

Questions from WWFs and Bain & Company's seminar "Swedish Businesses and the Biodiversity Crisis" on February 9, 2023.

Below, we answer the questions that came up in the chat during the seminar, that were not responded to during the webinar.

Q1: Leaving Fossil based materials behind by moving to renewables will put pressure on nature and Biodiversity. What would you say is the overall strategy to deliver on both challenges in parallel?

WWF recommends that the overall strategy should be to look at all use of materials, both natural and fossil based jointly, as one unity. The overall principle must be that every outtake should be within the ecological boundaries, this means securing functional ecosystem services. The next principle is that all material should go to the most important usage first, which is sustainable food production. After that, there will be some limited space left for other materials and usages. Innovation, increased efficiency and circular business models will be of utmost importance.

For inspiration, please explore back casting from an Earth System perspective such as the Framework for Strategic Sustainable Development for example at [BTH](#).

Q2: Can you comment if "net positive" includes offsetting to a large extent, with measures outside the own value chain?

The terminology net positive is still widely discussed and to our knowledge, there is no fixed definition on it, but it is often associated with potential biodiversity offsets. We strongly advise companies to use the mitigation hierarchy (see SBTN initial guidance), companies should avoid, reduce, restore, and regenerate biodiversity, and use their influence to transform the systems they are active in. To achieve a goal of halting and reversing nature loss by 2030 – a nature positive future - there has to be a strong focus on avoidance, especially zero new conversion of natural habitats. There is a very useful discussion paper by WWF and a number of other organisations here. Offsets will only be appropriate in a very limited set of circumstances. In instance where they are, for example for new essential infrastructure development, one has to bear in mind that nature is location specific. As such, any attempts to protect, restore or enhance an area of damaged nature should occur in the locality where such damage occurred.

Q3: When talking about "Net Positive Impact on Biodiversity", what is the actual definition of this? What is included and what is the baseline? Can companies work based on an own definition of what's included in Net Positive Impact?

"Net-Biodiversity positive" is a controversial terminology as it is often associated with potential biodiversity offsets. For this reason WWF suggests that companies consider targets framed around contributing to "[nature positive](#)". For WWF "nature positive" infers more of a focus on addressing the drivers of biodiversity loss.

In the case of H&M Group, their aspirational ambition of becoming Net-Biodiversity Positive provided the necessary context and drive for H&M Group (including with WWF) to commence work on biodiversity-focused landscape projects and more specific supply chain

targets. This ambition was set up at a time when there was still great uncertainty about the correct framing for biodiversity work in a company, but was an important step to start work in this critical area. It is clear that a time-bound target, underpinned by more detailed sub-targets, needs to be established and H&M group and WWF are in constant dialogue to further develop a more detailed biodiversity strategy. The work of the Science Based Target Network (SBTN) is critical on this front. Consistent definitions/standards of net-zero biodiversity impact and nature-positive are still under development. Both WWF and H&M Group support the work and alignment of SBTN in this regard and we continue to work together to deliver impact on the ground and in supply chains without waiting for the definitions to be finalised because time is running out to reverse the loss of nature. There is a good discussion paper on this topic [here](#).

Q4: When will the 4 section of "Respond" in WWF's biodiversity risk filter be released?

The Respond section in [WWF's biodiversity risk filter tool](#) is aimed to provide ideas on how to mitigate biodiversity risks and enhance resilience. An exact date for when it will be released has not yet been set, but we hope to see it live sometime during the first half of 2024.

Q5: What type of biodiversity is included in the WWFs biodiversity risk filter?

The [WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter](#) assesses the state of biodiversity-related issues and pressures that may impact biodiversity and ecosystems using 33 different indicators. You can see the spatial distribution of all indicators in the **EXPLORE** module (the maps).

For more information, see the tool's **Biodiversity Risk Filter Methodology** in [Data & Methods](#)

Q6: How do H&M Group handle the traceability obstacle in the biodiversity risk filter?

For some commodities H&M Group have farm level data, but for many they only have country or sub-national regional level data. As an interim solution for their materiality assessment, and for trialling the WWF biodiversity risk filter (BRF), the WWF & H&M Group partnership team has been using secondary data from national statistics on the regions where specific commodities are produced in countries. One can then select a number of points within those production areas to serve as proxies. Please note that this is not official guidance to using the BRF – this is simply the approach we are testing in the WWF & H&M Group partnership at the moment.

Q7: How big part of the H&M Group business is included in these different actions today?

H&M Group influences the majority of their suppliers through certification requirements and their material sourcing policy as part of a target to only source 100% recycled or more sustainably-sourced materials by 2030. The specific projects in India and South Africa that were mentioned during the seminar, do not represent a large part of H&M Group's sourcing of cotton or wool sourcing. They are being pursued as pilot projects to understand if/how H&M Group could go beyond certifications towards more regenerative practices. The experience and lessons learned contribute to wider landscape efforts such as the Regenerative Production Landscape Collaborative in Madhya Pradesh, India, which aims to reach 120,000 farmers and cover 100,000 Hectares by 2026.

