

胡远洋 (2022) 生物多样性抵消的研究进展. 生物多样性, 30, 21266.
<https://www.biodiversity-science.net/CN/10.17520/biods.2021266>.

附录1 美国生物多样性抵消项目没有实现许多物种的无净损失: 原因、例子和建议(Fox, 2008; BBOP, 2013; Kormos et al, 2014; Kormos et al, 2015)

Appendix 1 The Biodiversity Offsetting programs in the US did not achieve no net loss for many species: Reasons, examples and recommendations (Fox, 2008; BBOP, 2013; Kormos et al, 2014; Kormos et al, 2015)

原因 Reasons	例子 Examples	建议 Recommendations
<p>美国鱼类及野生动植物管理局(USFWS)并不确定他们是否有权为开发商造成的负面影响寻求赔偿, 因此导致赔偿的延迟。换句话说, 模糊和过时的法律和政策阻止了政府机构对破坏行为进行处罚。</p> <p>The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) was uncertain about their authority for requiring compensation for negative impacts, causing the delay of compensation. In other words, the ambiguous and obsolete laws and polices inhibits the announcement of punishment on negative actions.</p>	<p>自 1984 年以来, 开发项目对佛罗里达黑豹栖息地造成了栖息地的净损失, 直至 1990 年 USFWS 才要求补偿。相反, 自 1980 年, 加利福尼亚州要求对圣华金小狐狸进行补偿, 从 1987 年起就获得了净收益。</p> <p>It was not until 1990s that compensation was asked for “take” of Florida Panther habitat, therefore since 1984, development projects had caused a net loss of habitat. Conversely, since the 1980s in California, the compensation was required for the San Joaquin kit fox and a net gain was obtained from 1987.</p>	<p>及时修正法律或政策。</p> <p>Amend laws or policies that can offer authority for managers to ask compensation for species in time.</p>
<p>政治总是影响 USFWS 在宣布关于危险意见方面的工作, 只有显示出“危险”的意见才要求适当的补偿。对于大多数允许“意外捕获”的非危险意见, 很少要求对负面影响的补偿, 或者补偿不充分。然而, 这些负面影响可能会逐渐累积, 并带来生物多样性的损失。(例子: 不适用)</p> <p>Politics always impacts USFWS in terms of the announcement of jeopardy opinions. For most non-jeopardy opinions that allow ‘incidental take’, compensation for negative impacts is seldom included or included inadequately. Nevertheless, these negative impacts can be cumulative, and finally bring a net loss of biodiversity. (Examples: N/A)</p>		<p>对危险或不危险的判断需排除政治影响。</p> <p>The judgement on jeopardy or non-jeopardy should be politic-free.</p>
<p>抵消银行方法中抵消比率不够准确, 无法证明损失和收益之间是对等的。此外, 在设定比率时没有很好地考虑间接和累积影响。</p> <p>The mitigation ratios were not accurate enough to demonstrate there was an equivalence between loss and gain. In addition, the indirect and cumulative impacts were not well considered by the designation of ratios.</p>	<p>2005 年最常使用的抵消比例是 1:1, 即损失一英亩的土地应该由一英亩的土地来弥补。在 20 世纪 90 年代, 对佛罗里达豹的受影响数量被低估了, 因为佛罗里达豹并不是只活动于森林, 而森林以外的栖息地的损失没有得到补偿。</p> <p>A ratio 1:1 that means one hectar of land lost should be mitigated by one ha of land, was most frequently used in 2005. In 1990s, the number of mitigations for the Florida panther was undervalued because the Florida panther was only forest-obligated, causing loss of habitats excluded forest were not compensated.</p>	<p>抵消比率应从实际和规范的定期研究中获得, 同时应避免或最小化间接和累积的影响。</p> <p>Ratios ought to be obtained from practical and regulated-termly research while indirect and cumulative impacts should be avoided or minimized (BBOP, 2013).</p>
<p>抵消区域是零散的、不相连的。因此, 部分物种无法交换它们的遗传信息, 从长远来看, 物种保护会受到负面影响。</p> <p>The mitigation sites were fragmented and disconnected. Thus, these species could not exchange their genetic information and in the long term, the species protection would likely be negatively influenced.</p>	<p>佛罗里达豹的家园范围约为 57,299 ha。自 20 世纪 90 年代初以来, 它们获得的抵消面积要小得多, 只有约 156 ha, 同时划分出多个区域, 无法满足栖息地的要求。</p> <p>Florida panther’s home range was circa 38,548 acres (female), and circa 103,042 acres (male). However, the offset size for them was far smaller, only circa 387 acres since the early 1990s, which could not meet the habitat requirements.</p>	<p>连接物种的栖息地, 并在一个大范围的保护计划中考虑它们。</p> <p>Connect species’ habitat and consider them in a large conservation plan whilst the outbreak of diseases between species should be avoided.</p>
<p>开发商可以选择“被许可人自负责任的抵消”</p>	<p>有 12 个抵消银行为圣华金小狐狸提供保护。平均面</p>	<p>推广抵消银行, 鼓励开发商从</p>

原因 Reasons	例子 Examples	建议 Recommendations
<p>(Permittee Responsible Mitigation, PRM)作为它们的补偿策略,但他们并非生态抵消方面的专家,所以无法保证抵消的成功。此外,抵消银行比PRM有更多的优点,如提高抵消的成功率,减少许可时间,控制抵消成本。</p> <p>The developers chose permittee responsible mitigation (PRM) as their mitigation strategy while the success of the mitigation could not be guaranteed as they were not experts in mitigation. Additionally, conservation bank had more pros than PRM, such as increasing the success of the mitigation, reducing the permitting time, controlling the mitigation cost and promoting the development of conservation bank that obeys the precautionary principle.</p>	<p>积为 600 ha, 而个人持证人的平均面积约为 120 ha。对于黑豹,有3个被批准的抵消银行,有4,009,1,930和472英亩的土地。这些地区与其他保护区相连,意味着这些物种可以有一个大的栖息地来进行基因交换。个人却很难做到建立大面积的保护区。</p> <p>There were 12 conservation banks managed for the San Joaquin Kit Fox. The average area was 1,485 acres, while that of individual permittee are on average circa 297 acres. For the panther, there were three approved conservation banks that had 4,009, 1,930 and 472 acres of land. These areas were linked to other preserved areas, meaning these species could have a large habitat for gene-exchanging. It is difficult for person to build big scale conservation sites.</p>	<p>这些银行购买抵消区域,而不是使用PRM。</p> <p>Promote conservation bank and encourage developers to buy credits from these banks rather than conduct their own PRM.</p>
<p>由于人员和资金的短缺,与PRM有关的文件部分丢失,USFWS甚至无法访问开放商实施的补偿现场。相反,抵消银行总是被很好地记录和跟踪。(例子:不适用)</p> <p>Due to shortages in staff and funding, the documents relating to PRM were partially missing and the USFWS was even unable to visit the mitigation sites. Conversely, conservation banks were always well documented and tracked. (Example: N/A)</p>		<p>准确记录补偿地点,推进抵消银行的发展。</p> <p>Accurately monitor the mitigation sites and promote the conservation bank.</p>
<p>获得许可来建立抵消银行的时间非常漫长,而保护濒危物种却迫在眉睫。</p> <p>The time to obtain approval for building mitigation banking can be extremely long while it is urgent to protect the endangered species.</p>	<p>获得许可建立一个简单的、单一濒危物种的保护银行需要花费8个月甚至是几年。</p> <p>Eight months, even several years will be required to get the approval for building a simple and single-species conservation bank (Fox, 2008).</p>	<p>加快审核机制过程,缩短获得许可时间。</p> <p>Accelerate the supervision process and reduce the time of obtaining approval.</p>

参考文献

- BBOP (2013) To No Net Loss and Beyond: An Overview of the Business and Biodiversity Offsets Programme (BBOP). BBOP. Washington, DC.
- Fox J (2008) Getting two for one: Opportunities and challenges in credit stacking. In: Conservation & Biodiversity Banking: A Guide to Setting Up and Running Biodiversity Credit Trading Systems (eds Carrol N, Fox J, Bayon R), pp. 171–186. New York, USA.
- Kormos R, Kormos CF, Humle T, Lanjouw A, Rainer H, Victurine R, Mittermeier RA, Diallo MS, Rylands AB, Williamson EA (2014) Great apes and biodiversity offset projects in Africa: The case for national offset strategies. PLoS ONE, 2017, e111671.
- Kormos R, Mead D, Vinnedge B (2015) Biodiversity offsetting in the United States: Lessons learned on maximizing their ecological contribution. Unpublished report prepared for Fauna & Flora International, Cambridge. https://www.fauna-flora.org/app/uploads/2017/12/FFI_2015_Biodiversity-offsets-USA.pdf. (accessed on 2021-12-17)