



## Evidence Project Final Report

- Note**

In line with the Freedom of Information Act 2000, Defra aims to place the results of its completed research projects in the public domain wherever possible.

The Evidence Project Final Report is designed to capture the information on the results and outputs of Defra-funded research in a format that is easily publishable through the Defra website. An Evidence Project Final Report must be completed for all projects.

- This form is in Word format and the boxes may be expanded, as appropriate.

- ACCESS TO INFORMATION**

The information collected on this form will be stored electronically and may be sent to any part of Defra, or to individual researchers or organisations outside Defra for the purposes of reviewing the project. Defra may also disclose the information to any outside organisation acting as an agent authorised by Defra to process final research reports on its behalf. Defra intends to publish this form on its website, unless there are strong reasons not to, which fully comply with exemptions under the Environmental Information Regulations or the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

Defra may be required to release information, including personal data and commercial information, on request under the Environmental Information Regulations or the Freedom of Information Act 2000. However, Defra will not permit any unwarranted breach of confidentiality or act in contravention of its obligations under the Data Protection Act 1998. Defra or its appointed agents may use the name, address or other details on your form to contact you in connection with occasional customer research aimed at improving the processes through which Defra works with its contractors.

### Project identification

1. Defra Project code

2. Project title

Towards integration of low carbon energy and biodiversity policies: an assessment of impacts of low carbon energy scenarios on biodiversity in the UK and abroad and an assessment of a framework for determining ILUC impacts based on UK bio-energy demand scenarios

3. Contractor organisation(s)

BIO Intelligence Service /  
BIO by Deloitte  
185 avenue Charles de Gaulle, 92200  
Neuilly-sur-Seine, France

Institute for European Environmental  
Policy (IEEP)  
11 Belgrave Road,  
IEEP Offices, Floor 3  
London SW1V 1RB

Centre for Ecology & Hydrology (CEH)  
Lancaster Environment Centre  
Library Avenue  
Bailrigg  
Lancaster LA1 4AP

4. Total Defra project costs  
(agreed fixed price)

5. Project: start date .....

end date .....

6. It is Defra's intention to publish this form.

Please confirm your agreement to do so..... YES  NO

(a) When preparing Evidence Project Final Reports contractors should bear in mind that Defra intends that they be made public. They should be written in a clear and concise manner and represent a full account of the research project which someone not closely associated with the project can follow.

Defra recognises that in a small minority of cases there may be information, such as intellectual property or commercially confidential data, used in or generated by the research project, which should not be disclosed. In these cases, such information should be detailed in a separate annex (not to be published) so that the Evidence Project Final Report can be placed in the public domain. Where it is impossible to complete the Final Report without including references to any sensitive or confidential data, the information should be included and section (b) completed. NB: only in exceptional circumstances will Defra expect contractors to give a "No" answer.

In all cases, reasons for withholding information must be fully in line with exemptions under the Environmental Information Regulations or the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

(b) If you have answered NO, please explain why the Final report should not be released into public domain

## Executive Summary

7. The executive summary must not exceed 2 sides in total of A4 and should be understandable to the intelligent non-scientist. It should cover the main objectives, methods and findings of the research, together with any other significant events and options for new work.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The UK has set itself a challenging target with the Climate Change Act: to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 80% by 2050 (compared to 1990). This objective may be achieved by implementing different options for energy reduction, or shifting to low carbon renewable energy technologies. At the same time, the UK has also committed to conserve biodiversity and contribute to the achievement of EU targets and those of the Convention on Biological Diversity. The UK's energy policy could lead to massive deployment of certain energy production technologies such as bioenergy, offshore wind power, tidal and wave power technologies. But how would this affect biodiversity?

Biodiversity impacts are difficult to characterise and quantify as they depend on which biodiversity components are considered (e.g. all taxa or only certain species and ecosystems), their conservation status and spatial context (e.g. whether they have a restricted range, are threatened and the scale of the threat) and the longevity of the impacts. Furthermore, energy technologies affect biodiversity in multiple ways when considering all stages of energy production from extraction of natural resources through energy conversion to distribution. Impacts of energy technologies can be positive or negative; direct (e.g. direct mortality, habitat loss and disturbance, etc.) and indirect (e.g. through impacts on other components of the ecosystem). Impacts at each stage also often vary spatially and over time. As the nature, magnitude and duration of impacts on habitats and species are site and context dependent, it is especially difficult to assess current and future impacts based on current available information.

#### Review of evidence of the impacts on energy technologies on biodiversity

To help aid policy decisions, this study performed an extensive review of the literature of impacts of different energy production technologies on biodiversity to provide a clear overview of available evidence and its robustness. While there is good evidence of the impacts on biodiversity for many energy technologies, the impacts of more recent renewable technologies are neither well understood or documented (e.g. offshore wind, second generation energy crops, agricultural and forestry residues, tidal stream, wave power, carbon capture and storage, etc.). This is of concern as renewable technologies are expected to be extensively deployed in the UK to meet the UK's 2050 climate change target.

#### Assessment of the current and future potential biodiversity impacts of energy technologies in the UK

A simple, transparent methodology that uses the existing evidence was developed to provide an indicative assessment of the current and potential future impacts of energy technologies on biodiversity in the UK. The aim was to integrate the impacts of possible energy technology deployment pathways on biodiversity in the UK into DECC's 2050 Calculator<sup>1</sup>. The methodology for estimating the potential impacts on biodiversity was based on two basic parameters: the **sensitivity** of a particular habitat or species to a certain energy technology; and the **exposure** of the habitat or species to the energy technology. Each parameter was estimated by biodiversity experts in the project team (with internal checks) based on the evidence gathered in the literature review and other relevant available data, and then quantified using a percentage score. The assessments were of residual impacts and assumed that all feasible proportionate mitigation measures would be taken to minimise impacts, including the avoidance of impacts within areas that receive statutory protection for their biodiversity<sup>2</sup>. The residual impact on a particular habitat or species from each energy technology was calculated as the product (multiplication) of the two parameters. This was calculated for a baseline year (in most cases the year 2007) for all UK BAP Priority Habitats in the UK<sup>3</sup> (40 terrestrial habitats and 25 marine habitats) as well as a sample of higher plants, birds and marine fish in the UK (50 species of each including both priority and non-priority species). Future impacts on each habitat and species was calculated by extrapolating the baseline assessments according to existing parameters in the Calculator that characterise different energy deployment scenarios until 2050 (as proxies for change in exposure). This allowed the Calculator to automatically calculate the potential negative and/or positive impacts of different energy technology choices. Narratives, highlighting the main biodiversity impacts of each energy technology, were also developed to complement the quantitative assessments and provide additional information (e.g. impacts on biodiversity outside the UK).

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/2050-pathways-analysis>

<sup>2</sup> I.e. Sites/Areas of Special Scientific Interest, Special Protection Areas and Special Areas for Conservation.

<sup>3</sup> According to the UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UK BAP). Although the UK BAP has been superseded by national initiatives, this list remains the most relevant for this type of UK-wide analysis.

The assessment of baseline impacts of each energy production technology on biodiversity in the UK showed that detrimental impacts were often no more than moderate and the majority were very low. Some technologies may also provide biodiversity benefits if carried out at appropriate locations and scales and carefully managed (e.g. use of dedicated bioenergy crops on arable land, forest residues and genuine wastes). Others have mixed impacts depending on their context, such as offshore wind farms, which cause some habitat loss, disturbance and bird losses, but create new habitat/shelter and prevent trawling within their vicinity. However, detrimental impacts from many technologies could increase substantially in the future (e.g. large-scale hydropower, tidal barrages, biomass and biofuels), especially for those that would need to be massively deployed to achieve the UK's climate target in 2050. For some technologies (e.g. tidal range) in future, under potential levels of increased use, it would be difficult or impossible to avoid impacts within protected areas.

Although the biodiversity assessment is a simplified methodology that has many assumptions and uses expert judgement, it is fit for its purposes of helping policy makers and the general public identify the main impacts that UK energy policy could have on biodiversity in the UK in the future. With the biodiversity module in the Calculator users can easily contrast the GHG emissions with biodiversity impacts under different energy deployment scenarios, and attempt to find pathways where both climate change mitigation and biodiversity conservation can be achieved. The biodiversity impact assessment takes many different aspects of biodiversity into account but does have several limitations. Therefore, the assessment methodology and its results should always be complemented with more in-depth assessments and robust evidence. Decisions on particular schemes and projects must also take into account their specific context.

### **Approaches to improve the assessment of energy technologies in the UK on biodiversity**

To overcome two of the identified shortcomings of the developed assessment methodology, spatially-explicit land use modelling and indirect land use change were investigated in more detail to see if they could be developed and integrated into future biodiversity impact assessments.

#### ***Using spatially explicit land use modelling to assess impacts on biodiversity***

To explore whether spatially-explicit modelling could be used to better assess the impacts on biodiversity, two scenarios of bioenergy deployment were assessed using Countryside Survey Land Cover Map 2007 (LCM2007) of habitats in the UK. Based on spatial information of available land with potential for growing non-food (second generation) energy crops, the location of the habitats most likely to be converted to bioenergy production was identified. This was then used to estimate in a more systematic manner which habitats and plant species were most at risk due to increases in bioenergy production. It is possible to use spatially-explicit data and models in biodiversity assessments, but this approach is limited to whether reliable information exists on the (probable) location of future deployment of each energy technology. The current spatial and temporal resolution of land use and biodiversity data sets limit assessments.

#### ***Assessing the effects of indirect land use change on biodiversity***

A framework for assessing the impacts of indirect land use change (ILUC, i.e. displacement of land use (either intensification and/or expansion) following increases in bioenergy demand) on biodiversity developed by the United Nations Environment Programme's World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), was evaluated to see if this aspect could also be integrated into biodiversity assessments. The UNEP-WCMC framework is a broad framework which asks the right conceptual questions for assessing land-use related impacts on biodiversity, but does not offer detailed guidance on how to determine in practice indirect land use change or its impacts on biodiversity. While spatially explicit ILUC data at a fine resolution are a pre-requisite to perform a reliable assessment of the impacts on biodiversity, obtaining such information remains both a technical and conceptual challenge. Another challenge, common to most other biodiversity assessments, consists in identifying robust evidence and relevant information on key biodiversity indicators. Some of the assumptions made in the framework were found to be too limiting. The framework risks not taking into consideration some important effects of ILUC such as differences in crops and cultivation practices, long-term effects, off-site effects and habitat fragmentation. The WCMC framework can serve as a basis for ILUC impacts on biodiversity, but needs to be developed further.

### **Recommendations and further research**

Biodiversity impact assessments are in general limited by robust evidence and available data of the impacts of energy technologies and knowledge of biodiversity in specific locations. This study recommends that the initial focus of future research should be on the energy technologies that have been identified as having potentially high impacts on biodiversity (e.g. tidal range, imported bioenergy), and those whose impacts are particularly uncertain (e.g. tidal stream, wave power, offshore wind, biofuels and dedicated energy crops (in relation to possible indirect land use change)). Other areas that would also merit more research are monitoring of the effectiveness of mitigation options, their expression in terms of population impacts and the consequences of combinations of energy generating technologies. There is also a need for future research to establish better biodiversity impact assessment methodologies and develop predictive models to feed decision support systems for policy and planning purposes.

## Project Report to Defra

---

8. As a guide this report should be no longer than 20 sides of A4. This report is to provide Defra with details of the outputs of the research project for internal purposes; to meet the terms of the contract; and to allow Defra to publish details of the outputs to meet Environmental Information Regulation or Freedom of Information obligations. This short report to Defra does not preclude contractors from also seeking to publish a full, formal scientific report/paper in an appropriate scientific or other journal/publication. Indeed, Defra actively encourages such publications as part of the contract terms. The report to Defra should include:
- the objectives as set out in the contract;
  - the extent to which the objectives set out in the contract have been met;
  - details of methods used and the results obtained, including statistical analysis (if appropriate);
  - a discussion of the results and their reliability;
  - the main implications of the findings;
  - possible future work; and
  - any action resulting from the research (e.g. IP, Knowledge Exchange).

*See final report*

## References to published material

---

9. This section should be used to record links (hypertext links where possible) or references to other published material generated by, or relating to this project.

*See final report*