External Review of Phase II of the

Preface

This report presents the results of the independent Review of Phase II of the IUCN-Holcim Agreement. Following two months of data collection in the summer of 2013, the report was written in September and iteratively revised over a two-month period in light of ongoing discussions between the reviewer, Holcim and IUCN. The report was produced by Dr. Alain Frechette, with technical research support provided by Ms. Melissa Rodrigue. The views and interpretations presented herein are those of the author only. Any remaining factual errors should likewise be attributed to the reviewer.

Fruitful completion of this assignment would have been impossible, were it not for the open and collaborative relationship that IUCN and Holcim have development over the years, and the willingness of all interviewed stakeholders to critically examine the benefits, successes and

In this regard, the role and authority of the Steering Committee is vital to ensure that influence is exerted in the appropriate forums. Likewise, continuous support is necessary to increase operational capacity, and the assumptions underlying the Agreement and IUCN's BES require further refinement in order to effectively guide actions and attain impacts.

Recommendations

Recommendation 1: The programmatic intentions of Phase II of the IUCN-Holcim Agreement should be brought to a useful conclusion.

IUCN and Holcim should (i) develop a working model of how and under what conditions the BMS and the Biodiversity Indicator Reporting System (BIRS) are likely to be integrated and acted upon; (ii) test the model and its assumptions in different settings/regions; and (iii) scale up interventions and monitor results.

Recommendation 2: With the technical backing of IUCN and members of the Biodiversity Panel, Holcim should strengthen the capacity of operational and management personnel, so they can better understand the meaning and value of biodiversity conservation, reliably measure relevant risks, as well as plan, implement, monitor and report on mitigation strategies.

More must be done to convey the importance of biodiversity across Group companies, to inform operators of the biodiversity directive, and to better communicate the changes that Holcim seeks to achieve. To this end, Holcim should work with IUCN to devise a robust capacity building strategy that addresses the full range of learning needs within Group companies. Moreover, Holcim should consider

IUCN could play a central convening role, as well as explain the limits of ecosystem and planetary boundaries, while Holcim could help establish industry-wide standards. The assumption that this approach would yield interest from a larger group of companies, as well as increased resources, buy-in and opportunities, remains to be tested.

Recommendation 6: The IUCN Secretariat should take time to reflect on recent experiences with the private sector to revisit its Business Engagement Strategy and the assumptions that support it.

Though IUCN's work with the private sector is supported a relatively clear set of results, the assumptions that underpin its ability to deliver such support appear questionable. As IUCN begins thinking of ways to further its relationships with the business community, it will need to define a more robust and consistent account of how it seeks to effect change, including the assumptions that underlie its approach and the operational model it uses to organise and deliver its work. Clarification of the role and contribution of all segments of the Union will be crucial.

Acronyms

BAP	Biodiversity Action Plan
BBP	

Table of Contents

Exhibits

Appendices

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

In 2011, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) renewed a three-year agreement with Holcim Ltd., one of the world's leading suppliers of cement and

to frame the context (see Section 2) of this review, providing a firm basis for understanding the results of the present inquiry.

1.3 Audience

This review is intended to support the decision-making needs of the joint Steering Committee, the Relationship Managers for both partners, the IUCN Business and Biodiversity Programme, the Water Programme and the Environmental Law Centre, under the authority of the IUCN Director General and the Chief Executive Officer of Holcim. In support of these stakeholder groups, the review sought to develop lessons learned and make recommendations to each organisation, as appropriate.

1.4 Methodology

This report presents the results of an evaluative inquiry conducted between July 1 and August 30, 2013. To ensure the validity and reliability of the study findings, the review was carried out using a participatory and qualitative mixed-method approach involving expert interviews, site visits, and document review. The questions guiding the

Final

1.4.4 Limitations

The review was hindered by three main factors. First, Holcim has been working on the rollout and implementation of the BMS at all its sites, however, the level of implementation was difficult to assess given the available data. As a mitigation measure, the review focuses analytical attention on stakeholder perceptions of progress, the successes and challenges operational managers face in trying to comply with the implementation directive, and the degree to which the underlying institutional conditions provide a favourable

Final Àú1ñ˜6

When IUCN entered into the Agreement, it operated with an evolving set of assumptions regarding the way it should engage business and the value or comparative advantage it brought to such relationships. As IUCN strengthened its ties to the private sector and learned what worked and what didn't, and as well as what could and could not be done, the models, tools and frameworks it relied upon to guide its work were continuously refined and improved upon. Its ability to leverage strategic support from key constituencies – including members, experts and regional offices – and how it organises to bring science, action and influence to bear on market-driven imperatives were but some of the concerns raised during this review. For its part, Holcim experienced the complexity of dealing with biodiversity conservation, and the challenge of scaling up the management of such efforts. Costing implications can be substantial, and the ability or willingness of Holcim Group companies to absorb the direct and indirect costs of biodiversity management necessarily varies. Phase II also saw the re varies.

The third result area focused on sector-wide engagement and was conceived as an opportunity to influence industry standards with respect to biodiversity conservation. Specifically, the workstream focused on strengthening relationships with industry associations through active involvement in joint biodiversity task forces, the publication and dissemination of relationship outputs (principally, the Integrat

Union's evolving BES and operational model for achieving change in the way business understands and manages its risks relative to biodiversity and water. Specifically, the Agreement supports IUCN's approach to the private sector, and in particular its Business Engagement Strategy by:

- Furthering the Union's efforts to engage with selected leaders in priority sectors to develop or adapt, field test and pilot new tools and other best practice approaches;
- Encouraging the building materials sector to develop, adopt and promote voluntary standards for improved management of biodiversity and ecosystem services; and
- Promoting engagement at the public policy level to strengthen existing regulatory measures in the building materials sector and extractive industries to improve biodiversity conservation and the maintenance of related ecosystem services, and thus provide a level playing field for progressive businesses that seek to make a difference.[5]

As such, the relevance of Phase II of the Agreement is directly tied to Holcim's efforts to "manage biodiversity risks so as to avoid and minimize biodiversity impacts" while seeking "opportunities" to improve "biodiversity conservation and benefits" in the areas where it operates.[6] Further, in spite of the fact

biodiversity conservation and sustainable water use are important because they are essential to Holcim's license to operate. Several senior staff members even went so far as to acknowledge that there are inherent limits to growth and that the long-term success of the corporation will eventually require even more fundamental changes in the way Holcim operates. To this end, the Agreement provides a critical step in the right direction.

Invariably, when Holcim staff were asked to explain the relevance of the Agreement for a profit-driven industry, responses were nearly always identical: being proactive about biodiversity saves time and resources relative to permitting processes (making it faster and cheaper to comply with national, provincial or local regulatory bodies) and creates a value-added precedent that improves relationships to communities at multiple scales of aggregation. Nowadays, the biodiversity management component is broadly regarded as a functional element of Holcim's sustainable development framework.

Assuming responsibility for, and compensating the impacts of, its operations are increasingly regarded as being crucial with the Holcim Group. As one senior official put it, "we do this because it's good business and good for the planet." Through its association with IUCN, Holcim gained confidence in its approach and a level of credibility that would have been difficult to achieve under any other arrangement. Internally, IUCN also added value by providing crucial guidance and key input into how to think about biodiversity and its significance for Holcim's operations. In the end, the four-part strategy (biodiversity, policy, sector engagement, and water) not only helped Holcim to further its environmental track record, but also aimed to enlist competitors in doing the same and helped produce regulatory guidelines in a bid to level the playing field and eventually scale up biodiversity conservation. For Holcim, the relevance of the Agreement ultimately lies in IUCN's strong credibility, influence, and technical knowledge.

F3: The IUCN-Holcim Agreement substantively raised the bar in terms of corporate environmental and social responsibility. It is a precedent-setting agreement with strong normative implications for the wider [illegible] As [illegible] policy,

stewardship.[7] While cement production may require less water thru-put than other sectors of the economy, its consumption remains substantial, and finding ways to understand and manage water related risks,[8] especially in water-stressed environments, represents another common point of entry between the CSI, Holcim and IUCN.[9] Finally, the CSI is currently revising its 2005 Guidelines for Environmental and Social Impact Assessment, and in this regard, the IBMS – a sector-based open-access tool that draws on the experience of IUCN and Holcim – will likely provide the core biodiversity component of the revised guidelines.

In sum, the achievements of the IUCN-Holcim relationship are highly relevant to the challenges that others face in the sector. IUCN and Holcim may have developed critical knowledge products to support the needs of the Holcim Group, but in doing so, they have also created a public knowledge base that can be used to leverage results across the sector and beyond.

3.2 Effectiveness

Effectiveness relates to the extent to which the objectives of the Agreement were achieved or are likely to be achieved.[10] To this end, the review focuses analytical attention on the four result areas of Phase II of the Agreement and measures progress made in the implementation of the following set of objectives:

1. Effectively implement the Biodiversity Management System within the Holcim Group;
2. Develop a policy guidance document to engage policymakers on how the building materials sector could better manage biodiversity at the operational level;
3. Influence the development of sector-wide standards for biodiversity conservation; and
4. Strengthen the approach to water management within the Holcim Group.

Collectively,

within the broader cement and aggregate sector remains largely experimental, and that few if any of the institutional and economic contexts wherein Holcim Group companies operate currently reward such investments, the incentive to do more than what appears necessary may be limited. This may help explain why, for instance, when Holcim requested IUCN and Birdlife International to map the potential biodiversity importance of its sites using the Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool (IBAT), that the Biodiversity Advisory Panel (BioPan) gave such a poor review of the level of consistency in self-reported data. In comparing the IBAT data with Plant Environmental Profiles (PEP) for 2010 and 2011, the BioPan observed that Holcim's exposure to biodiversity risks was likely being under-reported for a number of issues, including: (i) sites with elements of Global Biodiversity Importance, (ii) the actual level of biodiversity risk across the Holcim Group, and (iii) the presence of significant biodiversity elements outside the Biodiversity Importance Category (BIC) criteria – notably for invasive species and Karst ecosystem features. In their preliminary conclusion, BioPan members reported that "*evidence of uptake and implementation of the BMS [was] patchy and fairly weak.*" In recognising such discrepancy, one senior manager stressed that sooner or later, Holcim will need to become more transparent about the actual status of its biodiversity risk. Otherwise, "*we [will] face a credibility challenge in explaining the selection of so-called sensitive sites*" To this end, the IBAT results were provided to each operating company to further knowledge uptake, and increase the confidence in data that is being reported.

To overcome the potential for bias, country managers do call upon external experts to assess sites that present distinctive features or are thought to harbour sensitive species. The problem is that such detailed inventories are costly to produce and, under current conditions, none of the Group companies can afford to carry out such assessments for all of their sites. Moreover, Some even admitted that they actually face incentives to downplay the need to carry out a full assessment or confirm the presence of a rare species or unique ecosystem, since such occurrences could potentially limit exploitation activities and/or create additional cost burdens.

Of course, these issues are not new to IUCN or Holcim, which is why the Biodiversity Panel invested much of its energy in the latest phase of the Agreement to develop a monitoring and evaluation framework that would at once bring consistency in the assessment of biodiversity risks, and create measurement standards that could then be compared across sites and/or aggregated at multiple scales, in the form of Key Performance Indicators. While still in draft form, the Biodiversity Indicator Reporting System (BIRS) is currently being tested and refined, but is unlikely to be ready and scaled up for use prior to the end of Phase II. Drawing on a coarse filter approach that is designed to assess the extent of habitat, its condition and its uniqueness, the instrument primarily seeks to measure the suitability for biodiversity In this way, it provides a "site biodiversity condition index" that can be used to illustrate relative change over time. In the development of the BIRS, the panel was asked to ensure that the guidelines clearly showed the linkages between the BMS

F7: The pursuit of an ambitious conservation agenda is creating a strong pull effect within the broader cement and aggregates sector.

Within the current Agreement, IUCN and Holcim had agreed to (i) broaden sector engagement towards improved biodiversity conservation; (ii) strengthen sector-wide standards in relevant trade associations; and (iii) improve awareness of biodiversity management in the building materials sector. In support of these objectives, the Holcim-specific BMS tool was adapted to support the sustainability interests of the major cement and aggregates associations, such as the Cement Sustainability Initiative (CSI), the European Cement Association (Cembureau), the Federación Interamericana del Cemento (FICEM), and the Union Européenne des Producteurs de Granulats (UEPG). While discussions on the final nature of the proposed IBMS are currently taking place, the final version of the tool should be delivered before the end of the current Agreement. For its part, Holcim maintained its involvement in the CSI task force on biodiversity and land stewardship, which it helped to create in 2008, and recently joined the newly created task force on water.

More specifically, Holcim helped develop the CSI's 2011 Guidelines for quarry rehabilitation, which are now aligned with Holcim's own reporting requirements. It introduced IBAT as a common screening tool for sites of global or national importance to task force members, which has since been used by Titan, Lafarge, Cemex, and possibly Italcementi. It is currently helping with the creation of sector-wide guidelines for biodiversity management plans based on the tools developed by IUCN. Holcim also proposed IUCN to the CSI as a key informant for all relevant CSI products, and it is now working with UEPG (the European level aggregate producers association) to develop biodiversity indicators, using initial input from IUCN.

With regards to its partnership with IUCN, Holcim gained high exposure in a number of platforms, including the 2012 World Conservation Congress and the Convention on Biological Diversity Conference of Parties. Through these and other venues, Holcim was able to showcase its risk-based approach to biodiversity conservation and water resource management, and to advocate its positions on this topic. This has in turn generated interest from the banking sector on how to manage biodiversity risks.

It is difficult to tell whether Holcim's contributions and active participation in different communities of practice, though substantial, are driven by the objectives of the second phase of the Agreement or the leadership role it has long pursued. In effect, Holcim has always had a strong commitment to the CSI and is perceived as an influential player and pacesetter amongst its peers. For Holcim and the CSI alike, the need to establish minimum requirements across the board is seen as a crucial first step towards long-term change – a process that will ultimately help Holcim by creating a more level playing field. As one Holcim manager summed it up, "we do not want to be the best in a dirty industry; we want to be the best in a clean industry."

Evidence suggests c8sitions ¡ b) À 0

F8: The Agreement has helped to generate a robust baseline assessment of water resource use for all of Holcim's operations. Though management guidelines and mitigation strategies are still being developed, the less abstract nature of water resource management should translate into a more rapid deployment and reliable uptake of relevant tools and methods.

Though lower in

FinalReport

In terms of corporate governance, it makes sense to limit potential impacts on biodiversity and water because this ultimately limits the corporation's exposure to risk. Such an approach implies the need for credible assurance, for as one observer pointed out, "you are ultimately as bad as your worst site." Yet, as Nobel laureate Elinor Ostrom strongly emphasised, "without monitoring, there can be no credible commitment; [and] without credible commitments, there [are] no reason [s] to propose new rules," such as the directives that underlie the Agreement. Periodic external audits or verifications can help secure not only compliance, but also stakeholder and shareholder confidence in an organisation's capacity to manage risks. At the moment, Holcim has not made specific commitments to adopt a corporate assurance mechanism similar to what Rio Tinto uses (see Boxtext below).

3.4 Efficiency

Within the scope of this review, efficiency refers to how well IUCN and Holcim use their

F13: While the Agreement is praised for delivering value for money, a more inclusive, strategic, and deliberative planning process would have reduced the likelihood of delays in implementation, changes in programme design, and gaps in the achievement of results.

Phase II of

FinalReport

in Bangkok), IUCN has neither the institutional mandate to carry out such a level of involvement, nor does it have the capacity to reach

Monitoring, Reporting,

For instance, though IUCN is recognised for

extent to which these are sufficient to drive change in the way the Group manages its resource assets or scales up interventions to achieve net positive impacts remains doubtful. Unless biodiversity conservation can somehow generate increased returns through efficiency gains, competitive advantages or greater market opportunities, the likelihood of sustained and substantive change will likely remain subdued.

In addition to developing a balanced portfolio of

4. Lessons Learned

Arguably, the significance of the IUCN-Holcim relationship and its relative performance have to be considered in the context of the fundamental

Holcim's Operational Capacity

As explored above, one of the biggest challenges Holcim faces is that of local capacity to both evaluate biodiversity risks and develop appropriate mitigation strategies. Regardless of the presence or absence of local experts, the fact remains that in-house capacity is essential if the initiative is to become integrated into Holcim's organisational culture. As one stakeholder put it, "to seriously implement, one needs capacity." Other firms, such as Lafarge, Cemex and Heidleberg have taken steps toward having expertise on board. Their objectives are less ambitious, and they are also more selective in their efforts. While Holcim has strategic players that can effectively push the conservation agenda, there are doubts as to whether it has in-house capacity to make biodiversity conservation a realistic proposition. With only three people to service the information needs of a global operation, Holcim's ability to roll out the BMS is arguably stretched for the time being. Developing viable operational modalities, realistic expectations and a theory of change that incorporates the strengths and limitations of the Group's internal resource capacity will prove crucial to the long term success of Holcim's change efforts.

Learning by Trial and Error

Though it is generally agreed that the two partners were successful in developing a constructive and productive relationship, Phase II of the Agreement was not without its difficulties. Prior consultations were not always carried out before making decisions, leading to occasional frustrations and misunderstandings, which, as both organisations now recognise, could have been avoided altogether. Long-term commitment requires time,

5. Conclusions

The Agreement is highly relevant to IUCN's mission/BES as well as Holcim's vision/interests. It sets important standards for the wider sector to emulate.

While the Agreement supports efforts to engage sector leaders – including at the policy level – to improve biodiversity management, as well as broadens the scope of IUCN's commitment to the private sector, it also provides Holcim with the opportunity to improve relationships with different constituencies and reduce its transaction costs. This precedent-setting Agreement is relevant to the challenges faced by the wider sector, having fostered the development of knowledge products that can be applied to effect change.

Phase II of the Agreement has demonstrated progress in terms of attaining outputs, but outcomes have yet to be achieved.

While BMS implementation is progressing, concerns remain with regarding the costs.

6. Recommendations

The following areas of recommendation are for indicative purposes only. They point to emerging issues that could potentially help improve the intended results of the Agreement. They are provided here to test the feasibility and value-added for IUCN and

With the development of the IBMS, the BIRS and increasing sector engagement (the CSI and policy tools), IUCN is indeed poised to play a more critical role in advancing biodiversity concerns in the mining and extractive industries. Yet, without more specific ventures to test innovative ideas and initiate new strategies at a manageable scale (e.g. BMS, BIRS and Water Risk Assessment tool), IUCN also risks having little to offer at the sectoral level. The assumption that cross-sectoral approaches would yield interest from a larger group of companies, more resources, greater buy-in and opportunities to pilot new initiatives remains to be tested.

IUCN could play a central convening role in developing a multi-sectoral approach, while working with and through other network-based organisations such as the WBCSD and IFC. IUCN should appoint a liaison for the WBCSD and be proactive in sharing developments and knowledge products so as to improve usability and increase adaptive potential of relevant instruments. The BMS will survive if a strong community of practice is built around it and if industry understands

As such, the ways in which IUCN adds value to relationships with the private sector – beyond the mere use of its name and global reputation – will need to be clarified. If IUCN's strategy centres on the Union and what the Union can offer, then it will have to redefine its business and operational models to specify the assumptions that underpin the causal relationships of the strategy (i.e., chain of results) and the processes that explain how IUCN will organise itself to achieve the intended outcomes of the strategy. This would include the respective roles and responsibilities of the Secretariat (global programmes), regional offices, members and networks of experts (i.e., commissions). While such a reflexion should be led by the Business and Biodiversity Programme (BBP), it necessarily extends beyond the scope of BBP and will need to involve all levels of IUCN's Global programme, including internal decision making processes and institutional structure (i.e., arrangements between programmes, initiatives, members, commissions, etc.).

Appendix I Terms of Reference

External Review of Phase II of the IUCN-Holcim Agreement

A. Background

In 2011, IUCN entered into a second three-year agreement with Holcim, one of the world's leading suppliers of cement and aggregates. Phase II builds on the achievements of the first agreement and aims to support the effective implementation of the Biodiversity Management System, demonstrate better biodiversity conservation and business outcomes to the Holcim Group and extend the approach to the wider building material sector. Phase two has four key areas of work:

- Implementation of the Biodiversity Management System: IUCN and Holcim will develop tools, build capacities and establish indicators for ensuring the effective implementation by Holcim's operations on the ground.
- Influencing policy: IUCN and Holcim will work with policymakers to enable the building materials sector to deliver better biodiversity conservation outcomes.
- Sector-wide engagement: The partners will work Group and

relationship and draw lessons and recommendations for improvements in each organization. The review will also explore areas of work and trigger discussions on the nature and scope of future collaborations between both organizations.

E. The specific objectives are:

- To assess the extent to which the expected results of the Agreement have been fulfilled;
- To identify lessons and provide IUCN with recommendations which inform and improve the development of future bilateral agreements with companies and engagement at sector level as well as the IUCN Business Engagement Strategy;
- To identify lessons and provide Holcim with recommendations which will further support implementation of biodiversity and water-related systems in their extractive operations, especially:
- With regards to sustainability of the results of the Agreement;
- As a measure of overall impact on biodiversity;
- With regards to uptake of the water risk framework.

F. Scope of the Review

The scope of the review covers all aspects of the "Programme Agreement" between Holcim and IUCN, agreed in 2011. In particular, this includes the activities of IUCN and Holcim under the agreement and the functioning of the Biodiversity Advisory Panel.

G. Evaluation methods

The review will make use of standard evaluation data collection techniques (surveys, interviews, document review) and will be supplemented by data and analyses collected for the monitoring report of phase II. A proposed stakeholder interview list of 20 to 30 interviewees will be provided to the evaluator(s).

The review will be supported by a matrix of issues, questions, indicators and data sources to aid the review team in their data collection and analysis, but will not serve as a limit to their investigation. A proposed evaluation matrix can be found in the annex.

H. Qualifications of evaluator(s)

IUCN is looking for (an) experienced evaluator(s) with a track record in evaluating NGO-corporate relationships. The evaluator must be able to demonstrate sound judgment and ideally have a good understanding of IUCN's way of working with business. The evaluator(s) must have significant experience in both qualitative and quantitative social research and possess the necessary software to carry out statistical analysis. Strong communication skills, both written and spoken, are a must, as are highly-developed interpersonal skills. Knowledge and contacts in the cement and aggregates sector are also desired.

I. Deliverables

- Inception report/note
- Draft report for review by IUCN and Holcim
- Facilitation of discussion on draft report and recommendations
- Final Evaluation Report

J. Timeframe

Subject to agreement, the milestones for this review include:

- Development of the Review Inception Note (the review team's reaction to the Terms of Reference, methodology, workplan and detailed budget) and workplan by the evaluator(s) (May 2013)
- Data collection and analysis (June-August 2013)
- Provision of the draft report (September 2013)
- SC discussion on external review (including presentation of draft findings) (October 2013)
- Finalization of the review report (November 2013)

Appendix II Review Matrix

KeyQuestions	SubQuestions	[4agebfrativetions

Key Questions	Sub Questions	Illustrative Indicators	Data Sources/Methods
	x To what extent have IUCN-Holcim been effective in engaging the cement/aggregate sector in developing appropriate standards for biodiversity conservation/water management? x To what extent is the rest of the sector influenced by Holcim's implementation of the BMS? x What tangible products or services are applicable to the wider sector? What use has been made of these? x To what extent has the relationship helped Phase		

Key Questions	Sub Questions	Illustrative Indicators	Data Sources/Methods

Key

Appendix III Interview Protocols

Introduction

Phase II of the IUCN-Holcim relationship will come to an end in December 2013, and for internal learning and accountability purposes, IUCN contracted an independent consultant to evaluate the results and value of the relationship and programme so far.

The review has three main objectives:

1. Assess the extent to which the results of the Agreement have been fulfilled;
2. Identify lessons and provide IUCN with recommendations to improve future bilateral agreements with the private sector, in support of the IUCN Business Engagement Strategy;
3. Identify lessons and provide Holcim with recommendations to support implementation of biodiversity and water-related systems in their extractive operations.

Data collection for this review will be drawn from key stakeholder interviews and document reviews.

The information provided for this review will remain strictly confidential. The interview should take 40-50 min. In this document, bullet points should be viewed as prompts to solicit feedback.

Background Information

- What is your current role and responsibilities
- What has been your involvement in the agreement between IUCN-Holcim to this day?

Relevance

For IUCN

- What is the relevance of this agreement to the work of IUCN? How does it support the delivery of its mission?
  - What is the significance / importance of the agreement?
  - Have the terms of the agreement been used to improve IUCN's outreach to the business sector?
  - To what extent is the agreement aligned with the objectives of IUCN's Business and Biodiversity Programme and more specifically, the IUCN Business engagement Strategy?

For Holcim:

- How does the agreement support the interests of Holcim?
  - How does it support its business priorities? What benefits does Holcim derive from this?
  - How does the protection of biodiversity / conservation of water resources fit in the company's overall business strategy?
- What is the significance of this agreement for the broader cement/aggregate sector?

Effectiveness (for IUCN & Holcim)

BMS

- To what extent have IUCN-Holcim been successful in implementing BMS?
  - Is progress being achieved as planned? Are there country/regional differences? Why?
  - What difference has the adoption of BMS made for the

Relationship Managers:

- To what extent are the costs of the agreement manageable? Has Phase II been implemented within budget / estimated costs?
  - Were costs and benefits monitored over time?
  - What, if anything, has been done to minimise costs (transaction or operational)?

Factors

Relationship Managers:

- How has the overall context within which the relationship evolved changed since 2011?
- What are the key factors (internal / external) that have

- If the relationship was

Appendix IV List of Stakeholders Interviewed

Name	Title/Position	Role/Relationship	Affiliation
Ruksana Mirza	Head, Sustainable Development	SC member	Holcim Technology Ltd.
Domique Büchi	Head of Environment	SC member	Holcim Technology Ltd.
Rashila Kerai	Biodiversity Programme Manager	Relationship Manager	Holcim Technology Ltd.
Meg Garakani		Holcim water focal point	Holcim Technology Ltd.
Benedikt Vonnegut	CEO of Holcim Lebanon	Key informant/ex-SC member	Holcim Ltd.
David Kingma	Manager SD Coordination and Reporting	Key Informant	Holcim Technology Ltd.
Tanya Strevens	Associate, Cement Sustainability Initiative	Key Informant – Sector	World Business Council for Sustainable Development
Yvonne Leung	Manager, Cement Sustainability Initiative	Key Informant – Sector	World Business Council for Sustainable Development
Catherine Goyer	Directrice Environnement	Key Informant	Demix/Holcim Ltd.
Yves Lapointe	Surintendant entretien – Région Québec/Estrie	Key Informant	Demix/Holcim Ltd.
Oepoyo Prakoso	Corporate Environment & Compliance Dept.	Key Informant	PT Holcim Indonesia Tbk
Daniela Beles	Environmental Coordinator – Emerging Europe	Key Informant	Holcim Emerging Europe
Joel Nickel	Environmental Coordinator – United States	Key Informant	Aggregate Industries US
Giulia Carbone	h˜–TQcfGÿMcaY„3	Key	Mar

Name	Title/Position	Role/Relationship	Affiliation
Peter-John Meynell	Member, Biodiversity Advisory Panel	BMS/BIRS	IUCN
David Richards	Member, Biodiversity Advisory Panel	BMS/BIRS	IUCN
Marc Stalmans	Member, Biodiversity Advisory Panel	BMS/BIRS	IUCN
Gerard Bos	Head, Global Business and Biodiversity Programme	Key Informant	IUCN
Maria Ana Borges	Relationship Manager – Business and Biodiversity Programme	Key Informant – Manager	IUCN
Alex Moiseev	Head, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation	Key Informant	IUCN
Julia Marton-Lefevre	Director General	Key Informant	IUCN
Stewart McGinnis	Head, Global Programme & Nature Based-Solutions	Key Informant	IUCN

Bibliography

- Duncan, E. & Bertrand, N. (2008). Review of the Application of IUCN's Operational Guidelines for Private Sector Engagement, 25 p.
- International Union for Conservation of Nature. (2013). Excerpts from the Summary Minutes of the 81st Council Meeting (January 2013).
  - (2013). 60th Meeting of the Bureau of Council – Agenda Item 4: Terms of Reference

Appendix VI Holcim's Environmental Commitments

Established in 1912 in Switzerland, under the name Holderbank, the Holcim Group Ltd. has since grown to become one of the largest and most important producers of cement and aggregates in the world, with 80 000 employees working in approximately 70 countries. While the company has produced cement since its early operations, it now offers ready-mix concrete, concrete products and asphalt, among others.[55]

For the past two decades, the Holcim Group has taken a leading role in environmental protection and resource management, proposing innovative solutions, contributing to knowledge creation and dissemination, and influencing sector standards and policies. From quarry rehabilitation in Canada to butterfly gardens in the Philippines, Holcim continues to demonstrate its commitment to creating a cleaner and more sustainable cement and aggregate sector. The following tables provide an overview of Holcim's evolving understanding of effective environmental management.

The Evolution of Holcim's Environmental Commitments

1990s

[55] Annual Report 2010 Holcim Ltd., p. 3.
[56] Flammer, D. (2012). Holcim Chronology – A Story in 10 Chapters, pp. 49, 67.
[57] [Revised] Holcim Environmental Policy, 7 p.
[58] Holcim. (2010). Annual Report 2010 Holcim Ltd., p. 25.
[59] http://www.holcim.com/sustainable-development/vision-and-strategy.html

[60] Annual Report

Bibliography

- Flammer, D. (2012). Holcim Chronology – A Story in 10 Chapters, 91 p.
- Holcim. (2013). SD Committee Meeting 2013, Environment – Update on the IUCN Partnership, 4 p.
  - (2013). Memo to Alain Frechette – Holcim inputs into CSI – Influence the Sector, 1 p.
  - (2012). Performance Data 2012, 6 p.
  - (2011). Site Biodiversity Management Recommendation – Guidance

Appendix VII IUCN Business Engagement Strategy

The purpose of the following table is to demonstrate the evolution of the IUCN's Private Sector Engagement Strategy by comparing key elements from its implicit business engagement Theory of Change. Each element is drawn from four key documents that marked the evolving thinking about business engagement (i.e. the 2004 Private Sector Strategy, the 2008 IUCN Engagement with the Private Sector Rationale and Purpose, the 2009 Operation Guidelines and the 2012 Private Sector Strategy).

The eight years between the first an21rsanas8063Tj/TT21Tf.2Tc60003Tj/TT21Tf.2240TD.0073Tc[(an)Tfnve

	2004 Private Sector Strategy	2008 Rationale and Purpose; 2009 Operational Guidelines	2012 Private Sector Strategy
Inputs	x Developing case studies, guidelines and training material; x Providing technical services and advice; x Convening debate and discussion around key		

	2004 Private Sector Strategy	2008 Rationale and Purpose; 2009 Operational Guidelines	2012 Private Sector Strategy
Long-term Outcomes	x A conservation community that is well informed about market mechanisms and understands their potential and limitations to achieve biodiversity conservation. x A more accountable private sector which contributes to sustainable development including conservation and social equity. x Effective dialogue and collaboration between IUCN and the private sector which helps to achieve conservation through, and alongside, sustainable development (2004, p. 8)		x Businesses adopt policies to manage biodiversity risks so as to avoid and minimise biodiversity impacts and seek opportunities for biodiversity conservation and benefits for natural resource dependent people. x Supply chains apply sustainability standards and safeguards that positively impact biodiversity and local livelihoods. x Public and financial sector policies promote the integration of biodiversity and livelihood values in business decision-making (p. 9).
Impacts	x A sustainable global economy in which businesses are committed and effective partners in achieving a just world that values and conserves nature (2004, p. 3).		x Business practices at landscape and seascape levels are transformed to generate benefits for biodiversity and natural resource-dependent livelihoods (p. 9).