

# CLIMATE CHANGE AS AN OPPORTUNITY FOR CONSERVATIONISTS TO BUILD NEW ALLIANCES

Report of a workshop at the  
4th IUCN World Conservation Congress,  
Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain, October 2008

Ted Trzyna

with contributions from

Ali A. Kaka  
Barney Kgope  
John Davidson  
K.Vijaya Lakshmi  
Linda McMillan  
Dan Mazmanian  
Adrian Phillips

## WORKSHOP SPONSORS:

California Institute of Public Affairs / InterEnvironment  
InterClimate Network  
Task Force on Cities and Protected Areas, IUCN World  
Commission on Protected Areas

Published January 2009 by:

California Institute of Public Affairs  
P.O. Box 189040  
Sacramento, California 95818, USA  
(1 916) 442-2472  
[www.cipahq.org](http://www.cipahq.org)

CIPA Publication No. 111  
CIPA Environmental Studies Series No. 13

The designation of geographic entities in this paper and the presentation of the material do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the workshop sponsors or of IUCN, the International Union for Conservation of Nature, concerning the legal status of any country, territory, or area, or its authorities, or the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The views of the author expressed in this publication do not necessarily represent those of IUCN, InterClimate Network, or the California Institute of Public Affairs.

Copyright: © 2009 California Institute of Public Affairs

Reproduction of this publication for educational or other noncommercial purposes is authorized without prior written permission from the copyright holder provided the source is fully acknowledged. Reproduction of this publication for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without prior written permission from the copyright holder.

Citation: Ted Trzyna. 2009. *Climate Change as an Opportunity for Conservationists to Build New Alliances*. Sacramento, California: California Institute of Public Affairs. 19 pp.

This is the print edition of a report published online at [www.InterEnvironment.org/cipa/wcc4workshop.htm](http://www.InterEnvironment.org/cipa/wcc4workshop.htm).

The workshop “Climate Change as an Opportunity for Conservationists to Build New Alliances” was World Conservation Congress Event 285.

## **Contents**

Foreword 4

Introduction 4

Adrian Phillips: No nasty surprises: A British alliance based on waste 5

Ali A. Kaka: Hitherto unimaginable collaboration: A Kenyan alliance to conserve overused marine resources 7

Linda McMillan: Citizen scientists on vertical landscapes: Climbers and park managers in California's Yosemite National Park 8

K. Vijaya Lakshmi: Staying engaged and keeping flexible: Building relationships with rural and urban communities in India 9

John Davidson: Tapping into corporations' convening power: Working with the private sector in the United Kingdom 10

Barney Kgope: Relationships based on trust: Monitoring biodiversity changes in South Africa 13

Discussion 14

*Drivers of alliances*  
*Sustaining alliances*  
*Relevance to young people*

Conclusions 15

*Building alliances*  
*What works?*

Notes 17

Workshop sponsors 18

Workshop and press conference panelists 18

## **Foreword**

The World Conservation Congress, held every four years by IUCN, the International Union for Conservation of Nature, [www.iucn.org](http://www.iucn.org), is the world's largest and most diverse conservation event. In Barcelona, there were some 7,800 participants. For details, see [www.iucn.org/congress](http://www.iucn.org/congress).

Our 90-minute workshop was among nearly a thousand events at the Congress. This paper includes a report on the workshop, consisting of an introduction, summaries of six presentations, a digest of discussions, and conclusions; a brief description of the workshop's three sponsors; and a list of panelists at the workshop and a press conference that followed. (The purpose of the press conference was to formally launch InterClimate Network, described in the Introduction below, in the international conservation community.)

## **Introduction**

Climate change is a threat multiplier and a threat accelerator. It interacts with many other global trends.

Because it cuts across the concerns of so many constituencies, climate change offers an opportunity for conservationists to build new alliances. However, such alliances are not easy to build or sustain. Global problems tend to be addressed one by one in separate communities of organizations and experts. Each such community has its own outlook, culture, and priorities.

The idea for this workshop originated in the California Institute of Public Affairs, more specifically in discussions Dan Mazmanian and I had in mid-2007 about organizing a workshop at the World Conservation Congress to examine the potential for climate change to bring different constituencies together to work toward common goals, including conservation of biodiversity. We decided to bring in as a cosponsor the Task Force on Cities and Protected Areas of IUCN's World Commission on Protected Areas because of its desire to see climate change and conservation initiatives linked in urban areas.

Then, a more specific and immediate opportunity emerged. A British colleague, John Davidson, had just formed a new partnership organization, InterClimate Network, to "inspire action on climate change." With a major grant from Barclays, a leading international financial institution, he was putting together the new organization's first project, aimed at engaging secondary school students in solutions to climate change, both causes and impacts. The three of us decided to use the workshop as part of a launch of InterClimate Network in the international conservation community. We chose panelists from each of the five countries and regions where InterClimate Network will initially work: India, Kenya, South Africa, the United Kingdom, and the United States (California).

We invited the panelists to look at the nature of alliances, and especially what worked and what did not. So they were not asked to discuss climate change as such, but to reflect on the kind of cooperative alliances within which the challenging issues associated with climate change may be resolved. After listening to these brief presentations on various alliances, the workshop then discussed keys to success and their relevance to InterClimate Network, particularly in working with young people.

We used the term “alliances” loosely to cover a variety of ways by which organizations work with each other toward a goal, and for the purposes of our discussion used the words “alliance,” “partnership,” and “collaboration” interchangeably.

Little has been written about the potential for climate change to bring together diverse interests to work on a common problem. These interests are numerous, but none is more central than conservation of nature and natural resources. For, as IUCN Chief Scientist Jeff McNeely said in his closing address to the World Conservation Congress in Barcelona, “Climate change and biodiversity are part of the same problem and must be dealt with together.”

The workshop was moderated by Dan Mazmanian, a political scientist who is a professor at the University of Southern California, as well as a longtime Senior Associate of the California Institute of Public Affairs. (Affiliations of workshop and press conference speakers are listed at the end of this report.)

The following summaries of presentations are based on brief papers submitted by the workshop panelists.

### **No nasty surprises: A British alliance based on waste**

*Adrian Phillips, who has held many positions in international and British conservation organizations, told about a partnership in the English county of Gloucestershire in which he is directly involved.*

This partnership derives from the operation of the Landfill Tax, introduced in the United Kingdom in 1996. This is a tax on waste that is put into landfill sites. The tax is paid by the waste disposal operator, currently at a rate of GBP 32 (or around USD 48) a ton. The costs are passed on in the form of higher charges to the local authorities who are responsible for overseeing waste collection and disposal, and thereby, of course, to local taxpayers and householders. So everyone has an incentive to minimize waste and to turn to alternatives, notably recycling. Although the tax has been successful in raising the proportion of waste that goes to recycling in the UK to over 30%, this is still below that of many other European countries, and the tax will be further increased annually to continue the pressure to meet higher recycling targets set by the European Union.

Whatever happens, though, some landfill seems likely to continue for many years. And here the tax introduces a novel idea to compensate local communities for the environmentally unpleasant consequences of living near (within 10 miles, or 17 km) of a

landfill site. The landfill operator can reclaim 6% of the tax from the Treasury (the UK finance ministry) if it makes the funds available for local schemes that benefit the local community and its environment. These funds must be disbursed by a “registered environmental body.”

Gloucestershire, a county about 100 miles (170 km) west of London, has a population of 582,000 in an area of 2,653 sq km. Its landfill operations are run on behalf of the county council by Cory Environmental Ltd. Cory and the council have established the Gloucestershire Environmental Trust (GET) as an environmental body to disburse the funds that Cory receives back from the government.

The GET is run as a registered charity and regulated both under UK charity law and through a separate system specific to environmental bodies operating with landfill tax funds. The GET has a board of about 10 trustees (one of whom is a representative of Cory and another of the county council), and two part-time staff. The GET operates for the benefit of the people and the environment of the county. At present the trust receives an annual contribution from Cory of about GBP 750,000 (or USD 1,125,000). The trust has been in existence for 11 years and has used its funds from Cory (its sole source of income) to support nearly 500 community-based projects in the county, mainly for historic heritage conservation, community facilities, and biodiversity conservation.

In this partnership, Cory provides the GET with financial underpinning. It also provides trustee representation, support and advice on GET’s public relations (for example, dealing with the local media), and staff training. In return, the GET helps to improve Cory’s image with the local community, a factor which is relevant to the firm’s hopes to secure a renewed contract from the county council for waste disposal and management. And it also assures Cory of the responsible use of the funds that it provides.

The arrangements are, of course, very specific to the UK and its landfill tax regime. But there are some general lessons here about how a partnership operates. In particular, it is clear that success depends on these factors:

- A supportive national policy framework; in this case, the landfill tax regime and charity law.
- A formal mechanism for cooperation; in this case, the board of the GET.
- The presence of mutual benefit; each party gets something out of the relationship.
- The presence of mutual respect. (Thus Cory does not tell the GET what to do, nor is every decision to the taste of the Cory trustee on the board; and, for its part, the GET acknowledges the business world in which the firm needs to operate).

The GET is committed to being businesslike with Cory funds (and ensuring that they get no nasty surprises!).

*Note: Adrian Phillips chairs the board of the Gloucestershire Environmental Trust. For more information about the trust and its work, see [www.glos-environment-trust.co.uk](http://www.glos-environment-trust.co.uk).*

### **Hitherto unimaginable collaboration: A Kenyan alliance to conserve overused marine resources**

*Ali A. Kaka, who directs the East African Wild Life Society and has extensive conservation experience in the Kenyan government, as well as the international arena, spoke about an alliance in which his organization has been a catalyst.*

Edible marine resources in most of the inshore areas along East Africa's Indian Ocean coastline are under immense pressure by local fishermen. Adding to this pressure is the increased presence of large fishing trawlers whose off take is primarily aimed for the export market.

Increased population, unemployment, and poverty levels have caused unsustainable extraction by these artisanal fishermen. The result has been a fast decline in stocks of edible marine resources.

Desperation led the local people to use even more destructive methods, resulting in irreparable damage to coral reefs. In order to put food on the table, they turned to exploitation of non-edible species and items, such as live corals, turtle shells, coral (aquarium) fish, and even sea grass.

However, some local communities have sought to reverse this trend and explore alternative livelihoods.

A good example is the Kuruwitu community, the members of which live in a group of villages located near Malindi on Kenya's northern shores. Kuruwitu's leaders approached the East African Wild Life Society for help in conserving their resources through conservation initiatives, and to explore alternative livelihoods revolving around their villages.

The area identified for conservation has been a traditional fishing area for this community for generations. It thus took some convincing for the area to be closed off from any extractive activity, but the community was made aware of marine conservation principles and the respective roles each section of the user population would have to assume.

Cooperation between the Wild Life Society and the local people resulted in creation of the first Community Managed Marine Protected Area on the East African coast. Since it was created, the area has seen a remarkable recovery of the stock of all species, has attracted paying visitors coming to view the now-pristine coral reefs and coral inhabiting species, and has created service-related employment for the fishermen. Alternative livelihood projects have allowed entire families to be engaged in small-scale enterprises

apart from the traditional fisheries-based businesses that still have a lower income return.

In the Kuruwitu project, a degree of collaboration between users of natural resources and conservationists hitherto unimaginable in East Africa was achieved and resulted in commendable and pioneering success for all players.

### **Citizen scientists on vertical landscapes: Climbers and park managers in California's Yosemite National Park**

*Linda McMillan, who is a business consultant, mountaineer, outdoor recreation advocate, and conservationist, told about her experiences in forging an alliance between climbers and park managers.*

For over a century, scientists have been helping the United States National Park Service to understand, preserve, and protect the stunning natural resources of Yosemite National Park, a World Heritage Site in the state of California. But until recently, significant parts of Yosemite remained unreachable and unassessed by scientists: its long stretches of vertical granite cliffs. Through an innovative new alliance between the Park Service and The American Alpine Club, an association of mountain climbers, park scientists are now able to inventory and understand lichen and other species that serve as crucial indicators of climate change, as well as air and water pollution, on these remote vertical landscapes.

Climbers, along with scientists, park officials (and this year an Associated Press reporter) ascend such cliffs using technical climbing gear and methods. This year, for example, they visited lichens alongside the 100-meter sheer face of Vernal Falls.

This alliance is one of a growing number of outcomes from the successful resolution in 1998 of a legal contention between the Park Service and the Alpine Club. That resolution resulted in the historic preservation of Camp 4, the traditional climbers' base camp in Yosemite Valley that is the birthplace of modern rock climbing.

These mutually beneficial outcomes between recreational users of the national park, park managers, and the scientific community include:

- Moving beyond "us versus them." Climbers and park rangers now view themselves as allies and mutual stakeholders in preserving and protecting the natural and cultural resources of Yosemite National Park. Climbers are highly motivated to help park rangers because both groups now see their roles as "co-managers." Rangers have evolved from trying to somehow protect Yosemite from climbers to finding ways to protect Yosemite *with* climbers.
- Committing to long-term success. The American Alpine Club is committed to serving as an effective organizational interface in this collaborative relationship between climbers and protected area managers. It views this as a continuation of the long

history of conservation leadership forged by its members, who have included many prominent mountaineers.

- Creating mutual benefit. Climbers gain by receiving free scientific training and project management experience, plus free camping during high season. By using skilled volunteers for these projects, rangers gain more knowledge of park species and environments with minimal funding and scientific staffing.
- Fostering mutual respect. By volunteering their vertical skills to these projects, climbers gain a greater sense of stewardship, a new identity as “co-managers,” and a better appreciation of the rangers’ task of protecting Yosemite for future generations. Rangers gain greater respect for the climbers’ skills in the vertical world, and for their enduring, intense attachment to Yosemite.
- Creating a true partnership. Climbers and rangers view these projects as a natural extension of their shared love of Yosemite, and continue to find additional ways to create mutual success in protecting it as true partners. They continue to proactively suggest, test, and establish more alliances and collaborations for sharing stewardship of this special place.

This type of innovative project can be used around the world as a low-cost, high-value response to climate change and loss of biodiversity in protected areas. Such projects cut across many different constituencies. The ability to create skilled corps of “citizen scientists” through collaborations such as these can be used in many ways to bring together governmental agencies, NGOs, and public and private schools as long-term partners in effective responses to climate change.

*Note: For more information about Linda McMillan’s work in Yosemite National Park, including photographs, go to <http://lindamcmillan.info/mountain-stewardship-projects>.*

### **Staying engaged and keeping flexible: Building relationships with rural and urban communities in India**

*K. Vijaya Lakshmi, a scientist who is a Vice President of Development Alternatives, gave two examples of alliances initiated by her organization. Founded in 1983 and based in New Delhi, DA works to “create large-scale sustainable livelihoods.” Conservation of natural resources has been a principal aim since DA started.*

India’s Bundelkhand region is notorious for being one of the country’s most backward in terms of development. The region comprises 13 districts across two states: Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh. The main cause of its problems is degradation of a once-rich forest, which has led to more frequent droughts, lowering of the water table, and a cyclic process of poverty and environmental degradation.

In the late 1980s, Development Alternatives joined hands with local communities in the region to introduce new opportunities for livelihoods based on improved technology.

DA's entry point was through mobilizing self-help groups, especially among women. Mainly by providing information on what was possible, these groups were empowered to take decisions at family as well as local community levels.

The process of trust-building started by addressing the most pressing needs of these communities: access to water, energy, and fodder for animals; advice on cropping patterns; and skills required to raise income levels. DA takes care to ensure that the interventions chosen will not perpetuate environmental degradation or contribute to climate change but, instead, will help people become more resilient to climate change.

An example of DA interventions in Bundelkhand is encouraging women's self-help groups to use, make, and sell energy-efficient cooking stoves and biomass-based briquettes. To meet energy needs for irrigation and lighting, DA brings in options ranging from solar lanterns to check-dam construction. To sustain these initiatives and add value, DA seeks to make alliances with agriculture experts connected with local universities, and such organizations as crop insurance agencies, micro-finance agencies, and *panchayats* (the lowest level of local government).

Development Alternatives' CLEAN-India Program (CLEAN stands for Community Led Environment-Action Network) is a second example of how DA works through alliances. Through this initiative, DA has forged partnerships with local NGOs and schools in cities and towns across India to promote urban farming, paper recycling, composting, and tree protection. Links between urban and rural areas are promoted through events such as an eco-friendly urban "festival of colors," in which rural women's self-help groups sell organic color powders for urban use.

The key lessons in these alliances are that it is essential to stay engaged, add value on a continuous basis, and remain flexible to bringing in new allies to meet the needs of the parties involved.

### **Tapping into corporations' convening power: Working with the private sector in the United Kingdom**

*John Davidson, Executive Director of InterClimate Network, spoke about his experience in working with businesses as cofounder and first Chief Executive of Groundwork, an innovative and highly successful British environmental partnership organization.*

The whole of society has a role to play in achieving conservation objectives. The challenge for conservationists is to persuade people and organizations to participate in activities which, at first sight, may not seem to be relevant to their core purpose.

This is a brief version of a long story: How three large companies became involved with, and committed resources to, Groundwork, a nonprofit organization charged with the task of greening Britain's cities.

When a global bank based in the United Kingdom expressed interest in the work we were doing, I went to meet the appropriate executive officer. It was clear that there was no provision in the bank's budget for the kind of work we were proposing: local community-led regeneration of urban wasteland to create parks and nature gardens. Waiting for a new policy to be developed within the bank was one option, but that would take time and it would be months before any financial commitment could be made. We therefore explored other options within the scope of existing programs.

What emerged, after further exploration of ideas, was a pilot project funded from the bank's human resources budget. We would provide an outdoor team building opportunity for 20 people from one of the local branches of the bank. Our task was to find the site, obtain all necessary permissions from the landowner, neighbors, and regulatory authorities, provide tools and equipment, and make available a professional landscape designer, an "expert on tap." The bank would provide 20 people, brief them properly, and set them the challenge: to transform, over a weekend, a derelict site into an asset for the local community.

The first pilot project proved so successful that it grew into a national program, which the bank was willing to continue to fund out of its training budget, devoting more funds each year to cover the costs we incurred in managing our side of the partnership. Bank employees voted the project the best training opportunity on offer; we achieved many successful transformations of wasteland. Both parties gained benefits, as did local people, the local government, and the local and regional media.

Most towns in the United Kingdom have "industrial estates," that is, complexes zoned for industry that house small- and medium-sized enterprises. Some are of modern design and look like inviting places to work and do business. Many are run down and dilapidated. We wondered if it would be possible to build alliances with the owners and tenants to achieve an overall improvement in the environmental quality of these areas and, in so doing, enhance profitability and contribute in a modest way to the overall greening of the city.

The question we had to answer was: How to engage the interest of business people and, more importantly, persuade them to commit resources to the investments so clearly necessary to achieve a better quality environment.

It quickly became apparent that our environmental language did not go down well with our audience. We had to learn to listen to the concerns that people had. Improved lighting, removal of potholes, and tighter security were much higher up the list than tree planting, eyesore clearance, and the reintroduction of some biodiversity. And all of this work took time — lots of it, which would have to be paid for.

The breakthrough came when our work caught the attention of an international oil company. Our small target companies were also suppliers to large firms, and we were doing pioneering work at a time when those in the corporate sector realized they had to

take a leadership role by looking at their own internal policies and the performance of supply chains.

What emerged from a year of discussions was a challenge to small firms to improve the external appearance of their factory sites. The “Brightsite Campaign” was sponsored by the oil company. We provided free landscape-design ideas, which were then put forward for national awards. The process attracted a large number of entries stimulated, as much as anything, by the prospect of gaining national recognition at virtually no cost. The challenge for us was to convert the sketch schemes into real projects and win the consultancy fees associated with it.

It was at this point that our sponsor identified a weakness in our training. We were not good sales people, we were told. There is an art in converting “prospects” into “contracts,” and we were lacking these skills. The answer was for the sponsor to provide a full week of sales training to ten of our staff at the company’s training center, at no cost to us.

In this example, money to pay for our staff and marketing costs was crucial. But equally important to the success of the scheme was the good will that came with the name of our sponsor — much respected among our target audience — the insight into our strengths and weaknesses, and our sponsor’s ability to make in-kind training resources available to improve our sales skills.

A major British retailer with a global brand developed an interest in supporting projects focused on young people. Its motivation was partly from self-interest (the young are customers and potential employees), and partly from concern for the general wellbeing of society at a time when relationships between generations were strained. The company’s Corporate Social Responsibility team took a pro-active view of its role and approached us with a proposal. Would we be interested in joining forces with another NGO, one concerned with youth crime, if funds were made available to launch a new initiative?

The outcome was a project called YouthWorks, which targeted low-income housing estates in distressed neighborhoods with multiple social and economic problems. (Such “estates” are called by various names in different countries, for example, “public housing projects” in the United States.) By bringing together in an alliance the business skills of the retailer, the experience of an NGO skilled at working with young people, and our own environmental expertise, it was possible to engage with “hard to reach” individuals. The offer of challenging and exciting outdoor activities as an alternative to crime helped redirect lives. It also made good projects happen, thus improving the lives of residents in bleak housing areas.

This example shows that the corporate sector has an ability to see gaps in provision and, through its convening power and access to resources, can forge alliances among organizations that would not normally have reason to meet, let alone consider working in partnership.

## **Relationships based on trust: Monitoring biodiversity changes in South Africa**

*Barney Kgope, a scientist with the South African National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI), spoke about his organization's efforts to build new alliances to monitor the causes and effects of climate change in his country. SANBI is a parastatal organization charged with promoting "the sustainable use, conservation, appreciation and enjoyment of the exceptionally rich biodiversity of South Africa, for the benefit of all people."*

Since the late 1990s, the South African National Biodiversity Institute has built alliances with a range of constituencies to carry out its climate-change mandate. Two key constituencies are managers of protected areas and private land owners. Each of these groups has its own sets of values. Park managers are guided by conservation strategies and environmental management laws. Land owners live off the land, which is their prime asset.

In both cases, land management is based on longstanding practices that do not take into consideration changes due to global warming. Therefore, it was essential that those who set out to engage with prospective partners be conversant with these practices. There was no standard approach. In both cases — park managers and landowners — SANBI used the following tools in random order: prospecting, scoping, negotiating, consistent contact, memorandums of understanding, funding, educational tools, incentives, and — finally — "ownership." Each of these tools is described below.

Prospecting involved finding relevant sites for long-term monitoring of biodiversity in the face of climate change. This process was informed by research results generated by computer models that pointed to specific target sites for conservation and monitoring of climate change impacts over time.

Scoping had to do with the magnitude of each project, the period of time over which it would be conducted, and — equally important — how to entice a park manager or land owner to become the central part of the project. In other words, take ownership of the project. This was an important step, since it would determine SANBI's approach to the prospective partner and the kind of alliance that would best suit both candidates.

Once the potential partner was identified, the agency's staff began its approach by setting up meetings to present its scientific goals and its readiness to assist with avoiding negative impacts of climate change on the land in question. This immediately set negotiations on course. Memorandums of understanding (MOUs) were drafted and signed. Contained in them were such incentives as bringing in scientific equipment for long-term monitoring, and identification of indicator species whose behavior signals impacts of climate change. Such data help to inform the host partner on how to change land management practices in view of such impacts.

In addition, a representative of the host park or private landowner was included in most field excursions. This ensured that no activities would be undertaken outside the MOU, and that there would be a free exchange of on-the-ground information. SANBI regularly

updates its partners about new climate-change scenarios that might help with their future planning.

Already, this work by SANBI has led to changes in land management by park managers and land owners, and results have influenced policy on climate change at the national level.

SANBI has learned that alliances can go beyond the formalities of such agreements as MOUs to long-term working relationships. Sustained and healthy relationships are based on trust and, in turn, require servicing that can take many forms. In SANBI's case, we have involved park managers in our monitoring and encourage them to take charge of some aspects of our work. In this way they get to "own" the project and are able to carry on by themselves in our absence if and when formal agreements expire.

Finally, we have found that it is important to communicate science in simple ways that are inclusive and facilitates public buy-in.

## **Discussion**

Especially considering that this workshop was limited to 90 minutes, moderator Dan Mazmanian did a remarkable job of drawing out some "takeaway lessons" from both the panelists' presentations (which took about half the time) and their give-and-take with the audience. He stressed lessons particularly relevant to building alliances to tackle climate change:

### ***Drivers of alliances***

The drivers, or triggers, of alliances based on climate change include:

- Anticipated effects of climate change.
- Startling new scientific findings, such as those announced at the World Conservation Congress about the state of the world's oceans and fisheries.
- Confrontation, or a desire to avoid it.
- A need for money or other resources to carry out a project.
- The law, which in some countries forces parties to collaborate before receiving government funding.
- Hope for the future.

## ***Sustaining alliances***

The elements required to sustain alliances include:

- Good communication. (One participant put this as follows: “Listen to what your partner is telling you, and be patient; it may take a long time to tease out common interests.”)
- Mutual trust.
- Mutual benefits: a clear need to stay together.
- Framing the issues right, and reframing them as experience is gained and circumstances change.
- Persistent engagement of all parties involved.
- A continuing process of innovation.
- Keeping focused on the goal.

## ***Relevance to young people***

Points especially relevant to conservationists and young people include these:

- Motivate young people to imagine what the future could be. Paradoxically, this is often harder for them to do than it is for older people. This is probably because they have a shorter timeline of experience and less context to draw from.
- Encourage young people not to be daunted by confrontation. They tend to avoid it.
- Engage with schools around climate change, especially through real-world, on-the-ground field trips and demonstrations.
- Take more advantage of the “power of kids,” which is often underestimated and untapped.

## **Conclusions**

In organizing, chairing, and following up this workshop, I drew many conclusions and plan to write about them in detail. For now, however, I will make two points:

## ***Building alliances***

We in the conservation movement should look systematically for opportunities to make new alliances and strengthen existing ones around the many challenges presented to the world by climate change.

Going beyond our traditional partners — groups concerned with natural science, rural poverty, cultural heritage, and outdoor recreation, for example — we should look at the successes many of our colleagues have had in working with such other constituencies as religious institutions; a variety of businesses and industry associations; and organizations concerned with such problems as public health, migration, water supply, wildfire, security, human rights, and tourism, all of which are coping with problems that promise to be exacerbated by climate change.

Two important groups require special attention because the conservation movement has a very mixed record in developing and sustaining alliances with them:

- Young people. Climate change presents an opportunity to experiment with more effective ways of engaging young people. InterClimate Network, in cooperation with other organizations, is giving this top priority.
- Urban institutions. With few exceptions, separate sets of organizations work on urban and conservation issues. The IUCN Cities Task Force has been exploring ways of bridging this gap,<sup>1</sup> a challenge becoming more urgent with climate change.

## ***What works?***

In making alliances and strengthening existing ones, knowledge about what works — and what doesn't work — is critical. This workshop demonstrated some strengths and weaknesses in how conservationists go about acquiring, evaluating, and sharing such knowledge.

It can be very useful to summarize experience in a few words, especially when such “lessons learned” are drawn out from discussing real-world examples in a short time, as was the case in our workshop. However, distilled wisdom has its limits. The journalist Malcolm Gladwell (*The Tipping Point; Blink*) wrote about this in a review of *Heat Wave*,<sup>2</sup> a book by sociologist Eric Klinenberg about Chicago's failure to respond to a disastrous weather event in 1995. In his review, Gladwell points out that “Problem solving, in our day and age, brings with it the requirement of compression: we are urged to distill the most persistent lessons from any experience. Klinenberg suggests that such distillation only obscures the truth, and by the end of ‘Heat Wave’ he has traced the lines of culpability in dozens of directions, drawing a dense and subtle portrait of exactly what happened.”<sup>3</sup>

It is just such “dense and subtle portraits” that conservationists need in order to understand what makes alliances work. We need well-told stories written by

independent observers. We need stories that decision-makers and their close advisers will read from front to back. (I need hardly add the other side of the coin, but will do so anyway: We don't need more case studies written by "experts" paid by those whose projects they are describing; we don't need more case studies written in turgid bureaucratic or social-science jargon.)

In addition to true and readable stories, we need more face-to-face interchange. Crowded World Conservation Congresses and their 90-minute workshops serve important purposes. But small meetings that bring together carefully selected leaders and experts for several days in a relaxed atmosphere are much more effective ways of getting at the unfettered truth, talking over new ideas, and forging the personal relationships on which our networks depend. So are thoughtfully planned international visits and exchanges.

IUCN, working through its member organizations, commissions, and staff, is in a unique position to raise standards for case studies, and encourage and facilitate more small-scale, face-to-face interchange.

Small catalytic organizations such as the California Institute of Public Affairs, an active member of IUCN since 1980, play an important role in exploring new ideas and convening representatives of diverse groups to discuss them.

No doubt InterClimate Network will have much to contribute to the dialogue about what works once it has an opportunity to evaluate its pioneering projects in India, Kenya, and the United Kingdom.

## **Notes**

I want to thank Dan Mazmanian for helping to design the workshop and for moderating it; the six panelists for their contributions; Adrian Phillips for his comments on a draft of this paper; and Barclays for its financial support of the workshop through InterClimate Network. I alone am responsible for this report.

1. See Ted Trzyna, ed. 2005. *The Urban Imperative: Urban Outreach Strategies for Protected Area Agencies*. California Institute of Public Affairs, Sacramento, for IUCN and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy. [www.InterEnvironment.org/pa/papers2.htm](http://www.InterEnvironment.org/pa/papers2.htm). See also additional material on the Cities Task Force Web site, [www.citiesandconservation.org](http://www.citiesandconservation.org).

2. Eric Klinenberg. 2002. *Heat Wave: A Social Autopsy of Disaster*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

3. Malcolm Gladwell. 2002. Political heat. *The New Yorker*. 12 August: 78. [www.gladwell.com/2002/index.html](http://www.gladwell.com/2002/index.html).

## **Workshop sponsors**

California Institute of Public Affairs (CIPA, [www.cipahq.org](http://www.cipahq.org)), an IUCN member. CIPA proposed the workshop and was responsible for it. It provides the secretariat for the IUCN Cities Task Force, as it has for many other IUCN activities, and is a partner organization in InterClimate Network. InterEnvironment is CIPA's international program.

InterClimate Network ([www.InterClimate.org](http://www.InterClimate.org)) a new UK-based international initiative for education and local community involvement in climate change solutions.

IUCN Cities Task Force ([www.citiesandconservation.org](http://www.citiesandconservation.org)), part of IUCN's World Commission on Protected Areas. The task force is concerned with implementing a broad-ranging IUCN resolution on cities and conservation.

## **Workshop and press conference panelists**

*Note: In inviting panelists, emphasis was given to the five countries and regions in which InterClimate Network will be working initially:*

- *India (State of Maharashtra)*
- *Kenya (Nairobi, Nakuru, and other areas)*
- *South Africa (Cape region)*
- *United Kingdom (England)*
- *USA (State of California)*

*Workshop chair:* Ted Trzyna (USA), President, California Institute of Public Affairs; Leader, IUCN Cities Task Force; IUCN Senior Adviser, Cities and Conservation; former IUCN Councillor and commission chair; Senior Adviser and steering committee member, InterClimate Network

*Workshop moderator:* Dan Mazmanian (USA), Professor, School of Policy, Planning, and Development, and Director of the Bedrosian Center on Governance and Public Enterprise, University of Southern California; Senior Associate, California Institute of Public Affairs

John Davidson (UK), Executive Director, InterClimate Network; Deputy Leader, IUCN Cities Task Force; Senior Associate, California Institute of Public Affairs

Christine Farnish (UK), Director of Public Policy and Sustainability, Barclays

Ali A. Kaka (Kenya), Director, East African Wild Life Society; Regional Vice Chair for East Africa, IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas

Barney Kgope (South Africa), Principal Scientist, Global Change Research Group, South African National Biodiversity Institute

K. Vijaya Lakshmi (India), Vice President, Development Alternatives

Linda McMillan (USA), business consultant; recreation advocate; President, Mountain Protection Commission, International Mountaineering and Climbing Federation; Deputy Vice Chair, Mountains Biome, IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas; member, IUCN Cities Task Force

Adrian Phillips (UK), leader in international and British conservation organizations; former IUCN Councillor and Chair, World Commission on Protected Areas; member, IUCN Cities Task Force

Lord Paul Tyler (UK), Member of the British House of Lords