Chapter 4

Planning for CWR Conservation and Partnership Building

Biodiversity managers often underestimate the commitment, human resources and time necessary to develop trusting relationships that lead to collaboration between communities, other government agencies, businesses and conservationists (Hesselink et al, 2007).

Aims and purpose

The field of CWR *in situ* conservation, like other areas in biodiversity conservation, is susceptible to limited collaboration and subsequent, ineffective planning and implementation. Some reasons for this have already been highlighted and discussed in Chapters 1 and 3, and are also mentioned elsewhere in this manual. Having to operate in a time-bound project context constitutes one major challenge, while the lack of a traditional culture of collaboration between the agriculture, forestry and conservation sectors represents another. Addressing this existing disconnect and bridging such gaps is surely one of the foremost challenges limiting the success of CWR *in situ* conservation. This part aims to provide the reader with information and guidance for consideration when planning partnerships or collaborations to ensure the effective coordination and implementation of the CWR *in situ* conservation planning process and to highlight why such collaborations are important.

Introduction

Conservation does not just happen; it is the result of a planning process that includes a series of initiatives and policy decisions operating within a particular context – a strategic process of setting priorities and goals. The process may be organized at a national, regional or local level and financed in a wide variety of

Most CWR projects will contain a variety of activities and components, not all of them directly relevant to actual physical, on-the-ground conservation activities. Given project staff and partner tendencies to focus on the often easier tasks of data collection, documentation and public awareness, it is critical that the overall aims and goals of *in situ* conservation are clearly articulated. The most serious shortfall of a project can be the failure to appreciate, until late in the planning process, the importance of the conservation components or the sequence in which they need to be carried out and what *in situ* conservation of target species (as opposed to area conservation) entails. To prevent this, it may be advisable to establish a dedicated conservation committee at an early stage. Certainly, a global or regional project should have a technical advisory committee established early in the process to clarify these issues and a conservation inception workshop held to determine a common understanding of the technical steps involved in the *in situ* process.

Adapted from the UNEP/GEF CWR Project Technical Advisory Committee.

ways. It will involve a number of different agencies and will affect many stakeholders who may or may not be directly involved or consulted. The process must address an equally diverse range of activities – developing national action plans, conservation prioritization, data collection, adapting and developing management plans, community participation, education and public awareness – spanning the natural and social sciences skills spectrum (see Chapter 15). It operates within a timescale and requires considerable financial and human resources. Poor planning and consideration of the *in situ* conservation process and context can lead to a waste of valuable resources, a haphazard approach to the activities involved and a failure to achieve the expected conservation goals.

Planning will require partnership among a diverse range of actors, which may include local and national government agencies, national and international non-governmental organizations, academia, donor organizations, the private sector and local and indigenous communities (the topic of local and indigenous communities is dealt with in detail in Chapter 5 and highlighted in Figure 4.1). It is advisable that due attention is paid to the task of partnership building between these stakeholders at the outset (see the section below, 'planning for partnership'). Each discrete group will bring potential benefits to the partnership, but they will also come with their own interests, perspectives and expectations. It is the task of the conservation manager and planner to harness these divergent views for the greater good of the partnership and CWR conservation. This is a skill that few are adequately prepared for, and although often discussed in biodiversity and development circles, scant attention is given to mobilizing effective partnerships or providing the capacity building necessary to achieve this. Despite the complexity and challenges, effective planning and partnerships can lay the foundation for successful CWR *in situ* conservation by harnessing the enthusiasm, skills and resources of those working in this area, building on their strong interest in protecting this valuable global resource.

Figure 4.1 *When establishing partnerships, it is important to enter into consultation and dialogue with indigenous and local communities at an early stage. This is the main topic of Chapter 5*

Source: Danny Hunter

Context for planning – requirements of sponsoring agency (national or international) and timescales

There is a strong case to be made for improved evaluation and learning by donor agencies involved in CWR *in situ* conservation. While most initiatives have been project-driven, there has been little attempt at any real organizational learning arising from this, other than the usual project evaluation exercises. To date, no effort has been made to undertake a strategic meta-type evaluation of multiple, related projects (even in cases where there is a common donor). We now have examples of national, regional and international projects, and there is much to be shared within and between agencies. Such analysis would generate key lessons learned and improved good practices that would influence future project interventions that are more tailored towards the long-term nature of conservation, such as more use of south-to-south capacity development.

Currently, most CWR *in situ* conservation projects have been sponsored by grants from agencies such as the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and with governmental approval and some degree of financial or in-kind support. They fall within traditional project implementation and funding cycles which introduce challenges for long-term conservation planning. As well as having a limited timescale, these projects usually have a specific geographic focus and often

involve working at particular locations. In addition, countries may participate as part of a regional or global initiative, which adds another level of complexity to the process. By their nature, these grants must follow the detailed goals, requirements and restrictions of the sponsoring agency(ies) and are strictly monitored with onerous reporting requirements which can compromise conservation actions. In addition to GEF, the European Union and FAO have also provided support for CWR conservation projects in the past, and international NGOs such as the World Wide Fund for Nature also support CWR-related activities, although to a lesser extent. Unfortunately, there are few other agencies that actively support CWR conservation. In the case of GEF-supported projects, other institutions, in addition to the GEF, include the implementing agency (which may be UNEP, UNDP, FAO or the World Bank), the national government(s) and their relevant ministries and agencies, the executing agencies (in the case of the UNEP/GEF CWR Project, Bioversity International). Global and regional GEF projects also offer opportunities to collaborate with international partners, which, in the case of the UNEP/GEF CWR Project, include FAO, IUCN, BGCI and UNEP-WCMC. Some form of an international steering committee involving these various actors is required to provide guidance and oversight to activities that should be described in detail in the project's terms of reference.

Collaborating with international partners provides a much needed opportunity to attract technical expertise to a project as well as the possibility of co-financing, a compulsory requirement for GEF projects. When looking for possible international partners, it is critical to clearly define where and how their involvement will be required and to determine the most appropriate agency for the task. If co-financing is a requirement, you need to ensure the agency is committed to meeting its contribution.

A major constraint for any CWR *in situ* conservation project is the timescale. By its nature, CWR *in situ* conservation is a long-term approach: not only does it require considerable time for project preparation, but its success (or failure) may not be evident for 5–10 years, or even longer, after the initiation of activities. Indeed, as noted in Chapter 10, a conservation management or recovery plan may take many years to achieve and have short-term, medium-term and long-term goals of 30 years or more. Likewise, monitoring the success of CWR *in situ* interventions may be open-ended. On the other hand, funding for such activities, if obtained through grants, tends to be time-bound, limited to 3 to 5 years and usually without the possibility of renewal. This is why it is important to clearly convey the long-term nature of the project when preparing a CWR *in situ* project proposal for sponsors. It is also the reason why, ultimately, the responsibility for *in situ* conservation of CWR should be assumed by the state or by an international agreement. Further, it is critical that some form of overarching CWR national action plan or strategy is put in place, if this is not already the case (see Chapter 6).

Obviously, donor agencies such as the GEF are not in a position to provide long-term funding to specific conservation projects. However, until new sustainable funding mechanisms, as proposed in Chapter 3, are identified, this is the reality and the situation needs to be dealt with as effectively as possible. Typically,

donor agencies look upon projects as short-term interventions, which will demonstrate localized impacts and in which partners, such as national governments and NGOs, will find value and seek to scale up and sustain. While challenging and rather idealistic, partnerships established for conservation planning can play a unique role in this situation. A partnership can help accurately identify financial needs and explore avenues that may sustain long-term conservation activities after the donor funding ends. This would include identifying funding gaps, sources and opportunities, as well as developing strategies to address these. Clearly, having an effective partnership in place, even in a project context, can assist with long-term planning and issues of sustainability surrounding CWR *in situ* conservation actions. This is more likely if the aforementioned national CWR action plan is in place.

Despite their different contexts, biodiversity frameworks and government structures, the CWR Project countries have formed an effective working partnership and have acquired unique experience in one of the most difficult areas of agrobiodiversity conservation. The attention of the GEF should be drawn to this and sympathetic consideration given to any proposals made for continuing this work into the future so that the effectiveness of the approaches developed in the project can be fully tested and applied by other countries.

Source: UNEP/GEF CWR Project Technical Advisory Committee.

Figure 4.2 *Beatriz Zapata Ferrufino (Bolivia) explaining CWR plans. National project coordinators and focal points have a large responsibility for consulting widely and explaining the project or programme to stakeholders*

Source: Bioversity International

Implications for national planning

A key challenge working in a project- or donor-driven context, with a focus on disbursement of funds and achievement of milestones and outputs, is the difficulty this presents in terms of the long-term nature of CWR *in situ* conservation, the need for organizational capacity development and for mainstreaming CWR conservation into relevant national programmes and strategies.

The constraints and challenges described for *in situ* conservation require a strategic, comprehensive and inclusive planning process. Adequate planning brings many benefits to enhancing CWR conservation (see Box 4.1).

A lead agency or organization with a mandate and capacity to plan and coordinate CWR *in situ* conservation activities will need to be identified. It is also likely that a national focal point for CWR *in situ* conservation will need to be identified within this agency. It will be the task of the mandate agency and the national focal point to facilitate bringing together relevant stakeholders and putting in place an appropriate process to undertake the planning and implementation of the range of activities necessary for successful CWR *in situ* conservation (see Figure 4.2). The national focal point will be responsible for articulating the objectives, goals and resources of the project and for ensuring that relevant stakeholders have a clear understanding of this information.

National focal points will be required to spend significant amounts of time consulting widely and publicizing a project or programme. This will include private and public meetings to describe the project and its goals and objectives, the type of partners sought, how to get involved, roles, responsibilities and obligations, and contacts for further information. This is more difficult than it may seem and it is important to not raise expectations unrealistically.

Given the level of complexity and multi-stakeholder nature of the task, it may be necessary to establish a national steering committee (see Box 4.2), which will have the overall responsibility for national planning and decision-making. The committee should have membership from as many relevant stakeholder groups as possible and detailed terms of reference should be provided. This may require formal or informal agreements, as outlined below, depending on the national context. It must be stressed that there will be pressure placed on national focal

Box 4.1 The benefits of planning

- decision-making is based on a clear understanding among all relevant stakeholders of the project, its goals and objectives and the resources available;
- roles and responsibilities are assigned and agreed;
- improved use of financial, staff and organizational resources;
- increased transparency and accountability;
- improved communication;
- being better placed to take advantage of opportunities;
- enhanced commitment and ownership.

Box 4.2 Steering the process

Given the complexity of CWR *in situ* conservation and the wide range of relevant institutional interests, it will be important to have a national coordinating mechanism or a national steering committee to oversee the planning and implementation process. In Bolivia, prior to the implementation of the UNEP-GEF CWR Project, a national steering committee with the role of guiding and monitoring project progress was formed. Representatives included senior decision-makers from the following institutions: the General Directorate of Biodiversity from the Vice-Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources; Unit of Production and Technology of the Vice-Ministry of Agriculture; the National Protected Areas Service; the Confederation of Indigenous Peoples of Bolivia; the Instituto de Ecología UMSA; and the seven national executing partner institutions of the CWR Project itself.

Source: Beatriz Zapata Ferrufino, National Project Coordinator, Bolivia

points and mandate agencies to meet the demands of all stakeholders. This must be carefully managed in an open and transparent manner and a national steering committee is well placed to balance priorities (this is a topic dealt with in detail in relation to species and locations in Chapter 7, see also Box 4.3).

More importantly, the committee should have linkages to, and be in communication with, other national biodiversity planning and reporting committees and processes so that CWR conservation receives national attention and recognition, which hopefully will translate into greater mainstreaming, political support and resources.

It is unlikely that such a national committee would be capable of undertaking the planning and coordination of all national activities. This will depend on the geographical size of the country, the political and institutional culture, diversity of agencies and stakeholders, and overall national capacity and resources. In many

Box 4.3 Whose priority counts?

As Chapter 7 illustrates, the task of prioritization of target CWR species for conservation action is an important, yet challenging, one. It is a task that will require consultation and negotiation with a wide range of stakeholders and institutions to reach consensus on a methodology, to ensure that relevant data is made available and to secure stakeholder and institutional commitment to follow-up actions. Each agency will have its preferred species and corresponding expertise, but this must be balanced against other criteria. In Armenia, Bolivia, Sri Lanka and Uzbekistan the process of prioritization sometimes took up to two months and involved a total of 97 experts from 27 different national organizations, including government departments, research institutes, universities, genebanks, herbaria, botanic gardens, indigenous peoples' organizations and non-governmental organizations.

instances, it will be necessary to initiate sub-committees that plan and coordinate activities addressing a particular geographical location or a thematic technical area, such as a sub-committee set up to develop a national CWR action plan, adapt a protected area management plan for CWR conservation or to prioritize target species for conservation actions (see Box 4.3).

Another key role for a national steering committee is to oversee the development of a national communication plan (see Chapter 16) and a national capacity development plan (see Chapter 15), both of which should be linked to any national CWR action plan or strategy (see Chapter 6).

Planning for partnership

This chapter has already referred to the difficulties involved in facilitating effective partnerships for conservation. Such impediments, and proposals for bridging them, have been described for disciplines strictly within the natural sciences (Golding and Timberlake, 2003; Lowry and Smith, 2003), as well as for disciplines from across the natural and social sciences spectrum (Mascia et al, 2003; Campbell, 2005). Despite the historical and complex reasons for these disconnects, which are beyond the scope of this manual, it is important to know that, with attention to planning and detail, progress can and must be made.

What is partnership?

Building partnerships for CWR *in situ* conservation is about working with others to achieve what cannot be achieved by individuals or individual institutions alone. The diversity of partner organizations involved in the UNEP/GEF CWR Project is already highlighted in the acknowledgements section and demonstrates clearly the scope for involvement. A partnership is a special kind of relationship, in which people or organizations combine their resources to carry out a specific set of activities. Partners work together for a common purpose and for mutual benefit. Different people, organizations and sectors have a wide range of resources and skills to offer each other in this regard. A good partnership should offer effective coordination, minimize duplication and make the best use of available resources; but, most importantly, it should ensure that everyone benefits from their involvement. It should also identify opportunities for collaboration with other initiatives relevant to CWR conservation. Building partnerships differs from 'networking' or 'public relations' in that partnerships are about in-depth relationships, involving a

Before embarking on partnership consider:

- What level of participation is required?
- What dangers/risks are involved?
- What are the potential benefits?

few carefully selected targets and having specific, practical goals as opposed to simply communicating a message or information. They also tend to be based upon informal, collaborative agreements or formal contracts such as memoranda of understanding, but such agreements will largely depend on the context.

The task of planning and implementing a partnership should involve wide consultation and effective communication between potential partners, strong commitment from all involved and, ideally, control of local decision-making on activities and resources. The potential benefits and pitfalls that may arise in partnership are many, but if planned and managed properly, the advantages greatly outweigh these difficulties.

Who can partnerships be built with?

The range of stakeholders involved in CWR *in situ* conservation is extensive, especially as activities will be area-based and those with an interest in the area concerned will normally need to be included (see Box 4.4).

Importantly, the conservation of CWR involves two major sectors that traditionally do not work together – agriculture and biodiversity conservation. This, in itself, presents an added challenge to the task of forming effective partnerships for CWR *in situ* conservation. There are already many techniques and methodologies for identifying and engaging potential stakeholders; these will not be elaborated here. Instead, the reader is directed to such tools and resources highlighted at the end of this chapter and also described in Chapter 5.

Box 4.4 Guidelines on identifying your key stakeholders

Key individuals who will play a role in a national strategy for CWR *in situ* conservation might include:

- political leaders and senior policy-makers;
- senior biodiversity, environment and agriculture decision-makers;
- heads of relevant organizations and institutes;
- national and local policy planners;
- scientists and researchers;
- protected area managers;
- project management staff;
- field technicians;
- university lecturers and postgraduate students;
- communications and public awareness specialists;
- extension and outreach specialists;
- information analysts and managers;
- training specialists; and
- community and indigenous leaders and groups.

When facilitating partnerships consider:

- common interests;
- common goals;
- reputation, both nationally and internationally;
- level of expertise;
- past track record, including past achievements/problems;
- proposed partner already working in similar area;
- clear objectives of what to achieve;
- what is in it for the partners;
- power relations with other sectors and actors;
- experience and attitudes towards other partners;
- receptivity to public opinion;
- what drives partners/limits them/enables them; and
- their interests/revenues/rewards.[1]

To assess if the context is conducive to partnership the following checklist questions can be posed:

- Where is the drive or motivation for this partnership coming from?
- How do you expect the partnership to address the problem?
- Will the partners be able to achieve more together than they would working on their own or individually?
- Is the partnership based on partners' differences rather than their similarities?
- What are the main strengths that each partner brings to the partnership?
- Are there gaps in strengths or skills that might be filled by another partner not yet identified?
- What do partners expect from the partnership?
- What do partners fear from the partnership?
- What can the partnership do to avoid, reduce or deal with these fears?
- Are there any problems or conflicts between partners before the partnership commences?
- Do the partners gain access to additional funds and resources that neither could access on their own?
- Will this access be on an equal basis?
- Will the partnership build a sense of local ownership?
- Will the partnership help sustain CWR *in situ* conservation actions?[2]

Planning the partnership

The development of a partnership should not be rushed and must be carefully nurtured if many of the above pitfalls are to be avoided. Roles and responsibilities will have to be clearly articulated and understood and these may need to be formalized in the appropriate manner. Three basic ingredients of a partnership need to be considered and negotiated (see Box 4.5).

Box 4.5 Partnership planning checklist

- Focus of the partnership
  - Define the objective (project, activity, product) of the partnership.
  - Define the time (period) and place involved.
  - If necessary, make sure it is clear what is *not* the objective of the partnership.
  - Define the limits of the partnership (a partnership does not mean complete involvement in each other's activities).
- Organization of the partnership
  Many of the challenges involved in partnerships can be managed through planning, but to complement this, you may want to establish formal or informal collaborative agreements to avoid misunderstandings and conflicts. These may include:
  - informal agreements, verbal agreement, guiding principles;
  - formal agreements (e.g. memorandum of understanding);
  - contracts (formal and legal).
- Rights and obligations of each partner
  Administrative, financial and legal issues involved will have to be openly discussed and agreement reached on such issues as:
  - financial inputs, material inputs;
  - access to resources;
  - sharing of information and benefits;
  - sharing of unexpected costs;
  - publicity and communication strategy;
  - financial accounting and liability aspects;
  - work plans, milestones, roles and responsibilities;
  - monitoring and reporting requirements.

Source: adapted from 'The Partnership Toolbox', WWF and other WWF partnership tools (see Further sources of information)

The importance of communication in the partnership

A partnership will bring together a variety of stakeholder interests, motives and objectives. Balancing these in a fair and open manner is one of the important challenges in managing a partnership. It is best to promote clear and open communication, right from the beginning, about partners' motives and desired benefits in order to provide a firm basis for a good partnership. The majority of problems that arise in partnerships can be traced to poor communication or lack thereof. At the planning stage, it is useful for the partnership to consider developing a communications strategy which should also incorporate aspects of external communication and advocacy for the partnership in general, not just internal communication between partnership members. Developing and maintaining clear communication channels between the partners will help build trust, maintain focus and momentum, and ensure that everyone shares in the partnership's successes. The subject of communication is dealt with in detail in Chapter 16.

The experiences of the UNEP/GEF CWR Project partnership

This global partnership was established to improve the *in situ* conservation of CWR and to use the experience of doing so as a platform to create and test tools to enable others to use similar methods. Throughout the project, all partners not only sought to improve matters within the target countries, but also to contribute to global knowledge about CWR and their conservation and use. Chapter 1 has already highlighted the considerable complexities of *in situ* conservation and the acute dilemma posed by climate change. This was the challenging context in which the project and partnership was implemented.

Bioversity International, in collaboration with Armenia, Bolivia, Madagascar, Sri Lanka and Uzbekistan, and the international organizations BGCI, FAO, IUCN and UNEP-WCMC, set out to establish a broad-based partnership to improve the conservation and sustainable utilization of these important resources, maximizing the use of existing information and conservation resources to protect CWR species occurring within these specific countries, through establishing further effective partnerships among relevant national agencies and individuals, and adding to the information base by carrying out original research on the distribution and uses of and threats to those populations.

The partnership was essential to overcome many of the national political, administrative and infrastructural obstacles limiting conservation efforts, and it provided a collaborative framework to target the effective *in situ* conservation of CWR. Most importantly, the partnership provided an interdisciplinary and apolitical platform for information gathering and sharing and for the development of national and international data resources, which are now available for other countries to use and employ.

The partnership included almost 60 national and international agencies essential to the complex and multidisciplinary nature of CWR *in situ* conservation planning and action (see acknowledgements). Planning, implementation and monitoring was carried out through a series of local and national committees, coordinated and guided by Bioversity International through an international steering committee made up of representatives from all participant countries and international organizations. A three-person technical advisory committee provided overall technical direction. At the national level, the partnership brought together individuals from universities, herbaria, government departments of agriculture, environment and biodiversity, protected areas administrations, local and indigenous community groups, NGOs, extension and outreach agencies, botanic gardens, natural history museums and research agencies.

The main advantage of the partnership was that it assembled and integrated the multidisciplinary expertise necessary to meet the complex challenge of *in situ* conservation of CWR (see Box 4.6). The agencies and organizations essential to this process traditionally had little history of working together; the partnership enabled them to do so, with great effectiveness. This, in itself, is a significant achievement. Despite their different cultures and contexts, and biodiversity and

Box 4.6 What did the UNEP/GEF CWR Project partnership achieve?

Because there are thousands of known CWR in the five countries and resources are limited, prioritization is vital. The partnership encouraged each country to consult widely and to negotiate with a diverse range of stakeholders and institutions to reach consensus on priority taxa and to agree on methodologies, to ensure that relevant data were made available and to secure stakeholder and institutional commitment to follow-up conservation actions. As a result, CWR species from 36 different genera were prioritized for action, including ecogeographic assessments. More than 310 CWR species were Red List assessed according to IUCN guidelines, and Bolivia published the first IUCN Red List specifically dedicated to CWR. This is probably the largest set of such assessments undertaken for CWR and represents a major contribution. Furthermore, the partnership worked closely with protected area authorities to develop species management plans for CWR in selected protected areas and put in place a series of important national action plans and strategies. This partnership has substantially expanded the previously limited body of knowledge on *in situ* CWR conservation in developing countries and used a series of innovative communication and outreach products to enhance awareness and understanding of CWR. Further, information and knowledge generated within the partnership has been consolidated in a series of national information systems which are, in turn, linked to a global CWR portal.

In addition, the partnership:

- created important synergies and facilitated sharing and learning through south–south and north–south exchanges;
- enhanced the capacity of individuals, organizations and communities to support CWR *in situ* conservation;
- linked national partners to the best and most up-to-date science by including relevant international partners in the fields of information management, conservation actions and legal and policy review and analysis; and
- strengthened linkages to utilization by undertaking evaluation of selected CWR species with potential for crop improvement.

government structures, the countries have formed an effective working partnership and have acquired unique experience in one of the most difficult areas of agrobiodiversity conservation, which must be undertaken with a long-term view. For this reason, it was crucial to incorporate responsibility for conservation of CWR into national biodiversity and plant genetic resources strategies. Having done so, the countries and the partnership are now well placed to act as hubs for CWR conservation in their regions.

Sources of further information

This chapter benefited immensely from the excellent partnering tools developed by the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF). *The WWF Partnership Toolbox*, and other partnering tools available from WWF, are useful starting points for resources and guides for establishing, nurturing and monitoring partnerships. Website: http://assets.wwf.org.uk/downloads/wwf_parthershiptoolboxartweb.pdf.

The *Conservation Action Planning (CAP) Handbook*, developed by The Nature Conservancy, is a simple, straightforward and proven approach for planning and implementing conservation projects. The CAP Handbook is available to download from the internet and contains a variety of chapters including Step 1: Identify People Involved. Website: http://conserveonline.org/workspaces/cbdgateway/cap/practices/index_html

Tuxhill, J. and Nabhan, G. P. (2001) *People, Plants and Protected Areas: A Guide to In Situ Management,* Earthscan, London, UK.
This book has a useful chapter on 'who is involved?' when it comes to routine, on-the-ground conservation activities and who you need to be working with to ensure conservation of useful plants in their native habitat. The chapter discusses the various reasons why you cannot expect to achieve successful *in situ* conservation without fully engaging the relevant stakeholders. Some of the discussion is related to Chapter 5 on engaging with local and indigenous communities.

Biodiversity Conservation: A Guide for USAID Staff and Partners provides basic information about designing, managing and implementing biodiversity conservation programmes or activities. This publication includes a chapter on: Involving Stakeholders. Website: http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNADE258.pdf

The *Effective Engagement* web pages of the Department of Sustainability and Environment, Australia have three useful downloadable documents: 'An Introduction to Engagement'; 'The Engagement Planning Workbook' and 'The Engagement Toolkit'. Website: http://www.dse.vic.gov.au/dse/wcmn203.nsf/Home+Page/8A461F99E54B17EBCA2570340016F3A9?open

Partnerships Online Guide which includes step-by-step guides for creating effective partnerships. Website: www.partnerships.org.uk/

The Partnering Toolbook, written by Ros Tennyson and produced in cooperation with the Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), provides a concise overview of the essential elements that make for effective partnering. English and Spanish versions are available for download. Website: http://www.undp.org/partners/business/partneringtoolbook%5B1%5D.pdf

The Partnering Initiative works with individuals, organizations and systems to promote and develop partnerships for sustainable development – between business, government and civil society – and has a number of publications and resources available on their website: www.thepartneringinitiative.org/

(Links last checked 29 May 2010)

Notes

1. Adapted from 'The Partnership Toolbox', WWF and other WWF partnership tools (see Further sources of information).
2. Adapted from 'The Partnership Toolbox', WWF and other WWF partnership tools (see Further sources of information).

References

Campbell, L.M. (2005) 'Overcoming obstacles to interdisciplinary research', *Conservation Biology,* vol 19, pp574–577

Golding, J.S. and Timberlake, J. (2003) 'How taxonomists can bridge the gap between taxonomy and conservation science', *Conservation Biology*, vol 17, pp1177–1178

Hesselink, F. Goldstein, W., van Kempen, P.P., Garnett, T. and Dela, J. (2007) *Communication, Education and Public Awareness: A Toolkit for National Focal Points and NBSAP Coordinators,* Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)

Lowry, P.P. and Smith, P.P. (2003) 'Closing the gulf between botanists and conservationists', *Conservation Biology,* vol 17, pp1175–1176

Mascia, M.B., Brosius, J.P., Dobson, T.A., Forbes, B.C., Horowitz, L., McKean, M.A. and Turner, N.J. (2003) 'Conservation and the social sciences', *Conservation Biology,* vol 17, pp649–650