



# Getting real

The challenges of sustaining biodiversity partnerships

**Essay written by Ros Tennyson  
with Sasha Hurrell and Justin Sykes  
Cover design: Alison Beanland  
Cover photograph: William Campbell/Still Pictures  
Printed by: PrintStore**

**Funding from Rio Tinto plc and  
British American Tobacco**

**© 2002 IBLF and BIO+10**

The Prince of Wales International Business Leaders Forum  
15-16 Cornwall Terrace, London NW1 4QP, UK  
Tel: +44 (0)20 7467 3600; Fax: +44 (0)20 7467 3610;  
E-mail: [info@iblf.org](mailto:info@iblf.org); Web-site: [www.iblf.org](http://www.iblf.org)

The Prince of Wales International Business Leaders Forum is a charity (No. 1024119) and company limited by guarantee (No. 2552695) whose registered office is in the UK at the above address. The Forum was founded in 1990 and operates internationally to promote socially responsible business practices that benefit business and society, and which help to achieve socially, economically and environmentally sustained development. The Forum works with more than 60 multinational companies, and is active in more than 50 emerging and transition economies.

All rights reserved. No part of the publication may be published without prior consent of the copyright holders. Any materials used for presentation or teaching purposes must give full acknowledgement to The Prince of Wales International Business Leaders Forum and BIO+10.

The opinions expressed in this essay are solely the authors and do not represent those of the publishing organisations or affiliates.

**BIO+10** is a partnership of business and biodiversity organisations working together to undertake an action research project to assess the real value of cross-sector partnerships for biodiversity.

This initiative is the result of collaboration between The Earthwatch Institute, Fauna & Flora International, IUCN-The World Conservation Union and two of IUCN's established corporate partners, British American Tobacco and Rio Tinto plc.

Assisted by The Prince of Wales International Business Leaders Forum, the project will analyse existing NGO:business partnerships for biodiversity with a view to sharing the findings widely and significantly enhancing future conservation outcomes.

Other business and biodiversity organisations are invited to become involved in BIO+10. To learn more, please email Frank Vorhies of the IUCN Business and Biodiversity Initiative at **[business@iucn.org](mailto:business@iucn.org)**

# Getting real

The challenges of sustaining biodiversity partnerships

## Table of contents

The starting premise

10 years on from Rio

Challenge 1: Selling biodiversity

Challenge 2: The 'business case' and beyond

Challenge 3: The NGO dilemma

Challenge 4: Are partnerships worth the effort?

Challenge 5: Weeding out bad partnerships

Challenge 6: Admitting mistakes

Challenge 7: Being efficient

Challenge 8: 'Small' is not beautiful enough

Challenge 9: 'Leadership' or 'followership'?

Challenge 10: Opening closed minds

Getting Real

Selected references

**The authors:**

**Ros Tennyson** has led the International Business Leaders Forum's cross-sector partnership work since 1992 working in more than 20 countries undergoing economic and / or political transition. She has published widely on a range of partnership issues. More recently she has developed partnership training programmes for the United Nations and The World Bank. She is currently a co-Director of the new post-graduate certificate in cross-sector partnerships – developed collaboratively by the Forum, the Copenhagen Centre and Cambridge University.

with

**Sasha Hurrell** who completed her degree in 'Social Justice' (including a dissertation on cross-sector partnerships) prior to joining the Forum as Coordinator of Capacity & Institution-building Programmes.

and

**Justin Sykes** who is the Forum's Web Manager/ Researcher. With a Masters in 'Environment and Development' from the London School of Economics, he has also worked with the UN, DFID and in Bosnia.

**The process:**

In anticipation of the World Summit for Sustainable Development in Johannesburg in August 2002, the Prince of Wales International Business Leaders Forum (IBLF) has been commissioned by BIO+10 to write an 'essay' on the challenges of biodiversity partnerships. Since BIO+10 is a new initiative this essay has been written in a very short space of time. It aims therefore to be provocative rather than exhaustive and to stimulate new activity and fruitful discussion rather than present a definitive or final point of view.

Invariably, the essay draws extensively on the IBLF's 12 years of cutting edge experience in this field, but there are two very important contributions to the process from the BIO+10 partners themselves. The first is material taken from an early discussion (Autumn 2001) on partnership lessons between a small group of organisations involved in biodiversity partnerships. The second contribution (July / August, 2002) is from responses to a questionnaire compiled by the authors asking respondents to consider:

- Key characteristics of effective partnerships
- Issues specific to biodiversity partnerships
- The importance of the impact of partnerships on the partner organisations themselves

The authors gratefully acknowledge the invaluable in-puts from Birdlife International, British American Tobacco, Earthwatch Institute; Fauna and Flora International, Pro-Natura and Rio Tinto plc. This has helped to ensure that the essay truly reflects the many challenges arising from biodiversity partnerships from the first-hand experience of those actually involved in them.

### **The starting premise**

Biodiversity is critically important to humanity, society and business. Since mankind is fundamentally a part of the whole biodiversity spectrum, the importance of biodiversity should be apparent to all, but it is not uncommon to find biodiversity issues tackled as something apart from mankind – to do with an entirely external concept of ‘nature’.

Biodiversity is “... *the variability of organisms and the ecological complexes of which they are part, including diversity within and between species and ecosystems.*” (1) Our survival as a species is, of course, intimately tied to the intricate web of natural resources and ecological components that comprise planet Earth. Life sustaining systems such as clean air, productive oceans, fresh waters, and fertile soils are all a function of healthy ecosystems that together sustain all species and populations.

In considering biodiversity, a balance also needs to be struck between people and planet. The livelihoods of millions of poor people depend on bio-diversity but the patterns and forms of natural resource extraction, production and consumption, which are encouraged by current development frameworks, create a situation where this dependency can hinder rather than enhance poor people’s livelihoods.

All this, added to the impact of a rapidly growing human population and the increasing demands for food, water, industrial growth as well as the inexorable pressure for continually rising living standards, account for the loss of species and the impoverishment of ecosystems. Since human prosperity as well as social and economic sustainability are all absolutely dependent upon conserving biodiversity, we do not need to ask *if* we need to sustain the world’s bio-diversity, but rather, *how* we should go about it.

Biodiversity cannot simply be a governmental or even an inter-governmental issue, but must be the shared responsibility of all human beings and all sectors of society including that major mobiliser of natural resources – and potential destroyer of the environment – the private sector. Biodiversity is so central to the continuance of life on the planet that only by working together and engaging the wide range of skills, capacities and resources of the different sectors (public, private and not-for-profit) can humanity have the best possible chance of heading off environmental catastrophe.

The Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) was one of the main international agreements of the 1992 Rio Summit – adopted by over 180 countries, though only ratified by 50. One of its main features being that, unlike other biodiversity agreements, it “*provides an integrative approach to biodiversity management. It is therefore attractive to business because it provides both a global policy platform and guidance on developing corporate biodiversity strategies and action plans*” (2).

The three priorities underlying the CBD approach involve equal attention

being given to: the conservation of biodiversity; the sustainable use of biological resources and the equitable sharing of biodiversity benefits.

It was at Rio in 1992 – where the business sector had a presence for the first time at such a significant international United Nations event – that cross-sector partnership was heralded as the key to building a sustainable development agenda.

Since 1992, ‘partnership-speak’ has entered our global language.

*“Partnerships in general may well serve core objectives that are directly relevant to their partner’s remits, because these are generated in an anthropocentric way - they reflect human aspirations and goals, where common ground may be readily identifiable. Biodiversity objectives may often be comparatively obscure. Biodiversity does not have a voice of its own.”*

Environmental NGO

*“Biodiversity is much harder to define than most development issues, it is therefore harder to pinpoint a direct benefit to a corporate partner, harder to say what constitutes a biodiversity activity, and harder to set the outcomes or goals. How do we know if we have achieved a benefit to biodiversity?”*

Corporate partner

*“Biodiversity is a worldwide issue, and so requires a global approach – international NGOs working strategically with international business”*

Environmental NGO

## **Ten years on from Rio**

Now, some ten years (much rhetoric and bio-degradation) later, we have arrived in Johannesburg at what has been described as *“the summit of all summits”* (3) called in order to review achievements since Rio and to focus the world’s attention once again on the importance of biodiversity, environmental protection and sustainability. Like others seeking to promote an integrated rather than fragmented agenda, Klaus Topfer, Head of UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme) describes the Johannesburg Summit as addressing the three major global issues with equal emphasis: *“poverty, social justice and environmental protection”* (4). We appear to have moved to a more general acceptance that these three issues are inseparable.

It is a good moment to take stock – to consider whether the partnership approach defined and promoted at Rio has been effective. This essay offers a small contribution to the debate by exploring what the partnership realities have been for at least some of those who have taken to heart the biodiversity partnership message and tried to implement it.

### **Challenge 1: Selling biodiversity**

Sustainable development partnerships are of many types and address many different issues. Whilst there are several features common to all partnerships, biodiversity partnerships do present some unique challenges as evidenced by those involved in creating them.

So the first challenge for those involved in biodiversity partnerships is to find convincing ways of bringing the issue itself to the forefront of both policy and practice in all sectors and with the general public. Raising awareness of what biodiversity is and why it matters. Providing the ‘voice’ that biodiversity cannot provide for itself.

### **Challenge 2: The ‘business case’ and beyond**

Since 1992, the ‘business case’ – arguing that there are sound *business* reasons for corporate involvement in biodiversity – have been articulated as follows (5):

- Securing a license to operate
- Attracting socially responsible investors

- Appealing to ethical customers / consumers
- Building quality stakeholder relationships
- Improving employee engagement and productivity
- Strengthening supply chain standards
- Reducing ecological liabilities and ensuring sustainable growth

Undoubtedly the increasing clarity of a 'business case' approach has strengthened the appeal of sustainable development partnerships to at least some of those shareholders and managers for whom making large returns on investment or meeting production targets are paramount considerations.

But things move on. Maybe the 'business case' isn't enough.

There are those in key positions in the corporate sector who are not constrained by the need for a 'business case' to justify biodiversity-friendly management decisions. There are those who actively seek to integrate their own personal values into their work place and to promote with vision and passion corporate activity that will help to conserve rather than destroy the planet. People in the corporate world also have children and grandchildren.

Corporations can become leaders in conserving the environment – in spite of conflicting pressures from shareholders, governments or consumers – when enough key individuals within the company see clearly that it is the right thing to do.

*“There are situations where business leaders must choose to incur additional costs with no immediate pay-back or to forgo opportunities, because it is the right thing to do based on their company’s values, principles or policies. The central challenge is to determine what the ‘right thing’ means in practice, and what are the appropriate roles, responsibilities and boundaries for different types of company, industrial sector, location and situation” (6)*

A second challenge, therefore, is to present the business case persuasively and then go beyond it – seeking out those who will pioneer and champion corporate engagement in biodiversity with vigour and commitment equal to their NGO counterparts.

In a recent article in The Guardian newspaper, Richard Holme (chair of the International Chambers of Commerce Environment Commission and vice-chair of Business Action for Sustainable Development) writes:

*“More and more businesses are declaring their values, publicising their policies and setting out their standards. That is as it should be. The modern world rightly requires power to be accountable - we live in a “show me”, not a “tell me”, world - and large companies are powerful bodies.*

*There is an unanswerable case for proper reporting on economic, social and environmental performance - what is sometimes called in shorthand the “triple bottom line”. But the main utility of accountability and reporting is to improve performance. It is not to provide a conveyor belt of juicy issues for campaigning NGOs, or to feed the blame culture of the media.” (7)*

### Challenge 3: The NGO dilemma

Let's turn to NGOs – often characterised as 'the good guys' – and what they have to learn / gain from becoming partners. NGOs face considerable organisational and sectoral challenges that partnerships with business may help to address. Issues to do with internal management, collaboration with other NGOs with which they may be in competition for funds and dealing with questions of scale are all things that business deal with daily and from which NGOs can learn.

*"Partnership is different from other forms of collaboration as it gives NGOs the chance to influence the company from within – unlike sponsorship. Partnership also uses the expertise and resources of both organisations, and in most cases involves a long-term commitment"*  
Environmental NGO

*"Partnerships really involve compromise and an ability to see common agendas and shared aspirations, so that value is added to all partners separately and together. Partnerships involve a greater degree of trust and commitment than other forms of collaboration, since developing and managing a partnership properly requires a big input in terms of time and effort."*  
Corporate partner

*"The partnership's objectives are not just about short and mid term project results but are also about influence and cultural change within the partner organisations. That is the ideal to work towards, at least, and should always inform the partnership"*. Environmental NGO

But a specific challenge is the choice all NGOs face as to whether they choose to reside inside or outside partnerships with the corporate sector.

Within the field of biodiversity we have essentially two types of NGO:

On the one hand we have the campaigning NGOs who rightly provide a voice for the voiceless by seeking out 'juicy issues' with which to lambast corporations and governments. Who can deny that the activities of Greenpeace have focused the attention of the world on some key issues of environmental importance? Such highly visible activities have pushed the biodiversity agenda forward. But they have also led to entrenchment by corporations, governments and international agencies. The risk is that such NGO activity perpetuates a conflict model of engagement and encourages a vested interest in denying any form of 'progress' within those organisations they seek to vilify.

On the other hand there are those NGOs equally committed to the pursuit of environmental and social causes who choose the path of engagement with governments and corporations in the belief that this is the best way to have influence on public policy and private sector work practices. The risk for them is that they are seen as 'consorting with the enemy' and thereby to have compromised their charitable mandate and to have 'lost the moral high ground'.

Is there a permanent impasse between these two different stances?

Can NGOs engage creatively with corporations and / or governments without compromising their integrity? Can they develop close working relationships and still feel free to challenge and criticise where appropriate? Is it possible to hold out for ambitious biodiversity targets in a relationship bound by the need for consensus and common objectives?

It is to a large extent a question of 'power'. Economic and political power has so often been allowed to outweigh moral authority or issues of equity. A collaborative approach to biodiversity needs to address this urgently – to work at achieving a genuine balance of power between the different players in a partnership – otherwise the partnership will fail. Indeed, it will not be a partnership at all.

This was a point recently raised by NGOs at a pre-Summit Partnership Consultation called by the IUCN in New York in July 2002:

*“Power relationships between partners was a matter of concern, and NGOs stressed that equity stakes in partnerships ought not to be merely a matter of finance. Human capacity and in-kind contributions must also be recognized, and measured, as equally meaningful contributions to partnerships” (8)*

#### **Challenge 4: Are partnerships worth the effort?**

Is a partnership approach the best way to promote biodiversity? What was wrong with old-fashioned sponsorship or simple philanthropic donations? Some regret the loss of the one-way financial transaction and the comparative freedom involved in operating as a single organisation getting on with the job.

In delivering single-focus projects on a comparatively small scale non-partnership approaches may be unnecessarily cumbersome. All new partnerships should be encouraged to assess whether there are better / quicker ways of delivering specific outputs. Partnership approaches are only a good thing if they are demonstrably better than other solutions.

These are some of the key factors that would indicate the appropriateness of a partnership rather than sponsorship:

<b>Key factor</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Building an iterative approach	A programme of work that grows and changes in continuous and close consultation with stakeholders rather than pre-conceived and centrally controlled
Multi-level focus	Activities that involve strategic and operational aspects in a range of locations where different skills / competencies can be drawn upon as needed
Action research and learning strategy	Initiatives that are designed to be exploratory and to draw lessons for wider application and will therefore benefit from diverse perspectives
Seeking to influence policy	Policy makers will be more convinced by an approach from a range of organisations representing different interests
Seeking to influence organisational behaviour	Organisations get stuck in their own operational styles – working with others using completely different working methods can contribute to radical re-thinks and useful change
Needing a wide resource base	Many initiatives need technical assistance, volunteers, equipment as much (often more) than cash
Aiming at significant scale-up	The greatest biodiversity project may do little if it remains too small scale – communicating success and building strategies for scaling up are likely to be more effective working in collaboration with other agencies and networks

*“Effective partnerships have the following characteristics: clearly defined roles for each partner; good quality partnership manager within the corporate partner; an established mechanism through which partners can genuinely influence biodiversity policy, strategy and implementation; effective but non-bureaucratic governance structures to ensure (and demonstrate ) independence of NGOs as well carefully chosen partners.”*  
Environmental NGO

*“Partnerships that work well are: flexible, creative, dynamic, fun, visionary and open to change. They involve: high levels of trust and commitment, solid management frameworks, constant feedback and reviews, quick response times, good personal chemistry, concrete outcomes, being embedded in each partner’s own institutions, concrete objectives, brand similarities and structural similarities”*  
Corporate partner

## Challenge 5: Weeding out bad partnerships

Partnership may be the global buzz-word of the 21st Century but there are not yet many examples of partnerships that have been established long-term enough to demonstrate convincingly that they do actually achieve what they hope to achieve - or, in some cases, what they claim to have achieved.

One could argue that many so-called partnerships are little more than sponsorship or other funding mechanisms in another guise.

Too many partnerships have started with a bang and ended with a whimper.

The BIO+10 partners have strong views about what makes for a good partnership (see quotes to the left and below)

*“Partnerships that work well can be either short or longer term initiatives but they all need to have well defined objectives established at the outset, clearly defined roles for different stakeholders and effective project planning and management.”*  
Environmental NGO

Perhaps there is enough experience now to know in advance what is unlikely to work - what the characteristics are of *bad* partnerships. We venture to put forward a check-list on the characteristics of bad partnerships based on our conversations with disillusioned ex-partners...

Bad characteristic	Notes
Culture of ‘dumping’	Everyone leaves everything to everyone else
Too much talking	All talk and no action or outputs
Too ‘safe’	Risk-averse – partnership seen as a way of mitigating risk rather than taking and sharing risks
Peripheral	Not impacting partner organisations or public policy
Too dependent on one individual	Failure to develop proper sharing of responsibility and activities. Risk of partnership breaking down when key people move on or withdraw
Unresolved conflicts of interest	Partners not open and honest about their own or their organisation’s conflicts of interest
No / poor governance and accountability structures	Partners may be accountable to each other but how is proper governance exercised over the partnership as a whole?
Introspective	Individuals perpetuating the partnership for its own sake rather than as a means to an end

## Challenge 6: Admitting mistakes

No partnership is perfect. To pretend everything in the partnership garden is lovely is to do a disservice to all those involved and can mislead others seeking confirmation that partnerships work. Yet we live in a culture of 'hype' and 'quick fix' stories and there is always pressure to prove 'success'. A healthy partnership is one where creative critique – the willingness to offer comment and challenge out of a commitment to learning and improving – is actively encouraged. A healthy partnership (like a healthy organisation) is invariably a 'learning' partnership.

After 3 years of working together a small group of NGOs in discussion with their corporate partner spent a day reviewing the lessons of their collaborative ventures. In other words building on their learning from the experience of working together they were able to identify the following shared priorities and to use them as the basis of the next stage of their partnership developments (9):

### **Internal\* achievements of our partnership to date**

- Overcoming cultural differences
- Finding a commonality of aims
- Achieving mutual benefit
- Gaining stakeholder recognition and acceptance
- Building institutional confidence
- Improving strategic understanding
- Building collective strategic insight

### **What we now see as the key tasks to sustain our partnership**

- Institutionalising
- Achieving brand 'parity'
- Getting further commitment of resources
- Agreeing performance measures
- Seeking 'added-value' opportunities
- Fast-decision making procedures
- Understanding knowledge gains and transfers

\* ie benefits to the various partner organisations as opposed to biodiversity achievements resulting from their partnership activities

## Challenge 7: Being efficient

*“The inaugural phase was characterised by high levels of enthusiasm and optimism and an expanding scope of vision in terms of what the partnership could potentially deliver. It is now being followed by a more realistic phase characterised by differentiating between productive and unproductive partnership contexts; developing appropriate actions to suit different circumstances and, importantly, addressing the more difficult constraints emerging within organisational structures and policies.”*

Environmental NGO

Phase	Notes
1. Pre-partnership	Identification of partners and analysis of options
2. Pilot phase	An initial activity that will ‘test’ the partnership
3. Engagement	Building a working relationship and tackling points of conflict or difficulty in systematic ways
4. Agreement	Objective setting Modus operandi Roles and responsibilities Deliverables Annual work plan Project outputs Project outcomes
5. Outcomes for partners	Sharing responsibility for ensuring that different partners needs are met through the partnership (at both operational and strategic levels)
6. Decision-making	Building appropriate procedures that are neither too cumbersome nor too ad hoc
7. Governance	Including grievance and dispute resolution procedures
8. Reviews	Regular opportunities for reflecting on progress at both strategic and operational levels
9. Familiarisation	Of partnership within partner organisations at both HQ and operational levels and with the stakeholder groups of all partners

In discussion a group of environmental NGOs and their corporate partner identified 9 ‘phases’ in the development of their partnership (10)

Other partnerships will analyse their ‘process’ differently – what is important is that such analysis takes place, that the partnership can build systematically on experience and can be formed in such a way that it does not rely too heavily on one or two individuals but has an independent life of its own that will ensure continuity.

## Challenge 8: “Small” is not beautiful enough

In his seminal work *Small is beautiful* E.F. Schumacher made a powerful case for getting on with things at small and local levels. Undoubtedly his thinking (based, he says, on his understanding of Buddhist economics) touched a chord for many offering, as it did, ‘*a study of economics as if people mattered*’.

*“The impact of partnerships on an organisation’s activities and development matters because corporations contribute (and / or are perceived to contribute) to environmental degradation, social injustice and economic inequalities. We can have an impact on genuinely redressing this with the local people and in educating the corporations themselves”* Environmental NGO

*“The greatest impact after three years has been to improve our understanding of biodiversity issues... it has also increased our confidence about dealing across sectors particularly with NGOs. This has allowed us access to the debate at the highest levels and to put us in the position of being a perceived leader in our commercial sector.”* Corporate partner

*“ Across the partnership, both NGOs and businesses are beginning to recognise the potential that such a relationship can deliver in both the short and longer term. Early and localised benefits in the form of employee enthusiasm, community involvement can set the scene for future, more substantial project work.”* Environmental NGO

Acting at local and small-scale levels is a crucial way of involving everyone – encouraging positive activity towards the conservation and promotion of biodiversity is very important and all local effort should be applauded and supported.

But the situation becomes daily more critical – today’s news bulletin has featured floods throughout central Europe, drought in southern Africa, a life-threatening cloud of air pollution across Asia – and too many people and institutions continue to ignore the urgency of the situation.

Biodiversity partnerships will be virtually pointless unless they can achieve significant scale. To be effective and to be sustainable, biodiversity partnerships need to have significant impact on:

- the environment
- the partner organisations
- current and future communities
- policy and practice of governments
- others who might be able to make a difference

Each one of these ‘target audiences’ is important – each needs a different strategy. Above all, partnerships need to set quite specific timetables and targets for impact and be prepared to assess achievement in relation to *scale* not just in relation to *quality*.

Some eight years ago, a vehicle manufacturer was asked whether the number of trees planted through his company’s community relations programme in rural India was on a scale that would compensate for the amount of oxygen consumed by the vehicles the company sold annually. His look of astonishment (and irritation) made it clear that at that time he had not seen these two issues as in any way connected. But the connection is obvious and these kinds of comparisons will become the norm as requirements to measure sustainability become more precise and more penetrating.

## Challenge 9: ‘Leadership’ or ‘followership’?

It is something of a cliché to talk about ‘leadership’ – a word almost as abused as ‘partnership’ in the early days of the 21st Century! Indeed one could argue that ‘leadership’ in the conventional sense of one individual at the forefront of change is inappropriate for a paradigm which so centrally depends on equity between many different players, consensus decision-

making procedures and collaboration in project delivery.

For biodiversity partnerships this may be especially true – since biodiversity is essentially a series of highly integrated and inter-dependent systems, biodiversity partnerships have a particular reason to role model a non-hierarchical way of operating.

Perhaps it is beholden upon us to develop a working concept of ‘followership’ as an alternative. Being a good follower may seem less glamorous but it may be more suitable to the partnership paradigm because ‘followers’ are likely to be personally modest, better listeners, more inclusive and more open to the views of others. Certainly the skills involved in building, developing and sustaining partnerships are closer to those of a coordinator or a facilitator than a leader in the traditional sense. In any case, leaders can be notoriously bad at following through. All too often they get bored just at the point that the partnership is moving from the inaugural to the implementation phase. And it is increasingly clear that partnership-building is a very slow process – not appealing to the impatient.

Insistence, persistence and consistence (and sometimes diplomatic resistance!) are all vital requirements for those involved in maintaining partnerships over time. All these are qualities that are critical to effective partnership ‘brokering’: *“Our considered view is that partnership brokers epitomise a new style of leadership, operating as catalysts of change by ‘guiding’ rather than ‘directing’... Essentially they are servants of a task”* (11)

People who are good at ‘doing partnership’ may indeed be a new breed often hidden within organisations in different guises and at different levels. We need to seek them out and learn to recognise their competencies and contribution in order to be able to offer them proper support and acknowledgement. Upon such individuals most – if not all – sustainable development partnerships are likely to depend for their survival and growth.

### **Challenge 10: Opening closed minds**

Above all, if they are to tackle things from a dynamic and fresh perspective, sustainable development partnerships need to be prepared to: ‘think outside the box’; take some risks and come up with imaginative, new solutions to old problems. Only this way will they excite genuine interest and break through the cynicism so pervasive in our modern over-hyped world.

Individuals who are opening up to alternative ways of doing things get their inspiration from many different sources. These include: turning to the new generation of ‘radical’ thinkers; in-depth study of related issues and/or seeing the arts as a source of new insights.

Radical thinkers – or ‘gurus’ of alternative perspectives – are not a new phenomenon. Many have subsequently become mainstreamed. And if we

want to be 'ahead of the game' we would do well to seek out those who are currently espousing original, eccentric and even extreme points of view. Gary Hammel of Harvard University Business School, for example, explores the underlying principles of radical innovation and identifies the key criteria for companies (in our view, equally applicable to non-corporate organisations) that are "*activist-friendly and revolution-ready*" (12)

To better understand the vital importance of bio-diversity we can choose to study it – it is never too late to educate ourselves in zoology, botany, climatology and other related sciences that will deepen our knowledge and our understanding of natural phenomena. Those who were there will never forget the impact on a group of 40 senior oil executives of the lecture from a professor of astronomy at the University of Cambridge: stunned silence, followed by thunderous applause, followed by enthusiastic questions – a truly transformational experience for all.

Partnerships can also be inspired by the arts – whether music, poetry, literature, painting or sculpture. Using arts experiences to develop our powers of imagination, intuition and creativity (either as individuals or in groups) can release hidden potential and move us from the entirely mechanistic to the more metaphysical.

In any event, inspiration can come from many places. If we close our minds we also close doors. What matters is that we give ourselves the opportunity to be seen beyond our immediate preoccupations and to allow ourselves to be inspired. As Nigerian author, Ben Okri, says

*"There are many ways to die, and none of them have to do with extinction. A lot of them have to do with living. Living many lies. Living without asking questions. Living in the cave of your own prejudices"* (13)

## **Getting real**

BIO+10 is a new initiative created by a number of environmental NGOs and their corporate partners to test biodiversity partnerships in a coherent and systematic way. This is in the form of a three-year action research programme with a focus on exploring the keys to sustaining partnerships.

Our working hypothesis is that successful long-term partnerships depend on four factors:

- Fully engaging partner organisations (not just a handful of individuals)
- Properly assessing the two-way benefits of the partnership from each partner's perspective
- Being a genuine 'learning' partnership (including being candid with each other, sharing lessons and being prepared to learn from mistakes)

- Having strategic impact (small successes are not enough).

The research will explore all these factors (and if more emerge, then those too) and will develop practical guidelines that can be shared with the many, many other organisations that have the potential to become involved in partnerships for biodiversity.

We have focussed here on biodiversity partnerships but it is clear that biodiversity is only one entry point out of many. We anticipate that many of our findings during the Bio+10 project will be applicable to all partnerships for sustainability.

For the partnership movement to be effective: to reach a proper level of scale and impact we all need to 'get real' – to work out what works, be honest about what doesn't and make sure that we take every opportunity to face challenges with courage and confidence. Our planet depends on it.

## Notes:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| (1) The Convention on Biological Diversity, (1992).   | (8) Report on a Partnership Consultation conducted by the IUCN, New York (19th July 2002)  |
| (2) Adapted from: The Convention on Biological Diversity, (1992). As above  | (9) Taken from notes of a 'brainstorm' between a small group of environmental NGOs and their corporate partner (Autumn 2001)             |
| (3) Charles Secrett, Director of Friends of the Earth, speaking on BBC Radio 4 (12th August 2002)   | (10) Ibid  |
| (4) Klaus Topfer, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), speaking on BBC Radio 4 (12th August 2002)   | (11) Tennyson, Ros and Wilde, Luke, <i>The Guiding Hand: Brokering Partnerships for Sustainable Development</i> , UN Publications (2000) |
| (5) Adapted from: <i>Business and Biodiversity: A Handbook for Corporate Action</i> due for publication by IUCN, (Autumn 2002)  | (12) Hamel, Gary, <i>Leading the Revolution</i> , Harvard Business School Press (2000)   |
| (6) <i>Corporate social responsibility - Passing fad or fundamental to a more sustainable future?</i> , Jane Nelson, Sustainable Development International Magazine, World Summit Special Edition (August 2002) | (13) Okri, Ben, <i>A way of Being Free</i> , Phoenix Publications (1997)   |
| (7) Extract from: <i>Giants tread carefully: Big business answers back</i> , Richard Holme, The Guardian, (Wednesday August 7, 2002)  |  |

## Selected references

### Publications

- Business Partners for Development (2002) *Putting Partnering to Work*, Business Partners for Development, www.bpdweb.org
- Dudok van Heel, O and Elkington, J (2001) *Buried Treasure: Uncovering the Business Case for Corporate Sustainability*, SustainAbility.
- Edwards, M (2000) *NGO Rights and Responsibilities: a New Deal or Global Governance*, UK, The Foreign Policy Centre
- Eisler, Riane (2002) *The Power of Partnership*, New World Library
- Elkington, J (1997) *Cannibals with Forks: the Triple Bottom Line of the 21st Century Business*, Capstone.
- Hamel, G (2000) *Leading the Revolution*, Harvard Business School Press
- Hammati, (2001) *Multi-stakeholder Processes for Governance and Sustainability*, Earthscan Publications Ltd
- Handy, C (1995) *The Empty Raincoat: Making Sense of the Future*, Arrow Books Ltd
- Hampden-Turner, C and Fons, T (2000) *Building Cross-Cultural Competence – How to Create Wealth From Conflicting Values*, John Wiley & Sons Ltd
- Hesselink, F, Wals, A and Van Kempen, P (2000) *International Debate on Education for Sustainable Development*, Island Press.
- Mittelman, J (2000) *The Globalisation Syndrome*, Princeton University Press Pirot, J, Meynell, P and Elder, D (editors)
- (2000) *Ecosystem Management: Lessons from Around the World: A guide for development and conservation practitioners*, Island Press.
- Russell, P (1998) *The Global Brain Awakes: Our Next Evolutionary Leap*, Element Books.
- Sachs, W (1999) *Planet Dialectics: explorations in environment and development*, New Internationalist
- Ringwood, K et al. (1997) *Business and Biodiversity, A Guide to the Private Sector*, The World Conservation Union.
- Tennyson, R (1998) *Managing Partnerships – Tools for Mobilising the Public Sector, Business and Civil Society as Partners in Development*, The Prince of Wales International Business Leaders Forum
- Tennyson, R and Wilde, L (2000) *The Guiding Hand – Brokering Partnerships for Sustainable Development*, The United Nations
- Utting, P (2000) *Business Responsibility for Sustainable development (Occasional Paper 2)*, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development
- Van der Linde, A and Danksin, M (eds) (1998) *Enhancing Sustainability: Resources for Our Future*, Island Press

## Biodiversity organisations and initiatives

Birdlife <a href="http://www.birdlife.net/">http://www.birdlife.net/</a>	Online Bibliography on the Impacts of Climate Change on Flora and Fauna <a href="http://www.pacinst.org/wildlife.html">http://www.pacinst.org/wildlife.html</a>
British American Tobacco Biodiversity Partnership <a href="http://www.batbiodiversity.org">http://www.batbiodiversity.org</a>	Partnership Brokers Forum <a href="http://www.partnershipbrokers.net">http://www.partnershipbrokers.net</a>
Business Partners for Development <a href="http://www.bpdweb.org">http://www.bpdweb.org</a>	Pro-Natura <a href="http://www.pronatura.ch">http://www.pronatura.ch</a>
Conservation International. <a href="http://www.conservation.org/">http://www.conservation.org/</a>	Rio Tinto <a href="http://www.riotinto.com/community/mining/default.asp">http://www.riotinto.com/community/mining/default.asp</a>
Defenders of Wildlife <a href="http://www.defenders.org/">http://www.defenders.org/</a>	SustainableBusiness.com <a href="http://www.sustainablebusiness.com/">http://www.sustainablebusiness.com/</a>
Earth Council links to the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Centre (ITP-Centre) <a href="http://www.itpcentre.org/">http://www.itpcentre.org/</a>	The Biodiversity Economics Library <a href="http://www.biodiversityeconomics.org">http://www.biodiversityeconomics.org</a>
Earthwatch Institute <a href="http://www.earthwatch.org">http://www.earthwatch.org</a>	The Nature Conservancy. <a href="http://nature.org/">http://nature.org/</a>
Energy and Biodiversity Initiative <a href="http://www.celb.org/ebi.html">http://www.celb.org/ebi.html</a>	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change <a href="http://unfccc.int/">http://unfccc.int/</a>
FAO Forestry UN <a href="http://www.fao.org/forestry">http://www.fao.org/forestry</a>	University of Cambridge: Post-graduate Certificate in Cross-Sector Partnership <a href="http://www.cpi.cam.ac.uk/pccp/">http://www.cpi.cam.ac.uk/pccp/</a>
Fauna and Flora International Global Business Partnership <a href="http://www.fauna-flora.org/our_partners/our_main_corporate_frame.htm">http://www.fauna-flora.org/our_partners/our_main_corporate_frame.htm</a>	World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) <a href="http://www.wbcd.ch/">http://www.wbcd.ch/</a>
Forest Stewardship Council <a href="http://www.fscoax.org">http://www.fscoax.org</a>	World Commission on Protected Areas (IUCN) <a href="http://wcpa.iucn.org/">http://wcpa.iucn.org/</a>
Friends of the Earth <a href="http://www.foei.org/">http://www.foei.org/</a>	World Conservation Monitoring Centre <a href="http://www.wcmc.org.uk/">http://www.wcmc.org.uk/</a>
Future Forests <a href="http://www.futureforests.com">http://www.futureforests.com</a>	World Resources Institute. <a href="http://www.wri.org">http://www.wri.org</a>
Global Mining Initiative <a href="http://www.globalmining.com">http://www.globalmining.com</a>	World Wildlife Fund. <a href="http://www.worldwildlife.org">http://www.worldwildlife.org</a>
Greenpeace International. <a href="http://www.greenpeace.org/">http://www.greenpeace.org/</a>	
Investing in Nature <a href="http://www.investinginnature.org/">http://www.investinginnature.org/</a>	
IUCN Commission on Ecosystem Management <a href="http://www.iucn.org/themes/cem/">http://www.iucn.org/themes/cem/</a>	
Marine Stewardship Council <a href="http://www.msc.org">http://www.msc.org</a>	

