMB in NSW) so consultants provide consistent approach when across the nation.	2
Are there good examples of offset credits being used on Indigenous owned lands?	2
Re the Golden sun moth grassland over the road. At 5.00 this afternoon we will taking anyone who is interested to the site. Meet at the reception desk	2
Rather than stopping projects, could increase avoidance/rejection of impacts make us more innovative?	2
Shared monitoring results and le	1
Offset model work well in a freehold land environment, they have limited effectiveness in leases environment or we're they reduce the states investment	1
So, it seems principle related to funding if research by offset needs to be that it needs to be targeted at on ground outcomes and most for habitat protection	1
We need agreement on the fundamentals of biodiversity offsets, based on sound science and strong metrics, developed by an independent body.	1
Concerning that SA assessments and offsets don't really consider fauna, especially as there are next to no EPBC referrals. Who's protecting these species?	1
A National scheme will result in a lowest denominator outcome as states will want their scheme endorsed. That occurred with Nat. Environ. Protection Measures.	1
The preservation of Golden Sun Moth habitat across the road is a failure in my view. Happy to discuss.	1
So you still go for high quality if there is no other opportunity to protect it	0
Use bioregional plans basis for regional priorities see Liam's comment under reserved over cleared reserve design then add in threatened communities spp	0
Really a question that didn't get through. A national market would possibly need an aggregated unit of measure. How to still conserve biodiversity appropriately	0

Ideas and suggestions**Score**

Are there good examples of how credits have been used for offsets that are not land parcel related? E.g. widescale feral animal reduction.

0