

Annex A

BirdLife International–Rio Tinto Partnership

Alliance basics

Established: 2001

Managers:

At BirdLife International: Jonathan Stacey, manager of the alliance with Rio Tinto

At Rio Tinto: Sarah Basden, manager of alliances with NGOs

The partners

Rio Tinto

The Rio Tinto Group is composed of Rio Tinto plc (headquarters in London) and Rio Tinto Limited (headquarters in Melbourne, Australia). When we refer to Rio Tinto, we refer to the group combining both structures.

Rio Tinto is a world leader in finding, mining and processing the earth's mineral resources (Rio Tinto, *The Way We Work*, 2003). The group's main products are aluminium, copper, diamonds, energy products (i.e., coal, uranium), gold, industrial minerals (i.e., borax, titanium dioxide, salt, talc, zircon) and iron ore.

Rio Tinto is active in more than 40 countries, with a strong presence in Australia and North America and important operations in Latin America, Asia, Europe and South Africa.

Turnover: \$7.3 billion USD in 2006³⁶⁴

Employees: 35,000 in 2006³⁶⁵

Partnerships with other NGOs: Rio Tinto manages six partnerships in the United Kingdom, six in Australia and two in the United States.³⁶⁶ These include alliances with the following NGOs:

- Earthwatch (since 1996, in particular within the framework of the Corporate Environmental Responsibility Group)
- Fauna and Flora International (since 1999)
- Kew Gardens, London (since 2000)
- Eden Project, Cornwall, UK (since 2002)

BirdLife International

BirdLife is a network of more than 100 autonomous environmental NGOs present in more than 100 countries. This network is managed by the international office of BirdLife, located in Cambridge, UK. BirdLife is an authority on endangered species of birds, and is one of the most important NGOs in terms of biodiversity conservation.

The goals of BirdLife are as follows³⁶⁷:

- to prevent the extinction of all bird species
- to maintain, and if possible, to improve the conservation status of all bird species
- to protect and, where necessary, to improve and extend important bird sites and habitats
- to help, through birds, to conserve biodiversity and improve the quality of life of people
- to integrate bird conservation and sustainable development.

By focusing on birds and their habitats, BirdLife helps improve the quality of life for birds, wildlife in general and people.

Partnerships with other companies:

- British Petroleum (BP), London (since 1990).
- RMC Group, Egham, UK: The partnership with RMC Group was less strategic than that developed with Rio Tinto.³⁶⁸ RMC Group was acquired by CEMEX in 2005.
- CEMEX, Monterrey, Mexico (since 2007).

History of the partnership

It was Rio Tinto who initiated the partnership.

In 1996, Rio Tinto conducted research on the strategic issues which could affect the group's commercial perspectives in the medium-term and long-term. One of the questions raised by this study was 'What do our stakeholders expect of us?' Concern for biodiversity was one of the aspects brought to light by this study. Society's expectations concerning the mining industry include the reduction of its ecological impact, support for local development and upkeep of cultural and historical values.³⁶⁹

Rio Tinto was aware of the existence of the partnership between BirdLife International and British Petroleum (BP) and the NGO's sound reputation. The Rio Tinto Group recognised that an alliance of this type could be a relevant tool for achieving their own environmental goals.³⁷⁰

The negotiations lasted 18 months, and the alliance began formally in January 2001 (the first memorandum of agreement being signed in June 2001 for a duration of five years) and was then renewed in 2006.

Partnership goals

This is a complex and exhaustive alliance. BirdLife intervenes at all levels, from strategy to operational activities. The alliance seeks the following³⁷¹:

- to have an influence on Rio Tinto's practices of land stewardship
- to help the Rio Tinto Group achieve its commitments in terms of sustainable development
- to improve the capabilities and environmental awareness of Rio Tinto employees and other stakeholders
- to educate local communities, since it is from them that Rio Tinto draws its human resources
- to embed the concept of sustainable development in the mindset of all Rio Tinto's stakeholders.

Working with companies which pollute is an opportunity to bring about changes in their practices. [...] Our idea is to develop more

partnerships with companies as a tool to protect the environment. (Jonathan Stacey, BirdLife, Interview on 17 January 2006)

Rio Tinto and BirdLife share the goal of integrating biodiversity conservation into the core business activities of the company.

The partnership seeks to demonstrate the benefits of cross-sector partnerships and to promote best practices in order to conserve biodiversity and the environment in the international mining sector. Our activities show that a proactive and integrated approach will ensure sustainable and durable benefits for birds, biodiversity, the industrial community and other relevant stakeholders.

Partnership activities

The partnership promotes biodiversity conservation through diverse activities:

- promoting the public's interest in birds to make them aware of environmental problems – This is done especially through annual birdwatching events on Rio Tinto's operational sites.
- identifying and developing conservation projects relevant to mining operations
- advancing the debate on corporate responsibility through the demonstration of the partnership's success.

Birdwatching events have grown from around 20 events with 330 participants in 2000 to 42 events with 1,800 participants in 2003 (BirdLife International–Rio Tinto Partnership, 2004).

The conservation projects, which are developed jointly by Rio Tinto operational units and local BirdLife partners, are varied in nature, depending on the priorities, capabilities and the local culture of both organisations. Adapting these initiatives to the needs and capabilities of both organisations is the key to the success of the projects.

These projects include development of ecotourism in Richards Bay, South Africa, protection of the Damara Tern in Namibia, school wildlife education projects in Zimbabwe, biodiversity site identification and nature centres in the United States, and bird surveys relevant to Rio Tinto's activities in Australia.

Annex B

Lafarge–World Wide Fund for Nature Partnership

Alliance basics

Established: 2000

Managers:

At World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF): Luc Giraud-Guigues, manager of the alliance with Lafarge

At Lafarge: co-managed by Olivier Luneau, manager of Sustainable Development and Public Affairs, and the Director of Communication of the Lafarge Group

The partners

Lafarge³⁷²

The Lafarge Group, whose headquarters is in Paris, France, is the world's leader as a source of construction materials. Lafarge occupies leading positions in each of its activities: n°1 in cement in the world, n° 1 in granulates, n°3 in concrete and n°3 in gypsum. The Lafarge Group is present in 70 countries on the American continent, Europe, Africa and Asia.

Turnover: 17 billion euros in 2006, around 22 billion 450 thousand US dollars (31 December 2006 rate)

Employees: 71,000 (2006)

Partnerships with other NGOs:

- **Habitat for Humanity** (since 2005): The two structures are committed to working globally together to help underprivileged families build and renovate simple, decent houses. Habitat contributes

the expertise and the know-how. Lafarge contributes the materials and voluntary collaborators to participate on the sites. The partnership agreement lasts 5 years and involves work in 25 countries.

- **CARE (since 2003):** HIV/AIDS is widespread in the developing countries where Lafarge is strongly established. Through its association with CARE, the Lafarge Group is involved in a vast public health operation.

World Wide Fund for Nature

Established in 1961, WWF, whose international headquarters is in Geneva, Switzerland, operates in more than 100 countries with the aim of creating a future where people and nature can live in harmony.³⁷³ WWF currently finances around 2,000 environmental projects and employs 4,000 people.

The goals of WWF are as follows:

- to conserve the planet's biological diversity
- to ensure renewable natural resources are used in sustainable ways
- to promote reduction in pollution and changes in consumption methods.

Partnerships with other companies³⁷⁴:

- **HSBC³⁷⁵ (since 2002):** The goal of the alliance is to protect the planet's freshwater systems (collaborating presently in Brazil, China, Mexico, Great Britain and the United States).
- **Nokia (since 2003):** Nokia and WWF began working together in 2003 to make company staff aware of environmental problems. In June 2006, Nokia and WWF extended the areas of activity of their partnership, having as their goal, apart from the environmental awareness building of their staff, the identification of innovative solutions to increase Nokia's environmental performance and to support WWF's conservation goals. In addition, WWF supports Nokia in three areas: energy issues, substance management and recycling. Nokia also pilots the concept One Planet Business, which aims to reduce the environmental impact of companies.
- **Hewlett-Packard (since 2006):** The collaboration between WWF and Hewlett-Packard (HP) seeks to develop pioneer initiatives to

combat the causes and consequences of climate change. HP is committed to reducing its carbon dioxide emissions by 15 per cent between 2006 and 2010, promoting the adoption of best practices and using HP technology to support conservation efforts around the globe.

- Coca-Cola Company (since 2007): WWF and the Coca-Cola Company signed an agreement in 2007 aiming to protect the planet's water resources, increase efficiency in the use of water resources in the company and protect species living around the most important freshwater basins in the world.

History of the partnership

In 1999, Christopher Boyd, then Lafarge's director of Environmental and Public Affairs, approached WWF's Forest Programme. At the beginning, this collaboration was envisaged as a communication operation. The idea was to plant a tree for every employee in the year 2000. The fact that it was a forestry programme was not by chance; this is the WWF programme which had the most contact and most experience with companies. WWF did not have specific goals in mind. The alliance was based on support for the forestry programme (i.e., tree replanting) and raising funds.

The negotiation of this first part of the partnership took about one year and was formalised in March 2000.

Once the initial agreement was signed, WWF's Climate Change Programme intervened; for them, Lafarge, a big polluter in the cement sector, could not have an alliance with the WWF if there was no goal involving a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions.

New negotiations took place, which lasted 18 months, giving rise to the second part of the collaboration, which was formalised in November 2001. It planned a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions and established guidelines for the rehabilitation of quarries.

Partnership goals

Since its beginning, the main goals of the partnership have been to reduce Lafarge's carbon dioxide emission and protect biodiversity through the rehabilitation of quarries.

The 2005–2007 agreement adds two complex issues: sustainable construction and persistent pollutants. For WWF, one derived goal

is also, through Lafarge's example, to lead the cement and aggregate sector to change its practices and adopt more sustainable policies.

Partnership activities³⁷⁶

Lafarge committed itself to reducing its carbon dioxide emissions per tonne of cement produced by 20 per cent by 2010, below its 1990 emissions levels. In developing countries where it has a quick growth strategy, the Lafarge Group has committed to improving the environmental standards of its factories and to promoting the development of sustainable construction programmes.

Lafarge and WWF have decided to be ambassadors among all construction actors to promote solutions and products favouring sustainable construction. This involves reducing the environmental impact of a building and its materials.

Lafarge and WWF have made the commitment to implement a worldwide measurement and management system for biodiversity. The methodology, set up in the Mannersdorf quarry in Austria, is presently being tested in France, in China and in Italy. The aim is to use this system in 25 per cent of the 800 Lafarge sites.

In 2007, the partners saw a strengthening of local partnerships between the Lafarge units and the WWF units in the field.

In January 2008, Lafarge and WWF decided not to renew their partnership agreement. Among other stumbling blocks, WWF was not satisfied with Lafarge's carbon dioxide emissions. But at the beginning of 2009, Lafarge announced that was a -10 it had diminished its carbon dioxide emissions by 12.5 per cent in industrialised countries between 1990 and 2008 (the initial goal % between 1990 and 2010), and that it had diminished by 18.4 per cent its net emissions per ton of cement, worldwide. This is satisfying for WWF, without whom Lafarge would not have gone such a long way. Furthermore, Lafarge's results are pushing the cement industry to follow suit (*Libération*, 11 April 2009).

These good results brought WWF and Lafarge to renew their partnership in April 2009. This new agreement puts the emphasis on Lafarge's water consumption and on the number of quarries rehabilitated (the aim is to rehabilitate 85% of them) (*Libération*, 11 April 2009).

Annex C

Agrupación Sierra Madre–CEMEX Partnership

Alliance basics

Established: 1992

Managers:

At Agrupación Sierra Madre (ASM): Patricio Robles Gil, president of ASM

At CEMEX: Armando J. Garcia, vice-president of CEMEX, assisted by Oscar Infante, environmental consultant of the Biodiversity Vice-Presidency of the CEMEX Group

The partners

CEMEX

Established in Mexico in 1906, CEMEX began as a local family business. Following rapid expansion in the 1990s, CEMEX today is the world's leader in ready-to-use cement and one of the largest manufacturers and world traders of cement and granulates.

The CEMEX Group, with its headquarters in Monterrey, in northern Mexico, is present in more than 50 countries in America, Europe, Africa, the Middle East and Asia and has commercial relations with more than 100 nations.³⁷⁷

Turnover: 16 billion dollars US³⁷⁸

Employees: 50,000

Partnerships with other NGOs:-

- Conservation International, Washington, DC
- World Resources Institute, Washington, DC

- BirdLife International, United Kingdom
- Pronatura, Mexico

Agrupación Sierra Madre

Agrupación Sierra Madre (ASM), whose headquarters is in Mexico City, is a Mexican environmental NGO established in 1989 by Patricio Robles Gil, who is still president of ASM today.

The goal of ASM is to develop environmental awareness and education among the various sectors of society in order to promote/protect Mexico's ecological wealth and to offer solutions for more sustainable development.

From its onset, ASM launched a campaign aimed at linking the private sector with NGOs and the academic sector. This is how Unidos para la Conservación was born, a campaign which helps support Mexican NGOs and educational institutions with financial resources, equipment and communication material. The success of this initiative led to the establishment of Unidos para la Conservación as a non-profit association in 1992. It contributes to the conservation of Mexico's natural resources through the drafting, financing, administration, promotion and dissemination of all types of environmental projects.

The two associations Agrupación Sierra Madre and Unidos para la Conservación work together. Employing eight people, today they form one of the main Mexican environmental NGOs (<http://www.unidosparalaconservacion.org/>).

History of the partnership

In the early 1990s, Patricio Robles Gil sold illustrated calendars to businesses to raise funds for his NGO. One day he left a calendar on the desk of Lorenzo Sambrano, CEO of the CEMEX Group, who asked to meet Patricio Robles Gil. That was in 1992.

Lorenzo Sambrano had a clear vision of what he wanted. He explained to the president of Agrupación Sierra Madre, 'My European associates are asking me to do something for the environment. I would like you to help me design our environmental commitment.'

Lorenzo Sambrano's ambition was to see two elements: on the one hand, environmental education publications and, on the other hand, land purchases for *land stewardship*. Creating books was relatively

easy for Agrupación Sierra Madre, since Patricio Robles Gil was an outstanding photographer and already had experience in this field. However, purchasing land and land management were much more complex areas in which neither Patricio Robles Gil nor CEMEX had any experience.

Armando J. Garcia, CEMEX's vice-president and development manager, learned that Lorenzo Sambrano wanted to buy land to demonstrate CEMEX's environmental commitment. Garcia was interested by this project, one that he would personally become involved in later.

Thus, initially the alliance between Agrupación Sierra Madre and CEMEX was based on the excellent relationship between Patricio Robles Gil, on the one hand, and Lorenzo Sambrano and Armando J. Garcia on the other hand.

In 2007, Patricio Robles Gil decided to withdraw from the alliance on a personal level. The work between CEMEX and Agrupación Sierra Madre would continue, but Robles Gil wanted to dedicate more time to the dissemination, promotion and replication of his experience with CEMEX, as well as his job as environmental photographer.

Partnership goals

- To develop the environmental culture, through publications.
- To collaborate in the conservation of biodiversity, whether through more sustainable quarry management or through land stewardship – CEMEX admits to be seeking 'proactive leadership' in environmental conservation.³⁷⁹

Partnership activities³⁸⁰

Since 1993, ASM and CEMEX have been publishing one environmental book per year as a CEMEX collection, extraordinarily illustrated, which is recognised today by the BBC and other organisations as one of the nature book collections which has left its mark on the last decade.

Moreover, ASM and CEMEX have initiated and managed several environmental projects together, in particular the reintroduction of the American bighorn sheep (*borrego cimarrón*) in northern Mexico (Coahuila region).

But by far the most emblematic project of the alliance is that of Maderas del Carmen. Maderas del Carmen is a *flora and fauna protection area* (Áreas de Protección de Flora y Fauna) created in 1994 by the Mexican government. In 1999, CEMEX bought land inside and around this area (55,000 ha, 60% inside the Maderas del Carmen protection area). Since that date, CEMEX has acquired more than 120,000 ha and has signed environmental conservation agreements with the owners of adjacent land corresponding to a further 60,000 ha.

The project, officially initiated in 2001, aims to conserve what is one of the last natural sanctuaries of North America. (In fact, entry into El Carmen is only authorised for a small number of people, for the purpose of scientific studies.) Maderas del Carmen is home to more than 500 species of plants (many of which are endemic), more than 400 species of birds, 60 species of mammals and 52 reptiles/amphibians. One of its emblematic inhabitants is the black bear. Maderas del Carmen is situated in the Chihuahuan Desert, which is considered by WWF as one of 20 priority ecoregions in the world.

Over these years since 2001, not only has emphasis been put on the protection of existing flora and fauna, but also on the reintroduction of the American bighorn sheep and the elk.

In 2005, Maderas del Carmen was designated a *wilderness area*, bearing in mind that there are only 11 in the world and it is the only one located in Latin America, with the project of making it a trans-border wilderness area by joining it to the Big Bend National Park in Texas.

As Patricio Robles Gil has said, Maderas del Carmen is a 'sexy' project, which attracts attention. He hopes to use it to show that companies, apart from conducting their activities in a responsible way, should also be aware that they have financial resources to acquire and protect territories with a high ecological value.

Notes

Prologue

1. As defined by the Brundtland Report, *Our Common Future*, published in 1987 by the World Commission on Environment and Development.
2. Point of view expressed during interviews with Luc Giraud-Guigues (WWF), Olivier Luneau (Lafarge) and Patricio Robles Gil (Agrupación Sierra Madre).
3. Heap, 2000, p. 1.
4. I am referring here to a large public in terms of number, including all social levels and ages.

General Introduction

5. Halal, 1993; Heap, 2000; Tennyson et al., 2002; World Economic Forum, 2005.
6. See Gray, 1989.
7. In general, research on NGO–business alliances assumes this point of view and considers the development of alliances as necessary and inexorable (see Murphy and Bendell, 1997; Austin, 1999; Bendell, 2000; Heap, 2000).
8. Austin (1999) defines the level of integration according to the partners' degree of convergence and the affinity of their goals.
9. Many authors have examined the study of inter-firm alliances. Although similar statistics do not exist for NGO–business alliances, the available data illustrate the difficulty of achieving successful institutional collaborations: Dyer and colleagues (2001) indicate that 50% of alliances fail; Hitt and colleagues (2000) point to a high level of dissatisfaction related to the results; Duysters and Heimeriks (2003) report that most literature estimates indicate failure rates of 40–70%; Geringer (1991) puts the failures at 35–70% of all alliances.
10. Lane and DiStefano, 1992; Duysters and Heimeriks, 2003; Zeng and Chen, 2003.
11. Understood as 'this type of cross-sector alliance'.
12. For further details about these alliances, see the annexes.
13. One of the world's leaders in the supply of cement and aggregates.
14. Small Mexican NGO focused on environmental education and company involvement in the protection of the environment.
15. World leader in the supply of cement and aggregates.
16. When it was founded, WWF stood for World Wildlife Fund. In the 1980s, the name became World Wide Fund for Nature to better express the

expanding activities of the organisation. Still, the US and Canada retained the old name.

17. One of the largest environmental NGOs in the world.
18. A mining and exploration group.
19. A large international NGO specialising in birds, the environment and human activities.
20. WBCSD is an association of multinational companies whose aim is to promote sustainable development in business. The headquarters is in Geneva, Switzerland.

1 Corporate–NGO Alliances: Essentially Strategic Choices

21. Murphy and Bendell, 1997; Heap, 1998, 2000; Bendell and Murphy, 1999; Tennyson et al., 2002.
22. Murphy and Bendell, 1997; Heap, 1998, 2000; Bendell and Murphy, 1999; Bendell, 2000; Arts B., 2002; IBLF, 2004; Sustainability, 2003.
23. This is the definition given by the Brundtland Commission report (or Brundtland Report), *Our Common Future*, published in 1987 by the World Commission on Environment and Development (convened by the United Nations).
24. Heap, 1998; Enderle, 2000.
25. Blumberg P.I. (1975), *The megacorporation in American society: The scope of corporate power*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA. Taken from Chauveau and Rosé, 2003.
26. Halal, 1993; Murphy and Bendell 1997; Bendell 2000; Heap, 2000; Marsden and Andriof, 1998; Chauveau and Rosé, 2003; Saddler, 2003; IBLF, no date.
27. Stafford and Hartman, 1996; Fowler, 2004b.
28. Murphy and Bendell, 1997; Bendell 2000; Heap, 2000; Chauveau and Rosé, 2003.
29. UNCTAD (1996), *Self-regulation of environmental management: An analysis of guidelines set by world industry associations for their member firms*, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, Geneva. Taken from Murphy and Bendell, 1997.
30. Taken from Chauveau and Rosé, 2003.
31. The poll was carried out in May 1999 by Environics International, in collaboration with the Prince of Wales International Business Leaders Forum and the Conference Board. This was the biggest opinion poll in the world ever carried out on the evolution of the role of companies: 25,000 people interviewed in 23 countries and on 6 continents (Manitoba Voluntary Sector Initiative, 2000).
32. Halal, 1993; Murphy and Bendell, 1997; Marsden and Andriof, 1998.
33. Heap, 2000.
34. PNUE/UNEP Conference (1995, October), *Programme des Nations Unies pour l'Environnement/United Nations Environment Programme*, Massachusetts, USA. Taken from Murphy and Bendell, 1997.

35. Chauveau and Rosé, 2003.
36. Saddler, 2003.
37. This is a pact by which businesses commit themselves to aligning their operations and strategies to ten universally accepted principles in the areas of human rights, labour standards, environment and anti-corruption. The World Pact, which brings together thousands of participants from more than 100 countries, aims primarily to promote the social legitimacy of companies and markets. For further information see the United Nations Global Compact web site: www.globalcompact.org.
38. Murphy and Bendell, 1997; Bendell and Murphy, 1999.
39. Taken from Stark, 1993.
40. IBLF, no date.
41. Tennyson et al., 2002.
42. Chauveau and Rosé, 2003.
43. Sarah Basden, Rio Tinto, 14 December 2005 interview.
44. Stafford and Hartman, 1996; Murphy and Bendell, 1997.
45. Stafford and Hartman, 1996; Chauveau and Rosé, 2003.
46. Stafford and Hartman, 1996; Murphy and Bendell, 1997; Murphy and Bendell, 1999.
47. Bendell, 1998.
48. Tennyson et al., 2002; SustainAbility et al., 2003.
49. Taken from Murphy and Bendell, 1997, p. 51.
50. Korten, 1987.
51. SustainAbility et al., 2003; Fowler, 2004b.
52. Murphy and Bendell, 1997; Bryer and Magrath, 1999; Man-Com Consulting, 2002; Fowler, 2004b.
53. SustainAbility et al., 2003.
54. Stafford and Hartman, 1996; Lindenberg, 2001.
55. Elbers, 2004; Heap, 2000.
56. Porter, 1996.
57. Botkin and Matthews, 1992; Bleeke and Ernst, 1996.
58. Jones and Wicks, 1999.
59. Fowler, 2004b.
60. This theory is based on the idea that an organisation cannot function in an isolated way but must take into account all the actors who may affect, positively or negatively, the organisation's operations. These may be internal stakeholders (e.g., employees, board of directors, leaders) or external stakeholders (e.g., suppliers, customers, the media, civil society, legislators). We will come back to this notion and study it in depth in Chapter 6.
61. Heath et al., 1988.
62. Freeman, R.E. (1984), *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*, Pitman, Boston.
63. Cowe, 2004.
64. UNEP (2002), *Industry as a partner for sustainable development: 10 years after Rio, the UNEP assessment* [Summary report], United Nations Environment Programme. Taken from Chauveau and Rosé, 2003.

65. Communications Group, 1997, *Putting the pressure on: The rise of pressure activism in Europe*, Communications Group plc, London.
66. Peters G. and Enderle G. 1998, *A strange affair: The emerging relationship between NGOs and transnational companies*, PricewaterhouseCoopers, London.
67. Waddock, 1991; Stark, 1993; Marsden and Andriof, 1998; Bas, 2002; Caulkin and Collins, 2003; Chauveau and Rosé, 2003; IBLF, no date.
68. Murphy and Bendell, 1997.
69. Murphy and Bendell, 1997; Marsden and Andriof, 1998; Tennyson and Wild, 2000.
70. SustainAbility, 2003.
71. SustainAbility et al., 2003.
72. SustainAbility, 2003.
73. Murphy and Bendell, 1997; Bendell, 2000; Heap, 2000; Saddler, 2003; Seb Beloe in SustainAbility et al., 2003; IBLF, no date.
74. Bryer and Magrath, 1999; SustainAbility et al., 2003.
75. Seb Beloe, SustainAbility, in Cowe, 2004.

2 Alliance Motivations

76. Stafford and Hartman, 1996; Heap, 1998, 2000; Austin, 2000; Manitoba Voluntary Sector Initiative, 2000; Houlder, 2001; Mach, 2001; Elbers, 2004.
77. Stafford and Hartman, 1996; Heap, 1998; Austin, 2000; Hutchinson, 2000; World Economic Forum, 2005.
78. Stafford and Hartman, 1996; Hounsell, 1997; Heap, 1998, 2000; Houlder, 2001; Elbers, 2004.
79. In the early 1990s, Greenpeace brought together researchers who specialised in the use of propane and butane as cooling agents and formed a partnership with the East German company DKK Scharfenstein. From this alliance emerged 'Greenfreeze', a cooling technology free of any chemical products which destroy the ozone layer. Some years later, Greenfreeze technology was marketed by the biggest European refrigerator brands and became established in Europe and other parts of the world. See <http://archive.greenpeace.org/ozone/greenfreeze>.
80. See Bas, 2002.
81. See Webb, T., 2005.
82. Hounsell, 1997; Austin, 2000; Elbers, 2004.
83. Stafford and Hartman, 1996; Hounsell, 1997.
84. Austin, 2000.
85. Murphy and Bendell, 1997; Waddell, 1999.
86. Bendell, no date.
87. Hounsell, 1997; Murphy and Bendell, 1997; Heap, 1998; Austin, 2000; Elbers, 2004.
88. Murphy and Bendell, 1997; Heap, 1998; Austin, 2000; Chauveau and Rosé, 2003.

89. Stafford and Hartman, 1996; Manitoba Voluntary Sector Initiative, 2000.
90. Bendell and Murphy, 1999; Elbers, 2004.
91. Chauveau, 2003.
92. Stafford and Hartman, 1996; Ottman and Polonsky, 1998.
93. Laville, 2002.
94. French NGO established in 1995, to promote Agenda 21 in France (an action program established at the 1992 Rio Summit, Rio de Janeiro).
95. Taken from Man-Com Consulting, 2002.
96. Questionnaire was sent out for this study in 2005 to the members of the WBCSD to understand the motivations of companies.
97. NGOs' broad networks enable them to identify political and social trends well before companies are able.
98. Murphy and Bendell, 1997; Waddell, 1999; Hutchinson, 2000; Houlder, 2001.
99. Heap, 2000.
100. Manitoba Voluntary Sector Initiative, 2000.
101. Waddell, 1999; Heap, 2000.
102. Heap, 1998, 2000.
103. Dean and Cassidy, 1990; Botkin and Matthews, 1992.
104. Heath et al., 1988.
105. In 1995, Shell UK received authorisation from the British government to sink its Brent Spar oil platform, which had become obsolete, in the North Sea. This decision led to an outcry of indignation. Greenpeace activists began to occupy the platform, and the German government lodged a complaint at the G7 Summit after Shell had begun to tow the platform to its immersion site. Shell saw a sharp fall in revenue, especially in Germany where 50 Shell stations were damaged by protesters.
106. Taken from Heap, 2000.
107. Stafford and Hartman, 1996.
108. The Canadian Council for International Co-operation (CCIC, 2001) has identified the development of ecotourism projects as one of the important examples of NGO–business collaboration.
109. Yaziji, 2004.
110. Bendell, no date.
111. Hounsell, 1997.
112. Hartman and Stafford, 1997; Prickett, 2003.
113. H. John Heinz III Center for Science, Economics, and the Environment, taken from Hartman and Stafford, 1997 – see also www.heinzctr.org.
114. Heap, 2000.
115. Heap, 1998; Yaziji, 2004.
116. Stafford and Hartman, 1996; Manitoba Voluntary Sector Initiative, 2000; Yaziji, 2004.
117. Smith, 1994; Stafford and Hartmann, 1996.
118. Smith, 1994; Stafford and Hartman, 1996.
119. Zadek, 1999.
120. Heap, 1998.

121. Stafford and Hartman, 1996; Dees, 1998; Heap, 2000.
122. Drucker, 1989.
123. Lane J. and Saxon Harold S. (1993), *Corporate philanthropy in Britain: Research on the voluntary sector*, West Malling, Kent, UK. Taken from Heap, 1998.
124. Marquardt, 2000b.
125. Hutchinson, 2000.
126. Austin, 1999.
127. Luc Giraud-Guigues, WWF, alliance manager, 29 March 2006 interview.
128. Christopher Boyd held this post at the time of writing Laville's book. He was involved in the origin of the partnership with WWF. He was then substituted by Olivier Luneau, who maintains the same type of position (6 December 2005 interview).
129. Laville, 2002.
130. This can also be said of *cause-related marketing*, which, in my opinion, is not really a strategic alliance as it does not engage partners on the basis of common goals and a common desire to change the role of the company in society. The partners enter such partnerships to meet their own individual goals, but there are no common goals.
131. Austin, 2000.
132. Stafford and Hartman, 1996; Heap, 2000.
133. Yaziji, 2004.
134. Elbers, 2004.
135. ARCO (acronym for Atlantic Richfield Company) was a North American oil company created in 1966. In 2000, ARCO was bought out by BP (formerly the British Petroleum Company), its official name becoming BP West Coast Products LLC.
136. Smith, 1994.
137. Hartman and Stafford, 1997.
138. Murphy and Bendell, 1997; Heap, 2000; Elbers, 2004.
139. Robert, 2005.
140. Stafford and Hartman, 1996; Heap, 2000.
141. Heap, 2000.
142. Ethical Corporation, 2006.

3 Typologies of Allies and Alliances

143. Mach, 2001.
144. Marquardt, 2000a, 2000b.
145. Fineman S. and Clarke K. (1996), Green stakeholders: Industry interpretations and response, *Journal of Management Studies*, vol. 33, n° 6, pp. 715–30. Taken from Shah, 2001.
146. Simon Zadek is a consultant and expert on corporate social responsibility and NGO–business alliances. Mark Lee was, at the time of these declarations, director of ‘governance and responsibility’ of Business for

- Social Responsibility in the United States, before becoming executive director of the consultancy firm SustainAbility in December 2005.
147. Zadek S., Pruzan P.M.; Evans R. and the New Economics Foundation (1997), *Building corporate accountability: Emerging practices in social and ethical accounting, auditing, and reporting*, Earthscan, London. Taken from Marquardt, 2000b.
 148. Austin, 1999.
 149. Luc Giraud-Guigues, WWF, manager of the Lafarge alliance, 2 December 2005 interview.
 150. Heap, 2000; Mach, 2001; Assadourian, 2005.
 151. Questionnaire was sent to members of the WBCSD in France, Great Britain and Mexico in 2005.
 152. In 2002, the Body Shop and Greenpeace International combined forces to carry out an international awareness campaign on climate change and to encourage consumers to move to renewable energies. The campaign came to a close in August 2002, at the Johannesburg Summit, calling on political leaders to give everyone on the planet the chance to choose renewable energies between then and 2012. (Source: web site of the Body Shop, www.thebodyshop.com).
 153. Questionnaire was sent to members of the World Business Council for Sustainable Development in France, Great Britain and Mexico in 2005.
 154. Taken from Robert, 2005.
 155. The Maderas del Carmen Project – see Annex C for a history of this alliance.

Introduction to Part II

156. See Stafford and Hartman, 1996; Hartman and Stafford, 1997; Murphy and Bendell, 1997; Austin, 1999; Bendell, 2000; Heap, 2000.
157. Web site of Barometer Surveys, www.barometersurveys.com.
158. Contractor and Lorange, 1988; Lane and DiStefano, 1992; Lorange and Roos, 1992.
159. Draulans et al., 2003.
160. Yan Cimon (2003) takes this remark from Devlin G. and Bleackley M. (1988), *Strategic alliances: Guidelines for success*, *Long Range Planning*, vol. 21, n° 5, pp. 18–23.
161. Here, alliances should be understood as ‘this type of cross-sector alliance’.

4 Symmetries versus Asymmetries in Corporate–NGO Alliances

162. Parker and Selsky, 2004; World Economic Forum, 2005.
163. Dean and Cassidy, 1990; Heap, 1998, 2000; Elbers, 2004; Robert, 2005.

164. Canadian Council for International Co-operation (CCIC), 2001.
165. Heap, 1998.
166. Cimon, 2003.
167. Margoluis et al., 2000.
168. According to Mélanie Rein, Senior Researcher at the Partnering Initiative (a project set up by the International Business Leaders Forum and the University of Cambridge, to systematise and disseminate knowledge about cross-sector partnerships); see Ethical Corporation, 2006.
169. Austin, 1999.
170. See Chapter 2.
171. Saxton, 1997; Gomes-Casseres, 1998; Beugelsdijk et al., 2004.
172. Cimon, 2003.
173. Heimeriks and Schreiner (2002) refer especially to Johnson J.L., Cullen J.B., Sakano T. and Takenouchi H., (1996), Setting the stage for trust and strategic integration in Japanese–U.S. cooperative alliances, *Journal of International Business Studies*, vol. 27, n° 5, pp. 981–1004.
174. Cimon bases this on the definition given by Oliver (1990).
175. Hartman and Stafford, 1997; Heap, 2000; Elbers 2004; Waddell et al., 2004.
176. Ashman D. (2001), Civil society collaboration with business: Bringing empowerment back in, *World Development*, vol. 29, n° 7, pp. 1097–113. Taken from Elbers, 2004.
177. Arts, 2002; Parker and Selsky, 2004.
178. Waddell, 2000; Parker and Selsky, 2004.
179. Ashman, 2000; SustainAbility, 2003.
180. Dussauge, Garrette and Mitchell (1999, 2004) base their theory on a typology previously proposed [Hennart J.-F. (1988), A transaction cost theory of equity joint ventures, *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 9, n° 4, pp. 361–74.], which stipulates that alliances are either *scale alliances* (i.e., partners contribute similar resources to obtain scale economies) or *complementary alliances* (i.e., partners combine complementary resources and competencies).
181. Das and Teng, 2001; Cimon, 2003.
182. Fox, 2001; Parker and Selsky, 2004; Robert, 2005; World Economic Forum, 2005.
183. Austin, 1999, 2000; Elbers, 2004.
184. World Economic Forum, 2005.
185. Waddell, 2000; Parker and Selsky, 2004.
186. Iyer, 2002.
187. A Canadian NGO.
188. Ogilvie and Everhardus, 2004.
189. Schneidewind and Petersen, 2000.
190. Schein E.H. (1996), Culture: The missing concept in organization studies, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 41, pp. 229–40. Taken from the Value Based Management web site, www.valuebasedmanagement.net.

191. Schein E.H. (1992), *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd ed.), Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
192. Doz, 1996; Maynard, 1996; Dyer and Singh, 1998; Faulkner and De Rond, 2000; Heimeriks and Schreiner, 2002; Delerue, 2004.
193. Hartman and Stafford (1997) take this comment from a study conducted by Milne G.R., Iyer E.S. and Gooding-Williams S. (1996), Environmental organization alliance relationships within and across non-profit, business and government sectors, *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing*, vol. 15, n° 2, pp. 203–15.
194. Heap, 1998, 2000; Waddell, 2000; Fox, 2001; Parker and Selsky, 2004; World Economic Forum, 2005.
195. Martin J. (1992) *Cultures in organizations: Three perspectives*, Oxford University Press, New York.
196. Crane, 2000; Parker and Selsky, 2004.
197. Marco Pagliani, with WWF, and Lotta Sand, with the Swedish tourist agency Fritidsresor, on the subject of their collaboration within the framework of the initiative One Dollar per Tourist; Training Workshop on Responsible Tourism, organised by the WWF Mediterranean Programme, 20–29 November 2003, Barcelona, Spain.
198. Heap, 2000; Robert, 2005.
199. This *gap* forms part of many prejudices that exist towards NGOs. Although there are, indeed, many local NGOs whose management skills are not very sound, there are also other structures, local or international, that are extremely professional and very exacting in terms of management. I would say that if a company has doubts about the ability of an NGO to successfully carry out a project, then it should not go into partnership with that NGO.
200. Parker and Selsky, 2004.
201. Drucker, 1989.
202. Elbers, 2004.
203. One of the world's leaders in mining and natural resources.
204. Sir Mark Moody-Stuart qualifies this idea by stressing that these alliances enable companies to work without being cut off from their environment (i.e., natural and human environments) and without creating an unhealthy culture of dependence. That is, he recognises the difficulty in managing alliances, while recognising their relevance for the company.
205. Chen M. (1996), Competitor analysis and interfirm rivalry: Toward a theoretical integration, *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 21, n°1, pp. 100–34. Taken from Cimon, 2003.
206. Saxton, 1997; Beugelsdijk et al. 2004.
207. Hartman and Stafford, 1997; Austin, 2000; Elbers, 2004.
208. Roussel, 2001.
209. Dawes and Eglene, 2004.
210. Heap, 2000; Waddell, 2000; Elbers, 2004; World Economic Forum, 2005.

5 Building Alliance Capacities

211. Doz and Hamel, 1998.
212. Doz, 1996.
213. Draulans et al., 2003.
214. Draulans et al., 2003; Duysters et al., 2003; Heimeriks and Schreiner, 2002.
215. Schreiner and Corsten, 2004.
216. Draulans et al. (2003) use the term *alliance knowledge*.
217. See De Man, 2001; Draulans et al., 2003; Duysters and Heimeriks, 2003; Heimeriks, 2005.
218. Snavely and Tracy, 2002.
219. Doz, 1996; Kale et al., 2000; Ariño et al., 2005; Shuman and Twombly, 2005.
220. See Frank and Smith, 2000; De Man et al., 2002; Schreiner and Corsten, 2004; Shuman and Twombly, 2005.
221. Ping, 1997; Gulati, 1998; Dawes and Eglene, 2004; Wondolleck and Yaffee, 2001; Grayson, 2003.
222. This need for a *business case* is also underscored by Earthwatch Europe, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (Earthwatch Europe et al., 2002).
223. Gloria Godinez, CEMEX, 8 May 2006 interview; Patricio Robles Gil, Agrupación Sierra Madre, 2 June 2006 interview.
224. Doz and Hamel, 1998; Iyer, 2002; Schreiner and Corsten, 2004; Johnson, 2005.
225. Gloria Godinez, CEMEX; TEC International, Jonathan Stacey, BirdLife.
226. Grant, 1996.
227. Luc Giraud-Guigues, WWF, 29 February 2006 interview.
228. Austin et al., 2000; Kale et al., 2000; Elbers, 2004; Johnson, 2005.
229. Sarah Basden, Rio Tinto; Faulkner, 2000; Genet, 2001; Snavely and Tracy, 2002; Jonathan Stacey, BirdLife.
230. Sarah Basden, Rio Tinto; Steven Covey, expert on leadership and organisational relations, taken from Roner, 2006; Johnson, 2005; Kanter, 1994; Gloria Martinez, CEMEX
231. Yaffee and Wondolleck, 2000; Das and Teng, 2001.
232. Grant, 1996.
233. Ring and Van de Ven, 1994.
234. See Elkington and Fennell, 2000; Grayson D., 2003.
235. Parker and Selsky, 2004.
236. Luc Giraud-Guigues, WWF; Patricio Robles Gil, ASM.
237. Swieringa and Wierdsma, 1995; Doz, 1996.
238. Hastings C. (1993), *The new organization: Growing the culture of organizational networking*, McGraw-Hill, London. Taken from Beugelsdijk et al., 2004.
239. Austin et al., 2000; Draulans et al., 2003; Shuman and Twombly, 2005.

240. Beugelsdijk et al., 2004.
241. Elements were taken from the following: Sarah Basden, Rio Tinto, 15 March 2006 e-mails; Jonathan Stacey, BirdLife, 4 April 2006 interview; Olivier Luneau, Lafarge, 6 April 2006 interview; Luc Giraud-Guigues, WWF, 13 February 2006 interview; Gloria Godinez, CEMEX, 8 May 2006 interview; Armando J. Garcia, CEMEX, 29 June 2006 interview; Patricio Robles Gil, Agrupación Sierra Madre, 2 June 2006 interview.
242. Luc Giraud-Guigues, WWF; Tennyson, 2003.
243. Botkin and Matthews, 1992; Manitoba Voluntary Sector Initiative, 2000.
244. Luc Giraud-Guigues, WWF, 13 February 2006 interview.
245. Luc Giraud-Guigues, WWF; Jonathan Stacey, BirdLife.
246. Sarah Basden, Rio Tinto.
247. Schreiner and Corsten, 2004.
248. Kale and Singh, 2000.
249. Waddock, 1991; Frank and Smith, 2000; Tholke, 2003.
250. Stressed as being fundamental by Elbers, 2004; Elkington and Fennell, 2000; Fowler and Heap, 2000; Manitoba Voluntary Sector Initiative, 2000.
251. Elkington and Fennell, 2000; Fowler and Heap, 2000; Elbers, 2004.
252. Botkin and Matthews, 1992; Gomez et al., 2002; Tennyson, 2003; Schreiner and Corsten, 2004; World Economic Forum, 2005; also highlighted by Luc Giraud-Guigues of WWF, Jonathan Stacey of BirdLife and Sarah Basden of Rio Tinto.
253. Dyer and Singh, 1998; Gomez et al., 2002; Schreiner and Corsten, 2004.
254. Kale and Singh, 1999; Draulans et al., 2003; Duysters et al., 2003; Beugelsdijk et al., 2004; Shuman and Twombly, 2005.
255. Austin, 1999; Draulans et al., 2003.
256. This idea has been developed by many authors: Anand and Khanna, 2000; De Man, 2001; De Man et al., 2002; Doz, 1996; Draulans et al., 2003; Duysters et al., 2003; Gulati, 1999; Kale and Singh, 1999; Simonin, 1997.
257. Huber, 1991.
258. Duysters et al., 2003.
259. Kale and Singh, 1999.
260. Kale and Singh, 2000; Hoang and Rothaermel, 2005.
261. Anand and Khanna, 2000.
262. Simonin, 1997; Kale and Singh, 1999; Draulans et al., 2003; Duysters et al., 2003; Heimeriks and Duysters, 2003.
263. Kolb D.A. (1984), *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA. Taken from Swieringa and Wierdsma, 1995.
264. Sarah Basden, Rio Tinto, 15 March 2006 e-mail.
265. Marquardt, 1996; Iyer, 2002; Draulans et al., 2003; Heimeriks, 2005; Parker and Selsky, 2004

266. Draulans et al., 2003.
267. This course, the result of the collaboration between the University of Cambridge and the International Business Leaders Forum, offers practical training based on the lessons learned and best practices of NGO–business partnerships. For further information, see the Programme for Sustainability Leadership web site, <http://www.cpi.cam.ac.uk/pccp/home.html>.
268. De Man et al., 2002.
269. Oscar Infante, CEMEX; Armando J. Garcia, CEMEX.
270. Armando J. Garcia, CEMEX, vice-president, CEMEX, 29 June 2006 interview.
271. Gloria Godinez, CEMEX, 8 May 2006 interview.
272. Collaboration between several sectors of society.
273. Luc Giraud-Guigues, WWF, 13 February 2006 interview.
274. For further details about strategies of codification and personalisation, see Hansen, Nohria and Tierney (1999).
275. Kale and Singh, 2000.
276. Oscar Infante, CEMEX; Luc Giraud-Guigues, WWF.
277. Heimeriks, 2005; Kale and Singh, 2000.
278. Kale and Singh, 2000.
279. Marquardt, 1996.
280. Luc Giraud-Guigues, WWF, 13 February 2006 interview; Jonathan Stacey, BirdLife, 4 April 2006 interview; Armando J. Garcia, CEMEX, 29 June 2006 interview; Patricio Robles Gil, ASM, 2 June 2006 interview.
281. Oscar Infante, CEMEX, 13 February 2007 interview; Olivier Luneau, Lafarge, 6 April 2006 interview.
282. Gloria Godinez, CEMEX, 10 May 2006 interview.
283. Stressed particularly by Luc Giraud-Guigues, WWF, and Oscar Infante, CEMEX.
284. Point of view expressed by Sarah Basden, Rio Tinto; Armando J. Garcia, CEMEX; Oscar Infante, CEMEX; and Luc Giraud Guigues, WWF.

6 Stakeholder Involvement

285. Botkin and Matthews, 1992; Lorange, 1992.
286. Murphy and Bendell, 1997; Austin, 1999; Tholke, 2003.
287. Elkington and Fennell, 2000; Fowler and Heap, 2000; Heap, 2000; Bendell, 2000; Fox, 2001; SustainAbility, 2003; Parker and Selsky, 2004.
288. Elkington and Fennell, 2000; Murphy and Bendell, 2000; SustainAbility, 2003.
289. 21 November 2006 interview.
290. Rowley, 1997; Kochan and Rubinstein, 2000.
291. Freeman, R.E. (1984), *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*, Pitman, Boston.
292. See Savage et al., 1991; Hill and Jones, 1992; Clarkson, 1995; Polonsky, 1995; Brouthers and Bamossy, 1997; Mitchell et al., 1997; Rowley, 1997; Frooman, 1999; Mercier, 2001.

293. This subjectivity is highlighted by Hill and Jones, 1992, and Mitchell et al., 1997.
294. Bouglet (2005) goes against most models by putting stakeholder expectations at the centre of his model.
295. Local: field projects. Systemic: for example, changing the production processes of a company and its activity sector. Educational: environmental education and cultural change.
296. The relation existing between two partner organisations.
297. In exerting *direct* power, one's actions will directly affect the project, the alliance or the organisation.
298. In exerting *indirect* power, one has the ability to affect other stakeholders who themselves have *direct* power within the organisation or society. Examples of those exerting indirect power include opinion leaders, the media and NGOs.
299. Oscar Infante, CEMEX, 13 February 2007 interview; Jonathan Stacey, BirdLife, 7 November 2006 interview.
300. Examples include the denunciation by Greenpeace of the lack of transparency of the Loblaws–Pollution Probe alliance in Canada (see Chapter 2) and the Scottish coalition of NGOs, which set itself up in 2003 against the WWF–Lafarge alliance following announcement of the company's project to create a mega quarry on the Isle of Harris in Scotland. In April 2004, Lafarge announced that it was renouncing this quarry project, thus ending the strong pressure which weighed against WWF International.
301. Summarising the literature and interviews.
302. Examples include the environmental NGOs who rose up against the WWF–Lafarge alliance (due to the mega quarry project of the company on the Isle of Harris) and the Mexican farmers of the state of Sonora who were opposed to the removal of the bighorn sheep from their state (as planned by CEMEX and ASM to repopulate certain areas of the state of Coahuila).
303. 4 June 2007 interview.
304. Oscar Infante, CEMEX.
305. Patricio Robles Gil, ASM.
306. Projects developed and implemented jointly by both partner organisations.
307. Jonathan Stacey, BirdLife, 7 November 2006 interview; Oscar Infante, CEMEX, 13 February 2007 interview; Luc Giraud-Guigues, WWF, 14 November 2006 interview.
308. Jonathan Stacey, BirdLife, 7 November 2006 interview; Luc Giraud-Guigues, WWF, 14 November 2006 interview.
309. Sarah Basden, Rio Tinto, 21 November 2006 interview.
310. Luc Giraud-Guigues, WWF, 14 November 2006 interview.
311. Armando J. Garcia, CEMEX, 29 June 2006 interview; Olivier Luneau, Lafarge, 23 February 2007 interview.
312. Survey was conducted to prepare the Conference on Partnerships, held at Cambridge, 24–26 September 2006; this conference physically

- brought together 130 people involved in partnerships, plus another 150 people online. See IBLF (2006).
313. Jonathan Stacey, BirdLife; Luc Giraud-Guigues, WWF.
 314. *Image* and *identity* are not the same concept. An *image* may reflect something that one is not (as in the case of greenwashing) or that one is not yet (as in one's desires). An *identity* is what one is.
 315. There are many individuals and organisations who stress that the political and economic environment does not offer a favourable framework for corporate–NGO alliances. This shows, as we have already underlined, that there is systemic work to be done so that accounting, legislative, consumer and investment systems reward those companies which engage in alliances in favour of sustainable development.
 316. Rowley, 1997.
 317. Donaldson and Preston, 1995.
 318. Oliver, 1991; Polonsky, 1995; Dick, 1997; Weaver et al., 1999.
 319. Savage et al., 1991 ; Polonsky, 1995; Perrott, 1996.

7 Measuring Alliance Performance: Success Indicators

320. Geringer and Hebert, 1991; Gulati, 1998; Hughes, 2002; Zollo et al., 2002; Ariño, 2003; PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2005; Sammer, 2007.
321. Murphy and Bendell, 1997; Austin, 1999; Frank and Smith, 2000; IBLF, 2000; Tennyson, 2003; Tholke, 2003; Tuxworth and Sommer, 2003.
322. Tuxworth and Sommer, 2003.
323. Saterson et al., 1999; Tholke, 2003 ; Rocha de Mendonça et al., 2004.
324. Tholke, 2003; PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2006.
325. GEMI, 1998; PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2006.
326. Hoffman, 2002.
327. Saterson et al., 1999; IBLF, 2000.
328. Saterson et al., 1999; IBLF, 2000; Tholke, 2003; PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2006; Sammer, 2007.
329. Frank and Smith, 2000.
330. Saterson et al., 1999; Leverage Point Consulting, 2001; Hoffman, 2002; Hughes, 2002.
331. Tuxworth and Sommer, 2003; PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2005.
332. Saterson et al., 1999; Hughes, 2002; Tennyson, 2003; Sammer, 2007.
333. Saterson, et al., 1999.
334. Yan and Gray, 1994; Brouthers, 2002; Ariño, 2003; Olk and Ariño, 2003.
335. Hoffman, 2002; IBLF, 2000; Michel Picard, Lafarge, 5 June 2007 interview.
336. Lebas, 1995; Pesqueux, 2004; Gilbert and Charpentier, 2005.
337. Margoluis et al., 2000; Tholke, 2003; Tuxworth and Sommer, 2003.
338. Yan and Gray, 1994; Brouthers, 2002; Olk and Ariño, 2003; Sammer, 2007.

339. Hughes, 2002; Tennyson, 2003; Sammer, 2007.
340. Ariño, 2003; Tennyson, 2003.
341. Ariño and Doz, 2000.
342. Ariño, 2003.
343. Global Knowledge Partnership, 2005; Tholke, 2003; Gabrielle Iwanow and Marcelle Shoop, Rio Tinto, 12 July 2007 e-mail.
344. PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2006.
345. GEMI, 1998; Gemignani, 2006.
346. Sammer, 2007.
347. GEMI, 1998.
348. PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2006.
349. Tuxworth and Sommer, 2003.
350. IBLF, 2000; Tennyson, 2003; Tuxworth and Sommer, 2003.
351. Tholke, 2003.
352. See Geringer and Hebert, 1991; Ariño, 2003.
353. Geringer and Hebert, 1991.
354. Hamel, 1991; Khanna et al., 1998; Olk and Ariño, 2003.
355. Doz, 1988; Hamel et al., 1989; Hamel, 1991; Kanter, 1994; Dussauge et al., 2000; Zollo et al., 2002.
356. Hoffman, 2002.
357. He stresses that this is his way of working; he does not want alliance management processes to become too 'bureaucratic'.
358. This is learning aimed at increasing the alliance's performance, disseminating its lessons in the organisation and increasing the organisation's sustainable development performance.
359. 5 June 2007 interview.
360. 4 June 2007 interview.
361. Bear in mind that projects will be tools to respond to these 'macro' goals.
362. Luc Giraud-Guigues, WWF, 8 May 2007 interview.
363. Frank and Smith, 2000.

Annex A BirdLife International–Rio Tinto Partnership

364. Company's 2006 annual report.
365. Company's web site, www.riotinto.com.
366. Sarah Basden, 25 December 2005 interview.
367. Organisation's web site, www.birdlife.org.
368. By repurchasing RMC Group, CEMEX inherited the alliance between RMC Group and BirdLife. After a hazy period, CEMEX and BirdLife decided to formalise their relationship in 2007 and initiated the process of establishing an official partnership.
369. BirdLife and Rio Tinto (2004), *Working together in partnership*, BirdLife International (Cambridge, UK) and Rio Tinto plc (London).
370. Jonathan Stacey, BirdLife, 17 January 2006 interview.
371. Sarah Basden, 20 December 2005 interview.

Annex B Lafarge–World Wide Fund for Nature Partnership

372. All the information in this section was taken from the company's web site, www.lafarge.com.
373. Organisation's web site, www.panda.org.
374. For further details, see http://www.panda.org/what_we_do/how_we_work/businesses/corporate_support/business_partners/
375. Formerly Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation.
376. For further details, see http://www.panda.org/what_we_do/how_we_work/businesses/corporate_support/conservation_partner/cp_lafarge/

Annex C Agrupación Sierra Madre–CEMEX Partnership

377. Company's web site, www.cemex.com.
378. CEMEX (2006), *El Carmen, Iniciativa de Conservación*.
379. Armando J. Garcia, vice-president of CEMEX, 29 June 2006 interview.
380. Interviews: Patricio Robles Gil, president of ASM; Oscar Infante, environmental consultant of the Biodiversity Vice-Presidency of the CEMEX Group. Publications: *El Carmen–Big Bend: Iniciativa de Corredor de Conservación*, *Agrupación Sierra Madre*; *CEMEX en la Conservación de la Biodiversidad: El Carmen, CEMEX*.

Bibliography

- Alexander C.S., Miesing P. and Parsons A.L. (sans date), *How important are stakeholder relationships?* State University of New York at Albany, USA. Available from <http://www.albany.edu/~pm157/research/stakeholders.pdf>
- Anand B.N and Khanna T. (2000), Do firms learn to create value? The case of alliances, *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 21, n° 3, pp. 295–315.
- Andrews K.R. (1989), Ethics in practice, *Harvard Business Review*, Sep–Oct, pp. 99–104.
- Ariño A. (2003), Measures of strategic alliance performance: An analysis of construct validity, *Journal of International Business Studies*, vol. 34, n° 1, pp. 66–79.
- Ariño A. and Doz Y. (2000), Rescuing troubled alliances... before it's too late, *European Management Journal*, vol. 18, n° 2, pp. 173–82.
- Ariño A., De La Torre J. and Smith Ring P. (2005), Relational quality and inter-personal trust in strategic alliances, *European Management Review*, vol. 2, pp. 15–27.
- Arst B. (2002), 'Green alliances' of business and NGOs: New styles of self-regulation or 'dead-end roads'? *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, vol. 9, n° 1, pp. 26–36.
- Ashman D. (2000), *Promoting corporate citizenship in the global south: Towards a model of empowered civil society collaboration with business* [Occasional paper, vol. 16, n° 3], Institute for Development Research (IDR), Boston. Available through World Education web site from <http://www.worlded.org/docs/Publications/idr/pdf/16-3.pdf>
- Ashman D. (2001), Civil society collaboration with business: Bringing empowerment back in, *World Development*, vol. 29, n° 7, pp. 1097–113.
- Assadourian E. (2005), The evolving corporation: The role of stakeholders, *World Watch*, vol. 18, n° 5, pp. 22–5. Available through the World Watch web site from <http://www.worldwatch.org/system/files/EP185C.pdf>
- Austin J.E. (1998), *Partnering for progress* [Working paper, n° 99–051], Social Enterprise Series n° 5, Harvard Business School, Boston.
- Austin J.E. (1999), *The collaboration challenge: Making the most of strategic alliances between nonprofits and corporations* [Working paper, n° 99–063], Social Enterprise Series n° 6, Harvard Business School, Boston.
- Austin J.E. (2000), Strategic collaboration between nonprofits and business, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 29, supp. 1, pp. 69–97.
- Austin J., Reficco E. and SEKN (Social Enterprise Knowledge Network) research team (2005), Motivations and the cross-sector alliance, *HBS Working Knowledge*, 10 January. Available through the Harvard Business School web site from <http://hbswk.hbs.edu/item/4564.html>
- Badaracco J.L. Jr. (1992), *Alianzas estratégicas: El caso de GM e IBM*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston.

- Barrett D., Austin J.E. and McCarthy S. (2000), *Cross-sector collaboration: Lessons from the International Trachoma Initiative* [Working paper, n° 00-091], Social Enterprise Series n° 16, Harvard Business School. An excerpt is available through the HBS Working Knowledge for Business Leaders web site from <http://hbswk.hbs.edu/item/1731.html>
- Bendell J. (sans date), *Opposites attract*, Business and Sustainable Development, International Institute for Sustainable Development, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada. Available from <http://www.bsdglobal.com/ngo/opposites.asp>
- Bendell J. (1998, July), *Citizens Cane? Relations between business and civil society*. Paper presented at the 3rd Conference of the International Society for Third-Sector Research, Geneva, Switzerland.
- Bendell J. (ed.) (2000), *Terms for endearment: Business, NGOs and sustainable development*, Greenleaf, Sheffield, UK.
- Bendell J. and Murphy D.F. (1999), *Partners in time? Business, NGOs and sustainable development* [Discussion paper, DP109], UNRISD (United Nations Research Institute for Social Development), Geneva, Switzerland, August. Available from <http://www.unrisd.org/unrisd/website/document.nsf/0/259BB13AD57AC8E980256B61004F9A62?OpenDocument>
- Berends H., Boersma K., Weggeman M. (2003), The structuration of organizational learning, *Human Relations*, vol. 56, n° 9, pp. 1035-56.
- Berman S.L., Wicks A.C., Kotha S. and Jones T.M. (1999), Does stakeholder orientation matter? The relationship between stakeholder management models and firm financial performance, *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 42, n° 5, pp. 488-506.
- Berman S.L., Wicks A.C., Kotha S.K. and Jones T.M. (1999), Strategic stakeholder management, *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 42, n° 5.
- Beugelsdijk S., Koan C.I. and Nooderhaven N.G. (2004), *Organizational culture and relationship skills* [Discussion paper], Tilburg University, the Netherlands. Available from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=556976
- Blecker T. and Neumann R. (2000), *Interorganizational knowledge management: Some perspective for knowledge oriented strategic management for virtual organizations*. In Malhotra Y. (ed.), *Knowledge management and virtual organizations* (pp. 63-83), Idea Group Publishing, London. Available from <http://www.manufacturing.de/download/kmvo.pdf>
- Bleeke J. and Ernst D. (1995), Is your strategic alliance really a sale? *Harvard Business Review*, Jan-Feb, pp. 97-105.
- Bleeke J. and Ernst D. (1996), Collaborating to compete. In Mintzberg H. and Quinn J.B., *Readings in the strategy process* (3rd ed.), Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA.
- Botkin J.W. and Matthews J.B. (1992), *Winning combinations: The coming wave of entrepreneurial partnerships between large and small companies*, Wiley, Hoboken, NJ, USA.
- Bouglet J. (2005), *La gestion des attentes comme contribution à la théorie des parties prenantes*. Paper presented at the 14th conference of AIMS (l'Association Internationale de Management Stratégique), Angers, France. Summary available from <http://www.strategie-aims.com/angers05/res/23-480rd.pdf>

- Brouthers K.D. (2002), Institutional, cultural and transaction cost influence on entry mode choice and performance, *Journal of International Business Studies*, vol. 33, n° 2, pp. 203–21.
- Brouthers K.D. and Bamossy G.J. (1997), The role of key stakeholders in international joint venture negotiations: Case studies from Eastern Europe, *Journal of International Business Studies*, vol. 28, n° 2, pp. 285–308.
- Brouthers K.D., Brouthers L.E. and Wilkinson T.J. (1995), Strategic alliances: Choose your partners, *Long Range Planning*, vol. 28, n° 3, pp. 18–25.
- Bryer D. and Magrath J. (1999), New dimensions of global advocacy, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 28, supp. 1, pp. 168–77.
- CARE International (no date), *Re-thinking corporate social responsibility: A partnership approach*, Business Partners for Development, Natural Resources Cluster, CARE International, London. Available through the BPD web site from <http://74.125.95.132/search?q=cache:6vjtMrGKQmAJ:www.odi.org.uk/projects/98-02-bpd-natural-resources-cluster>
- Caulkin S. and Collins J. (2003), *The private life of public affairs: A summary briefing paper*, Green Alliance, London. Available from <http://www.greenalliance.org.uk/uploadedFiles/Publications/ThePrivateLifeOfPublicAffairs.pdf>
- CCIC (1996, May), *Common interests: Exploring opportunities for NGO-private sector collaboration* [Conference report, Ottawa], Canadian Council for International Co-operation, Ottawa, Ontario. Available through CCIC web site from http://www.ccic.ca/e/archives/rd_1996-05-23_exploring_opportunities.pdf
- CCIC (2001, March), *Bridges or walls: Engaging with the private sector* [Final report of workshop series, Ottawa, Montreal, Vancouver, Winnipeg and Toronto] Canadian Council for International Co-operation, Ottawa, Ontario. Available through CCIC web site from http://www.ccic.ca/e/docs/002_dev_org_2002_01_final_pse_report.pdf
- Chauveau A. (2003), *De nouveaux types de relations*, Novethic Info, 25 February.
- Chauveau A. and Rosé J.-J. (2003), *L'entreprise responsable*, Éditions d'Organisation, Paris. Available from http://www.editions-organisation.com/Chapitres/9782708128835/chap2_Chauveau.pdf
- Chennell J. (2005), *Sustainability pays off: WBCSD members outperform global benchmarks* [Press release], WBCSD (World Business Council for Sustainable Development), Geneva, 4 January. Available from <http://www.wbcsd.org/Plugins/DocSearch/details.asp?DocTypeId=251&ObjectId=MTI0Mjg&URLBack=%2Ftemplates%2FTemplateWBCSD2%2Flayout%2Easp%3Ftype%3Dp%26MenuId%3DMzcx%26CurPage%3D4%26SortOrder%3Dsector%2520ASC>
- Child J., Chung L. and Davies H. (2003), The performance of cross-border units in China: A test of natural selection, strategic choice and contingency theories, *Journal of International Business Studies*, vol. 34, n°3, pp. 242–54.
- Cimon Y. (2003), *Knowledge related asymmetries in strategic alliances*, Montreal University, Quebec, Canada from <http://www.cda-cdai.ca/cdai/symposia/2003-graduate-student-symposium>

- Clarkson M.B. (1995), A stakeholder framework for analysing and evaluating corporate social performance, *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 20, n° 1, pp. 92–117.
- Collins J.C. and Porras J.I. (1996), Building your company's vision, *Harvard Business Review*, Sep-Oct, pp. 65–77.
- Communication Group (1997), *Putting the pressure on: The rise of pressure activism in Europe*, The Communication Group, London.
- Contractor F.J. and Lorange P. (eds) (1988), *Cooperative strategies in international business*, Lexington Books, Lexington, MA, USA.
- Corporate–nonprofit partnerships: Creating value in uncertain times* [Meeting highlights], Minnesota Regional Reception, hosted by the Minnesota Council of Nonprofits and the St. Paul Companies, Inc. Foundation. Available through the Independent Sector web site from http://www.independentsector.org/mission_market/Minnesota_Reception.html
- Courtney H., Kirkland J. and Viguier P. (1997), Strategy under uncertainty, *Harvard Business Review*, Nov-Dec, pp. 67–79.
- Cowe R. (2004), Business/NGO partnerships: What's the payback? *Ethical Corporation Magazine*, 16 Apr, pp. 14–18.
- Crane, A. (2000), Culture clash and mediation: Exploring the cultural dynamics of business–NGO collaboration. In Bendell J. (ed.), *Terms for endearment: Business, NGOs and sustainable development* (pp. 163–77), Greenleaf, Sheffield, UK.
- Curral S.C. and Judge T.A. (1995), Measuring trust between organizational boundary role persons, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, vol. 64, n° 2, pp. 151–70.
- Darnil S. and Le Roux M. (2005), *80 Hommes pour changer le monde: Entreprendre pour la planète*, JC Lattès, Paris.
- Dart R. (2004), Being “business-like” in a nonprofit organization: A grounded and inductive typology, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 33, n° 2, pp. 290–310.
- Das T.K. and Teng B.-S. (2000), A resource-based theory of strategic alliances, *Journal of Management*, vol. 26, n° 1, pp. 31–61.
- Das T.K. and Teng B.-S. (2001), Trust, control, and risk in strategic alliances: An integrated framework, *Organization Studies*, vol. 22, n° 2, pp. 251–83.
- Dawes S.S. and Eglene O. (2004, May), New models of collaboration for delivering government services: A dynamic model drawn from multi-national research, *Proceedings of the Annual National Conference on Digital Government Research*, Seattle, Washington, USA, vol. 262, pp. 1–11.
- De Man A.-P. (2001), *The future of alliance capability: Towards a basic necessity for firm survival?* In De Man A.-P., Duysters G. and Vasudevan A. (eds), *The allied enterprise: Global strategies for corporate collaboration*, Imperial College Press, London.
- De Man A.-P., Heimeriks K. and Duysters G. (2002), *The state of alliance management* [Special report], Association of Strategic Alliance Professionals, Needham, MA, USA.
- Dean B.V. and Cassidy J.C. (1990), *Strategic management: Methods and studies*, Elsevier, New York.

- Dees J.G. (1998), Enterprising nonprofits, *Harvard Business Review*, Jan-Feb, pp. 55–67.
- Delerue H. (2004, June), *Performance des alliances: Une gestion duale du risque relationnel*. Paper presented at the 13th conference of AIMS (l'Association Internationale de Management Stratégique), Normandy, France.
- Dick, B. (1997), *Stakeholder analysis* [Online publication]. Available through the web site of Southern Cross University, New South Wales, Australia, from <http://www.scu.edu.au/schools/gcm/ar/arp/stake.html>
- Doane D. (2005), Beyond corporate social responsibility: Minnows, mammoths and markets, *Futures*, vol. 37, n° 2–3, pp. 215–29.
- Donaldson T. (1999), Making stakeholder theory whole, *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 24, n° 2, pp. 237–41.
- Donaldson, T. and Preston, L.E. (1995), The stakeholder theory of the corporation: Concepts, evidence, and implications, *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 20, n° 1, pp. 65–91.
- Doz Y. (1988), Technology partnerships between larger and smaller firms: Some critical issues. In Contractor F.J. and Lorange P. (eds), *Cooperative strategies in international business* (pp. 317–38), Lexington Books, Lexington, MA, USA.
- Doz Y.L. (1996), The evolution of cooperation in strategic alliances: Initial conditions or learning processes? *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 17, n° S1, pp. 55–83.
- Doz Y. and Baburoglu O. (2000), From competition to collaboration: The emergence and evolution of R&D cooperatives. In D.O. Faulkner, M. De Rond (eds), *Cooperative Strategy: Economic, Business and Organizational Issues*, (pp. 173–192), Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Doz Y.L. and Hamel G. (1998), *Alliance advantage: The art of creating value through partnering*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston.
- Draulans J., De Man A.-P. and Volberda H.W. (1999), *Alliance capability: Source of competitive advantage*. Available from www.duysters.com/_file_/documents/original/download/10/alliancecapabilitypdf.pdf
- Draulans J., De Man A.-P. and Volberda H.W. (2003), Building alliance capability: Management techniques for superior alliance performance, *Long Range Planning*, vol. 36, n° 2, pp. 151–166.
- Drucker P.F. (1989), What business can learn from nonprofits, *Harvard Business Review*, Jul-Aug, pp. 88–93.
- Dussauge P., Garrette B. and Mitchell W. (1999), *Learning from competing partners: Outcomes and durations of alliances involving telecoms and other firms in Europe, North America and Asia*, HEC Working Paper.
- Dussauge P., Garrette B. and Mitchell W. (2000), Learning from competing partners: Outcomes and durations of scale and link alliances in Europe, North America and Asia, *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 21, n° 2, pp. 99–126.
- Dussauge P., Garrette B. and Mitchell W. (2004), Asymmetric performance: The market share impact of scale and link alliances in the global automobile industry, *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 25, n° 7, pp. 701–11.
- Duysters G.M. and Heimeriks K.H. (2003), *Developing alliance capabilities in a new era*, Eindhoven University of Technology, the Netherlands. Available

- through the Scientific Commons web site from <http://en.scientificcommons.org/993548>
- Duysters G.M., Heimeriks K.H. and Jurriens J. (2003), *Three levels of alliance management*, Eindhoven Centre for Innovation Studies, Eindhoven University of Technology, the Netherlands. Available through the Scientific Commons web site from <http://en.scientificcommons.org/993549>
- Dyer J.H. (1997), Effective inter firm collaboration: How firms minimize transaction costs and maximize transaction value, *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 18, n° 7, pp. 535–56.
- Dyer J.H. and Singh H. (1998), The relational view: Cooperative strategy and sources of interorganizational competitive advantage, *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 23, n° 4, pp. 660–79.
- Dyer J.H., Kale P. and Singh H. (2001), How to make strategic alliances work, *MIT Sloan Management Review*, vol. 42, n° 4, pp. 37–43.
- Earley, P. C. and Mosakowski, E. (2004), Cultural intelligence, *Harvard Business Review*, October, pp. 139–146.
- Earthwatch Europe, IUCN (International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources) and WBCSD (World Business Council for Sustainable Development) (2002), *Business and biodiversity: The handbook for corporate action* [Report], Atar Roto Presse SA, Vernier, Switzerland. Available through the WBCSD web site from http://www.wbcd.org/web/publications/business_biodiversity2002.pdf
- (*The Economist* (2003, 7 August), Living with the enemy: Non-governmental organisations and business – How firms should treat non-governmental organisations.
- Elbers W., (2004), *Doing business with business: Development NGOs interacting with the corporate sector* [Report], Centre of International Development Issues, Radboud University Nijmegen, the Netherlands. Available through the Evert Vermeer Foundation web site from <http://www.evertvermeer.nl/download.do/id/100105391/cd/true/>
- Elias A.A. and Cavana R.Y. (sans date), *Stakeholder analysis for systems thinking and modelling*, School of Business and Public Management, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand from portals.wi.wur.nl/files/docs/ppme/BobCavana.pdf
- Elkington J. and Fennell S. (2000), Partners for sustainability. In Bendell J. (ed.), *Terms for endearment: Business, NGOs and sustainable development*, Greenleaf, Sheffield, UK.
- Enderle G. (2000), *Corporate ethics at the beginning of the 21st century* [Manuscript].
- Ethical Corporation (2006, March), *Report on Business–NGO Partnerships Conference* [Conference report], London.
- Faulkner D. and De Rond M. (2000), *Cooperative strategy: Economic, business and organizational issues*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Fiol M.C. and Lyles M. (1985), Organizational learning, *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 10, n° 4, pp. 803–13.
- Foster M.K. and Meinhard A.G. (2002), A regression model explaining predisposition to collaborate, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 31, n° 4, pp. 549–64.

- Fowler A. (2004a), *Aid architecture and counter-terrorism: Perspectives on NGO futures* [Occasional paper], OPS 45, INTRAC (International NGO Training and Resource Centre), Oxford, UK.
- Fowler A. (2004b), *PVO and NGO futures: A framework for reflection and dialogue* [Paper], USAID (US Agency for International Development), Washington, DC. Available through the USAID web site from http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/private_voluntary_cooperation/conf_fowler.pdf
- Fowler P. and Heap S. (2000), Bridging troubled water: The Marine Stewardship Council. In Bendell J. (ed.), *Terms for endearment: Business, NGOs and sustainable development* (pp. 135–48), Greenleaf, Sheffield, UK.
- Fox T. (2001), Building partnerships between corporations and NGOs, *Monday Development*, vol. 19, n° 17, 24 September. Available through the Independent Sector web site from http://www.independentsector.org/mission_market/BuildingPartnerships.htm
- Frank F. and Smith A. (2000), *The partnership handbook*, Labour Market Learning and Development Unit, Human Resources Development Canada, Minister of Public Works and Government Services, Ottawa, Ontario. Available from http://www.servicecanada.gc.ca/eng/epb/sid/cia/partnership/partnerhb_e.pdf
- Frooman J. (1999), Stakeholder influence strategies, *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 24, n° 2, pp. 191–205.
- GEMI (1998), *Measuring environmental performance: A primer and survey of metrics in use*, Global Environment Management Initiative, Washington, DC. Available from www.gemi.org/resources/MET_101.pdf
- Gemignani Z. (2006), *Five rules for successful metrics (and a template)*, Juice Analytics, Herndon, VA, USA. Available from <http://www.juiceanalytics.com/writing/5-rules-for-successful-success-metrics/>
- Geringer J.M. (1991), Strategic determinants of partner selection criteria in international joint ventures, *Journal of International Business Studies*, vol. 22, n° 1, pp. 41–62.
- Geringer J.M. and Hebert L. (1991), Measuring performance of international joint ventures, *Journal of International Business Studies*, vol. 22, n° 2, pp. 249–63.
- Ghazi P. (1996), A grubby shade of green: Environmental groups believe they can change multinationals' attitudes by working more closely with them. The reality may be different, *New Statesman*, vol. 125, n° 4309, pp. 28–30.
- Gilbert P. and Charpentier M. (2005), *Comment évaluer la performance RH? Question universelle, réponses contingente* [Report], IAE de Paris (Institut d'Administration des Entreprises de Paris), GREGOR, Paris. Available in French through the e-RH web site from http://www.agrh2004-esg.uqam.ca/pdf/Tome1/Gilbert_Charpentier.pdf
- Gladwin T.N. and Walter I. (1980), *Multinationals under fire: Lessons in the management of conflict*, Wiley, New York.
- Global Knowledge Partnership (2005, May), *Advancing ICT solutions for development through cross-sector partnerships, with a special focus on the Middle East and North Africa* [Forum report], Cairo.

- Goleman, D. (1997), *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*, New York, Bantam Books.
- Gomes-Casseres B. (1998), Strategy before structure [Interview], *The Alliance Analyst*, August. Available from <http://www.alliancestrategy.com/PDFs/BGC%20StrategyStructure%20AA1998.pdf>
- Gomes-Casseres B. (2003, June), *Alliance strategy: Fundamentals for success*. Paper presented at the Management Roundtable Workshop, Boston, MA. Available from <http://www.alliancestrategy.com/PDFs/GomesCasseresAlliance.pdf>
- Gomez P.Y., Korine H. and Masclef O. (2002, May), *Generating cooperative behaviour between unacquainted: A case study of the Renault/Nissan alliance formation process*. Paper presented at the 2nd Annual Conference of EURAM (European Academy of Management), Stockholm, Sweden.
- Grant R.M. (1996), Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm, *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 17, pp. 109–22.
- Grant R.M. and Baden-Fuller C. (2004), A knowledge accessing theory of strategic alliances, *Journal of Management Studies*, vol. 41, n° 1, pp. 61–84.
- Gray B. (1989), *Collaborating: Finding common ground for multiparty problems*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Gray L. (2006), Employees are the best corporate ambassadors, *Ethical Corporation Magazine*, November.
- Grayson D. (2003, November), *Partnerships*. Paper presented at the Business in the Community Conference, July, 2003, London .
- Gress S. (2003), Les Partenariats Entreprises/ONG, Groupe One.
- Gulati R. (1995), Social structure and alliance formation patterns: A longitudinal analysis, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 40, n° 4, pp. 619–52.
- Gulati R. (1998), Alliances and networks, *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 19, n° 4, pp. 293–317.
- Gulati R. (1999), Network location and learning: The influence of network resources and firm capabilities on alliance formation, *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 20, n° 5, pp. 397–420.
- Halal W.E. (1993), Global strategic management in a new world order, *Business Horizons*, vol. 36, n° 6, pp. 5–10.
- Halal W.E. (2001), The collaborative enterprise: A stakeholder model uniting profitability and responsibility, *Journal of Corporate Citizenship*, n° 2, pp. 27–42. Available from <http://www.greenleaf-publishing.com/content/pdfs/jcc02hala.pdf>
- Hamel G. (1991), Competition for competence and interpartner learning within international strategic alliances, *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 12, n° S1, pp. 83–103.
- Hamel G. (1996), Strategy as revolution, *Harvard Business Review*, Jul–Aug, pp. 69–82.
- Hamel G. and Prahalad C.K. (1989), Strategic intent, *Harvard Business Review*, May–June, pp. 63–76.
- Hamel G., Doz Y. and Prahalad C (1989), Collaborate with your competitors – and win, *Harvard Business Review*, Jan–Feb, pp. 133–9.
- Hansen M., Nohria N. and Tierney T. (1999), *What's your strategy for managing knowledge?*, *Harvard Business Review*, 77(2), pp. 106–116.

- Harrigan K.R. (1988), Strategic alliances and partner asymmetries, *Management International Review*, vol. 28, special issue, pp. 53–72.
- Hartman C.L. and Stafford E.R. (1997), Green alliances: Building new business with environmental groups, *Long Range Planning*, vol. 30, n° 2, pp. 184–196.
- Heap S. (1998), *NGOs and the private sector: Potential for partnerships?* [Occasional paper], Occasional Paper Series n° 27, INTRAC (International NGO Training and Resource Centre), Oxford, UK.
- Heap S. (2000), *NGOs engaging with business: A world of difference and a difference to the world*, INTRAC (International NGO Training and Resource Centre), Oxford, UK.
- Heath R.L. and associates (1988), *Strategic issues management: How organisations influence and respond to public interest and policies*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Hefner L. (1994), Strategic alliances and the human implications for records managers, *ARMA Records Management Quarterly*, 28(3), July.
- Heimeriks K. (2005), *Managing portfolio of strategic alliances: The effect of alliance mechanisms on alliance portfolio performance* [Working paper], University of Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Heimeriks K. and Duysters G.M. (2003), *Experience and capabilities to explain alliance performance: Substitutes or complements?* [Working paper], Eindhoven Centre for Innovation Studies, Eindhoven University of Technology, the Netherlands.
- Heimeriks K. and Duysters G. (2004), *A study into the alliance capability development process* [Working paper 04.21], Eindhoven Centre for Innovation Studies, Eindhoven University, the Netherlands.
- Heimeriks K.H. and Schreiner M. (2002, September), *Relational quality and alliance capacity: A conceptual framework for their influence on alliance performance*. Paper presented at the 22nd Annual International Conference of the Strategic Management Society, Paris. Available from http://www.partneringintelligence.com/documents/5.02_RelationalQualityAlliance.pdf
- Heimeriks K., Duysters G.M. and Vanhaverbeke, W.P.M. (2004), *The evolution of alliance capability* [Working paper 04.20], Eindhoven Centre for Innovation Studies, Eindhoven University, the Netherlands.
- Henderson J.C. (1990), Plugging into strategic partnerships: The critical IS connection, *MIT Sloan Management Review*, vol. 31, n° 3, pp. 7–18.
- Hill C.W.L. and Jones T.M. (1992), Stakeholder–agency theory, *Journal of Management Studies*, vol. 29, n° 2, pp. 131–54.
- Hitt M.A., Dacin M.T., Levitas E., Arregle J.-L., and Borza A. (2000), Partner selection in emerging and developed markets contexts: Resource-based and organizational learning perspectives, *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 43, n° 3, pp. 449–67.
- Hoang H., Rothaermel F. and Simac S. (2003), The impact of general and partner specific alliance experience on joint R&D project performance, INSEAD Working Paper Series.
- Hoffman D. (2002), *Maximizing alliance performance*, SIIA Upgrade Magazine, Oct–Nov, pp. 12–15.
- Houlder V. (2001), Campaigners learn lesson of business advantage, *Financial Times*, 24 July.

- Hounsell S. (1997), *Biodiversity conservation: Making the link with business*, Available through the Biodiversity Economics web site from http://www.biodiversityeconomics.org/applications/library_documents/lib_document.rm?document_id=226
- Huber G.P. (1991), Organizational learning: The contributing process and the literatures, *Organization Science*, vol. 2, n° 1, pp. 88–115.
- Hughes J. (2002), *Implementing alliance metrics: Six basic principles* [White paper], Vantage Partners, Boston. Available from <http://www.duysters.com/Downloads%20managerial/implementingalliancemetrics.pdf>
- Hutchinson, M. (2000), *NGO engagement with the private sector on a global agenda to end poverty: A review of the issues* [Background paper], Canadian Council for International Co-operation, Ottawa, Ontario. Available from http://www.ccic.ca/e/archives/lc_2000-01_review_of_issues.pdf
- IBLF (International Business Leaders Forum) (sans date), *CSR roadmap*, Corporate Social Responsibility Forum and Prince of Wales International Business Leaders Forum. Available through the Strandberg Consulting web site from <http://www.corostrandberg.com/pdfs/Industry-Association-Sustainability-Roadmap.pdf>
- IBLF (2000), *Measures for success: Assessing the impact of partnerships*, Prince of Wales International Business Leaders Forum, London. Available from <http://www.iblf.org/docs/Measuresforsuccess.pdf>
- IBLF (2004), *Partnership matters: Current issues in cross-sector collaboration*, n° 2, Prince of Wales International Business Leaders Forum, London. Available from <http://www.iblf.org/docs/PartnMatters.pdf>
- IBLF (2006), *Realities of partnering in practice*, Prince of Wales International Business Leaders Forum, London.
- IIED (sans date), *Realising the global deal: What can cross-sector collaboration deliver?* International Institute for Environment and Development, London.
- International Ecotourism Society (2004), *Eco Currents Newsletter*, 1st trimester.
- Iyer K.N.S. (2002), Learning in strategic alliances: An evolutionary perspective, *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, vol. 6, n° 5. Available on www.amsreview.org/articles/iyer10-2002.pdf
- Johnson, L.C. (2005), *Understanding the role of cross-sector strategic alliances in the age of corporate social responsibility: An analysis of private and nonprofit sector relations* [Thesis], The Fletcher School, Tufts University, Medford/Somerville, MA, USA. Available from <http://fletcher.tufts.edu/research/2005/Johnson.pdf>
- Johnston R. and Laurence P. (1988), Beyond vertical integration: The rise of the value-adding partnership, *Harvard Business Review*, Jul-Aug, pp. 94–101.
- Jones T.M. (1995), Instrumental stakeholder theory: A synthesis of ethics and economics, *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 20, n° 2, pp. 404–37.
- Jones T.M. and Wicks A.C. (1999), Convergent stakeholder theory, *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 24, n° 2, pp. 206–21.
- Jonker J. and Foster D. (2002), Stakeholder excellence? Framing the evolution and complexity of a stakeholder perspective of the firm, *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, vol. 9, n° 4, pp. 187–95.

- Kale P. and Singh H. (1999), *Alliance capability and success: A knowledge-based approach* [Working paper], Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, USA. Available from <http://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/papers/842.pdf>
- Kale P., Dyer J.H. and Singh H. (2002), Alliance capability, stock market response, and long-term alliance success: The role of the alliance function, *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 23, n° 8, pp. 747–67.
- Kale P., Singh H. and Perlmutter H. (2000), Learning and protection of proprietary assets in strategic alliances: Building relational capital, *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 21, n° 3, pp. 217–38.
- Kanter R.M. (1994), Collaborative advantage: The art of alliances, *Harvard Business Review*, July–August, pp. 96–108.
- Kanter R.M. and Corn R.I. (1994), Do cultural differences make a business difference? Contextual factors affecting cross-cultural relationship success *Journal of Management Development*, vol. 13, n° 2, pp. 5–23.
- Khanna T., Gulati R. and Nohria N. (1998), The dynamics of learning alliances: Competition, cooperation, and relative scope, *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 19, n° 3, pp. 193–210.
- Kochan T.A. and Rubinstein S.A. (2000), Toward a stakeholder theory of the firm: The Saturn partnership, *Organization Science*, vol. 11, n° 4, pp. 367–86.
- Kolb D.A. (1984), *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA.
- Korten D.C. (1987), Third generation NGO strategies: A key to people-centered development, *World Development*, vol. 15, supp. 1, pp. 145–59.
- Lane H.W. and DiStefano J.J. (1992), *International management behaviour: From policy to practice*, PWS-Kent, Boston.
- Larsson R., Bengtsson L., Henriksson K. and Sparks J. (1998), The interorganizational learning dilemma: Collective knowledge development in strategic alliances, *Organization Science*, vol. 9, n° 3, pp. 285–305.
- Laville E. (2002), *L'Entreprise verte: le développement durable change l'entreprise pour changer le monde*, Village Mondial, Paris.
- Leader to Leader Institute, Peter F. Drucker Foundation for Nonprofit Management (2002), *Meeting the collaboration challenge: Developing strategic alliances between nonprofit organisations and business*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Lebas M. (1995), Oui, il faut définir la performance, *Revue Française de Comptabilité*, n° 269, July–August, pp. 66–71.
- Leverage Point Consulting (2001), *Alliance metrics: What CEOs and CFOs should know about the new metrics of performance partnering* [White paper], Leverage Point Consulting, Raleigh, NC, USA. Available through the Association of Strategic Alliance Professionals web site from <http://www.strategic-alliances.nl/download/asap/Alliance%20Metrics%20-%20Nieuwsbrief%20December.pdf>
- Lindenberg M. (2001), Reaching beyond the family: New nongovernmental organization alliances for global poverty alleviation and emergency response, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 30, n° 3, pp. 603–15.

- Lorange P. (1980), *Corporate planning: An executive viewpoint*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA.
- Lorange P. and Roos J. (1992), *Strategic alliances: Formation, implementation and evolution*, Blackwell Business, Cambridge, MA, USA.
- Lyles M. (1988), Learning among joint-venture sophisticated firms. In Contractor F.J. and Lorange P. (eds), *Cooperative strategies in international business* (pp. 301–16), Lexington Books, Lexington, MA, USA.
- Mach A. (2001), *Le pouvoir des ONG sur les entreprises: Pression, partenariats, évaluation*, Covalence SA, Geneva. Available from <http://www.covalence.ch/docs/annCHTMfr.pdf>
- Man-Com Consulting (2002), *L'état des rapports ONG et entreprises*, Rapport 2002. Available from www.man-com/documents/ong_ent.pdf
- Manitoba Voluntary Sector Initiative (2000), *Briefing note on corporate relations with the voluntary sector*, Secretariat on Voluntary Sector Sustainability, 20 November.
- Margoluis R., Margoluis C., Brandon K. and Salafsky N. (2000), *In good company: Effective alliances for conservation*, Biodiversity Support Program. Washington, DC. Available from <http://www.frameweb.org/adl/en-US/194/file/44/in-good-company.pdf>
- Marquard M.J. (1996) *Building the learning organization – a systems approach to quantum improvement and global success*. New York, McGraw-Hill.
- Marquardt R. (2000a), *Engaged or entangled? NGOs and the private sector on an agenda to end poverty* [Summary report], CCIC Learning Circle, Canadian Council for International Co-operation, Ottawa, Ontario. Available from http://www.ccic.ca/e/archives/lc_2000-11_engaged_or_entangled_summary_report.pdf
- Marquardt R. (2000b, June), *NGO engagement with the private sector on an agenda to eradicate poverty* [Workshop summary, second workshop, North Gower, Ontario], Canada, CCIC Policy Team, Canadian Council for International Co-operation, Ottawa, Ontario. Available from http://www.ccic.ca/e/archives/lc_2000-06_second_workshop.pdf
- Marsden C. and Andriof J. (1998) Towards an understanding of corporate citizenship and how to influence it, *Citizenship Studies*, vol. 2, n° 2, pp. 329–52.
- Maynard R. (1996), Striking the right match, *Nation's Business*, vol. 84, n° 5, May, pp. 18–20.
- Mercier S. (2001, June), *L'apport de la théorie des parties prenantes au management stratégique: Une synthèse de la littérature*, 10th conference of AIMS (l'Association Internationale de Management Stratégique), Quebec City, Quebec, Canada. Available from <http://www.strategie-aims.com/quebec/web/actes/f-152-cd.pdf>
- Mintzberg H. and Quinn J.B. (1996), *Readings in the strategy process* (3rd ed.), Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA.
- Mitchell R.K., Bradley R.A. and Wood D.J. (1997), Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principles of who and what really counts, *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 22, n° 4, pp. 853–86.
- Montoro-Sánchez A., Mora-Valentín E.M. and Guerras-Martín L.A. (2002, May), *Nature of the partner as a moderating factor in interorganizational*

- relationships*. Paper presented at the 2nd Annual Conference on Innovative Management Research, EURAM (European Academy of Management), Stockholm, Sweden.
- Mugica Y. (2004), *Partnering for success: DaimlerChrysler – POEMatec Alliance* [Case study], Kenan-Flagler Business School, North Carolina University, Chapel Hill, USA. Available through the World Business Council for Sustainable Development web site from http://www.wbcsd.org/web/publications/case/daimlerchrysler_poematec_full_case_web.pdf
- Murphy D.F. and Bendell J. (1997), *In the company of partners: Business, environmental groups and sustainable development post-Rio*, Policy Press, Bristol, UK.
- Newell P. (2000), Globalisation and the new politics of sustainable development. In Bendell J. (ed.), *Terms for endearment: Business, NGOs and sustainable development* (pp. 31–9), Greenleaf, Sheffield, UK.
- Nielsen B.B. (2004), The role of trust in collaborative relationships: A multi-dimensional approach, *M@n@gement*, vol. 7, n° 3, pp. 239–56. Available from <http://www.management-aims.com/PapersMgmt/73Nielsen.pdf>
- Nonprofit Sector Strategy Group (2001), *The nonprofit sector and business: New visions, new opportunities, new challenges* [Public statement], Aspen Institute, Washington, DC. Available from http://www.panet.sk/sk/dokumenty/text_nonprofitbusiness-en.pdf
- Ogilvie K.B. and Everhardus E. (2004), *ENGO–business partnerships: Lessons learned* [Report], Pollution Probe, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. Available from <http://www.pollutionprobe.org/Reports/engobus.pdf>
- Oliver C. (1990), Determinants of interorganisational relationships: Integration and future direction, *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 15, n° 2, pp. 241–65.
- Oliver C. (1991), Strategic responses to institutional processes, *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 16, n° 1, pp. 145–79.
- Olk P. and Ariño A. (2003), *Testing assumptions about evaluating strategic alliance performance* [Working paper, n° 529], IESE School of Business, University of Navarra, Barcelona, Spain. Available from <http://www.iese.edu/research/pdfs/DI-0529-E.pdf>
- Olk P. and Young C. (1997), Why members stay in or leave an R&D consortium: Performance and conditions of membership as determinants of continuity, *Strategic management Journal*, vol. 18, n° 11, pp. 855–77.
- Osborn R. And Hagedoorn J. (1997), The institutionalization and evolutionary dynamics of interorganizational alliances and networks. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(2), pp. 261–79.
- Ottman J. And Polonsky M.J. (1998), *Developing green products: learning from Stakeholders*, Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics, vol. 10, n° 1, pp. 22–43.
- Parker B. and Selsky J.W. (2004), Interface dynamics in cause-based partnerships: An exploration of emergent culture, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 33, n° 3, pp. 458–88.
- Parkhe A. (1991), Interfirm diversity, organizational learning, and longevity in global strategic alliances, *Journal of International Business Studies*, vol. 22, n° 4, pp. 579–601.

- Parkhe A. (1993), Strategic alliance structuring: A game theoretic and transaction cost examination of interfirm cooperation, *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 36, n° 4, pp. 794–829.
- (The) Partnering Initiative (sans date), Rio Tinto and Dundee: Working together to establish the rule of law [Case Study], Prince of Wales International Business Leaders Forum and University of Cambridge Programme for Industry, London. Available from <http://thepartneringininitiative.org/docs/tpi/RTCCaseSt.pdf>
- (The) Partnering Initiative (2006), *The case study toolbox: Partnership case studies as tools for change*, Prince of Wales International Business Leaders Forum and the University of Cambridge Programme for Industry, London. Available (with registration) from <http://www.iblf.org/docs/tpi/CaseStudyToolbook.pdf>
- Pastore-Reiss E. and Naillon H. (2002), *Le marketing éthique*, Village Mondial, Paris.
- Pearce R.J. (1997), Toward understanding joint venture performance and survival: A bargaining and influence approach to transaction cost theory, *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 22, n° 1, pp. 203–25.
- Perrott B.E. (1996), Managing strategic issues in the public service, *Long Range Planning*, vol. 29, n° 3, pp. 337–45.
- Pesqueux Y. (2004), *La notion de performance globale*, CNAM (Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers), Paris. Available in French from <http://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/docs/00/03/20/16/PDF/performanceTunis.pdf>
- Plunket A. (2001), Research on inter-firm collaboration: Evolution and perspective. In Plunket, Voisin and Bellon (eds), *The dynamics of industrial collaboration*, Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Polonsky M.J. (1995), Incorporating the natural environment in corporate strategy: A stakeholder approach, *Journal of Business Strategies*, vol. 12, n° 2, pp. 151–68. Available through the Sam Houston State University web site from <http://www.shsu.edu/~coba/jbs/vol12/no2/12-2-3.html>
- Polonsky M.J., Rosenberger P.J. III and Ottman J. (1998), Developing green products: Learning from stakeholders, *Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics*, vol. 10, n° 1, pp. 22–43.
- Porter M.E., *How competitive forces shape strategy*, in reading in the Strategy Process, Mintzberg H. and Quinn J.B., Prentice Hall Publishers, 3rd Edition.
- Powell A. (2001), Sleeping with the enemy, *BBC Wildlife Magazine*, August.
- PricewaterhouseCoopers (2005), *Communicating successes of public-private partnerships: A primer on how to develop metrics for sharing your white water to blue water partnership successes*, PricewaterhouseCoopers, London. Available through the Sustainable Development Partnerships (US State Department) web site from <http://www.sdp.gov/documents/organization/66182.pdf>
- Prickett G. (2003), *Can corporate-NGO partnerships save the environment?*, OnLine Opinion, Australia's social and political debate e-journal, 2 July.
- Ring P.S. and Van de Ven A.H. (1994), Developmental processes of cooperative interorganizational relationships, *Academy of Management Review* vol. 19, n° 1, pp. 90–118.

- Rio Tinto Group (2003), *The way we work: A statement of business practice*, Beacon Press, Uckfield, UK. Available through the Kennecott Utah Copper web site from <http://www.kennecott.com/library/media/papers/pdf/waywework.pdf>
- Robbins, S.P. (1988) *Management: Concepts and applications* (2nd ed.), Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA.
- Robert I. (2005, October), *Le Rôle des ONG dans les rapports de développement durable: Simple faire-valoir ou naissance d'un véritable partenariat avec les entreprises*. Paper presented to the 3rd Congress of ADERSE (Association pour le Développement de l'Enseignement et de la Recherche sur la Responsabilité Sociale de l'Entreprise), Lyon, France.
- Rocha de Mendonça L., Fedato C. and Tsustsui M. (2004, July), *Monitoring of cross-sector alliances: A Brazilian proposal*. Paper presented at the 6th Conference of the International Society for Third-Sector Research, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. Available in Portuguese through the ISTR web site from <http://www.istr.org/conferences/toronto/workingpapers/mendonca.luciana.pdf>
- Roner L. (2006), *Reputation: The high tax of low trust*, Ethical Corporation Newsletter, 28–29 March.
- Rothaermel F.T. and Deeds D.L. (2006), Alliance type, alliance experience and alliance management capability in high-technology ventures, *Journal of Business Venturing*, vol. 21, n° 4, pp. 429–60.
- Roussel C. (2001), The science of alliances: Governance roles and responsibilities, Accenture, <http://www.accenture.com>
- Rowley T. (1997), Moving beyond dyadic ties: A network theory of stakeholder influences, *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 22, n° 4, pp. 887–910.
- Russell J. (2006), Public private partnerships – Neither subsidy nor charity: The lessons of partnership, *Ethical Corporation Magazine*, 25 April. Available from <http://www.ethicalcorp.com/content.asp?ContentID=4232>
- Saddler P. (2003), *Sustainable development: The new board agenda*, Saddler P. Associates.
- Salafsky N., Margoluis R. and Redford K. (2001), *Adaptive management: A tool for conservation practitioners*, Biodiversity Support Program, World Wildlife Fund, Washington, DC. Available through the Foundations of Success web site from http://www.fosonline.org/resources/Publications/AdapManHTML/Adman_1.html and http://fosonline.org/resources/Publications/AdapManHTML/adman_2.html
- Salm J. (1999), Coping with globalization: A profile of the northern NGO sector, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 28, supp. 1, pp. 87–103.
- Sammer J. (2007), Strategic alliances: How to manage, how to measure, *Business Finance*, 1 March. Available from <http://businessfinancemag.com/print/5848>
- Saterson K., Margoluis R. and Salafsky N. (eds) (1999), *Measuring conservation impact: An interdisciplinary approach to project monitoring and evaluation* [Symposium proceedings], Biodiversity Support Program, Washington, DC. Available through the Development Resource Management Portal (USAID)

- from <http://rmportal.net/tools/biodiversity-conservation-tools/putting-conservation-in-context-cd/adaptive-management-resources/5-12.pdf/view>
- Savage G.T., Nix T.W., Whitehead C.J. and Blair, J.D. (1991), Strategies for assessing and managing organisational stakeholders, *Academy of Management Executive*, vol. 5, n° 2, pp. 61–75.
- Saxton T. (1997), The effects of partner and relationship characteristics on alliance outcomes, *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 40, n° 2, pp. 443–61.
- Schmeer K. (1999), *Stakeholder analysis guidelines*, World Health Organization, Latin America and Caribbean Regional Health Sector Reform Initiative. Available from <http://www.lachsr.org/documents/policytoolkitforstrengtheninghealthsectorreformpartii-EN.pdf>
- Schneidewind, U., Petersen, H. (2000), Change the rules! Business–NGO partnerships and structuration theory. In Bendell J. (ed.), *Terms for endearment: Business, NGOs and sustainable development* (pp. 216–24.), Greenleaf, Sheffield, UK.
- Schreiner M. and Corsten D. (2004), *Integrating perspectives: A multidimensional construct of collaborative capability* [Working paper], University of Saint Gallen, Switzerland.
- Segil L. (2004), *Measuring the value of partnering: How to use metrics to plan, develop, and implement successful alliances*, AMACOM, New York.
- Shah R. (2001), *Relational praxis in transition towards sustainability: Business–NGO collaboration and participatory action research* [Thesis], Bath University, UK. Available on http://www.bath.ac.uk/carpp/publications/doc_theses_links/r_shah.html
- Shuman J. and Twombly J. (2005), Alliance capability [White paper], *In Pursuit of Value*, vol. 4, March. Available through the Rhythm of Business web site from <http://www.rhythmofbusiness.com/documents/news/AllianceCapability.pdf>
- Simonin B.L. (1997), The importance of collaborative know-how: An empirical test of the learning organization, *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 40, n° 5, pp. 1150–74.
- Smith C. (1994), The new corporate philanthropy, *Harvard Business Review*, May–June, pp. 105–16.
- Snavely K. and Tracy M.B. (2002), Development of trust in rural nonprofit collaborations, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 31, n° 1, pp. 62–83.
- Stafford E.R. and Hartman C.L. (1996), Green alliances: Strategic relations between businesses and environmental groups, *Business Horizons*, vol. 39, n° 2, pp. 50–9.
- Stark A. (1993), What's the matter with business ethics? *Harvard Business Review*, May–June, pp. 38–48.
- Stone M.M. (2000), Exploring the effects of collaborations on member organizations: Washington County's Welfare-to-Work Partnership, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, vol. 29, supp. 1, pp. 98–119.
- Stuart T.E. (2000), Interorganizational alliances and the performance of firms: A study of growth and innovation rates in a high-technology industry, *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 21, n° 8, pp. 791–811.

- SustainAbility (2003), *The 21st century NGO: Roles, rules and risks* [White paper]. Available through the Syracuse University web site on <http://faculty.maxwell.syr.edu/sjlux/NGO/Assignments/Case%20-%20NIKE/NGO%20Roles,%20Rules,%20Risks.pdf>
- SustainAbility, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and UN Global Compact (2003), *The 21st century NGO: In the market for change* (2nd ed.), SustainAbility, London. Available from www.sustainability.com/downloads_public/insight_reports/21st_ngo.pdf
- Swieringa J. and Wierdsma A.F.M. (1995), *La organización que aprende*, Addison–Wesley. English version: *Becoming a learning organization: Beyond the learning curve*, 1992, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, USA.
- Tennyson R. (2003), *The partnering toolbook*, Prince of Wales International Business Leaders Forum (IBLF), London, and Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN), Geneva. Available (with registration) from <http://tpi.iblf.org/docs/tpi/pt/PartneringToolbookEng.pdf>
- Tennyson R. and Wilde L. (2000), *The guiding hand: Brokering partnerships for sustainable development*, United Nations Department of Public Information, New York. Available through the UN System Staff College web site from http://www.unssc.org/web/images/downloads/guidinghand_DPI.pdf
- Tennyson R., Hurrell S. and Sykes J. (2002), *Getting real: The challenges of sustaining biodiversity partnerships* [Essay], Prince of Wales International Business Leaders Forum and Bio+10, London. Available through the Earthmind web site from <http://earthmind.net/eibb/docs/workshop-d-iblf-2002-getting-real.pdf>
- Tholke M. (2003), *Collaboration for a change: A practitioner's guide to environmental nonprofit–industry partnerships*, Erb Environmental Management Institute and Green Business Network. Available through the Resource Saver web site from <http://www.resourcesaver.org/file/toolmanager/CustomO16C45F43021.pdf>
- Tuxworth B. and Sommer F. (2003), *Fair exchange? Measuring the impact of not-for-profit partnerships*, Forum for the Future, Cheltenham, UK. Available from <http://www.forumforthefuture.org/files/FairExchangeReportfinal.pdf>
- UNDP (1998), *Human development report*, United Nations Development Programme, Oxford University Press, New York. Available from <http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr1998/chapters/>
- Waddell S. (1999), *The evolving strategic benefits for business in collaboration with nonprofits in civil society: A strategic resources, capabilities and competencies perspective*, USAID (United States Agency for International Development), Washington, DC. Available from <http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/isp/resource/evolve.html>
- Waddell S. (2000), A “win-win” role for civil society in business strategy, *Journal for Nonprofit Management*, vol. 4, n° 1, pp. 24–43.
- Waddell S., Kane C., Billenness S. and O’Meara A. (2004), *NGO strategies to engage business: Trends, critical issues and next steps*, Global Action Network, Boston.
- Waddock S. (1991), *A typology of social partnership, organizations administration & society*, vol. 22, n° 4, pp. 480–515.

- Weaver G., Trevino L. and Cochran P. (1999), Integrated decoupled corporate social performance: Management commitments, external pressures and corporate ethics practices, *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(5), pp. 539–552.
- Webb T. (2005), Does it pay to get into bed with business? *The Guardian*, 25 February. Available from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2005/feb/25/activists.ethicalmoney>
- Webb T. (2007), Unilever's CEO: Social innovation and sustainability the only game in town, *Ethical Corporation Magazine*, 30 May. Available from <http://www.ethicalcorp.com/content.asp?ContentID=5110>
- Winter S.G. (2002), *Understanding dynamic capabilities* [Working paper], Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, USA. Available through the university web site on <http://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/papers/1247.pdf>
- Wondolleck J.M. and Yaffee S.L. (2001), *Sustaining the success of collaborative partnerships: Revisiting the building bridges cases* [Study conducted for USDA-Forest Service, 1997], School of Natural Resources and Environment, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA. Available from http://www.snre.umich.edu/ecomgt/collaboration/Sustaining_Success.pdf
- World Economic Forum (2005), *Partnering for success: Business perspective on multistakeholder partnerships* [Statement], World Economic Forum (Geneva), Prince of Wales International Business Leaders Forum (London), Harvard University John F. Kennedy School of Government (Boston). Available from <http://www.weforum.org/pdf/ppp.pdf>
- WWF (sans date), *Corporate social responsibility: An overview* [Discussion paper], World Wide Fund for Nature, Gland, Switzerland. Available through the WWF web site from http://www.panda.org/about_our_earth/all_publications/?7587/Corporate-Social-Responsibility-CSR-WWF-Discussion-paper-an-overview-by-Dennis-Pamlin
- Yaffee S.L. and Wondolleck J.M. (2000), Making collaboration work: Lessons from a comprehensive assessment of over 200 wideranging cases of collaboration in environmental management, *Conservation Magazine*, vol. 1, n° 1. Available from <http://www.conservationmagazine.org/articles/v1n1/making-collaboration-work/>
- Yan A. and Gray B. (1994), Bargaining power, management control, and performance in United States–China joint ventures: A comparative case study, *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 37, n° 6, pp. 1478–517.
- Yan A. and Zeng M. (1999), International joint venture instability: A critique of previous research, a reconceptualization, and directions for future research, *Journal of International Business Studies*, vol. 30, n° 2, pp. 397–414.
- Yasuda H. (2005), Strategic alliances for SMEs: An effective way to enhance innovative competitiveness, *Asia Pacific Tech Monitor*, vol. 22, n° 3, May–June, pp. 16–22. Available from http://www.techmonitor.net/techmon/05may_jun/tm/pdf/05may_jun_sf1.pdf
- Yasuda H. and Iijima J. (2004), Analytical framework for strategic alliances from the perspective of exchange of management resources, *International Journal Business Performance Management*, vol. 6, n° 1, pp. 88–105.

- Yaziji M. (2004), Turning gadflies into allies, *Harvard Business Review*, vol. 82, n° 2, pp. 110–15.
- Zadek S. (1999, January), *Can corporations be civil?* Paper presented at the NGOs in a Global Future Conference, Birmingham University, UK.
- Zeng M. and Chen X.-P. (2003), Achieving cooperation in multiparty alliances: A social dilemma approach to partnership management, *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 28, n° 4, pp. 587–605.
- Zollo M. and Winter S.G. (1999), *From organizational routines to dynamic capabilities* [Working paper], Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, USA.
- Zollo M., Reuer J.J. and Singh H. (2002), Interorganizational routines and performance in strategic alliances, *Organization Science*, vol. 13, n° 6, pp. 701–13.

Index

- Agrupación Sierra Madre (ASM),
5, 57, 68, 74, 89, 92, 94, 147,
156, 170
- alliances (corporate–NGO)
action alliances, 110
alliances as a gamble, 38
benefits of, xiii–xiv
coaching alliances, 110
definition of, xiii
factors that hinder alliances, 18
heterogeneous alliances, 4
integrative alliances, 56–7
(The) paradox of alliances, 71
political alliances, 36
systemic alliances, 44, 56
see also social partnership, 55;
structural partnership, 56
- alliance typologies
Austin's typology, 56
Elkington and Fennell's, 56
Hartman and Stafford's, 56
Mach's, 57
Waddock's, 55–6
- Anglo American, 83
- Arco, 36, 43
- asymmetries
Complementary, 71
Constraint, 81–2
Contradictory, 71
Cultural, 77
Derived, 77
Enabling, 71
Fundamental, 75–7
Language, 78
Limiting, 71
Power, 73–4
Repercussions of, 82–3
Skill, 80
Superficial, 72–3
Time, 78
- Trade, 80
see also cultural differences, 71, 79,
80, 83, 84; knowledge gap, 81
- Birdlife International, 5, 49, 68, 92,
94, 95, 101, 102, 116, 118, 121,
147, 148, 150, 162
- Body Shop, 33, 51, 52, 180
- Bristol-Myers Squibb, 34
- Burger King, 26, 43
- capability
alliance capability, 86–7
institutionalization of, 110
negative capability, 24, 36
- CARE, 34, 39, 167
- CEMEX, 1, 5, 57, 68, 74, 90, 92, 94,
95, 104, 105, 147, 156, 159, 163
- CERES, 42
- Chiquita Brands International, 31
- Citigroup, 41, 42
- Climate Savers, 31
- codification, 106
see also choice between
codification and
personalization, 108
- collaboration
factors explaining predisposition
to collaborate, 9
- company typologies
Elkington and Fennell's model,
46–7
committed company, 50–1
exposed company, 50–1
neutral company, 50–1
- compensatory projects, 24
- Conservation International, 31, 32,
34, 39, 41, 42
- consumption
ethical consumption, 11

- Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), 10, 11, 15, 21
- culture
 - alliance culture, 90, 93
 - organizational culture, 77–8
 - partnership culture, 95
 - see also* cultural asymmetries, 77;
 - cultural fragmentation, 79–80;
 - cultural intelligence, 97;
 - cultural unity, 79; culture clash, 79; reculturation, 80
- DaimlerChrysler, 31
- dissemination
 - three levels of, 122
- doing together vs thinking together, 31
- Domini Social Index, 13
- Dow Chemical, 15
- Dow Jones Sustainability Index, 13
- dysfunctional dynamics, 93
- Earthwatch, 49, 163
- education
 - a posteriori, 123, 124
 - a priori, 123
- Energy and Biodiversity Initiative, 31
- Environmental Defense Fund, 26, 43, 81
- environmental efficiency, 24
- environmentalism
 - three phases of, 15
- equality vs equity, 74
- ethical conflicts, 70
- evaluation
 - main functions of, 103
 - types of, 104
- executors
 - alliance executors, 98
 - direct executors, 121
- Exxon, 36, 42
- first-mover benefit, 21, 22, 28
- Forest Stewardship Council, 33, 79
- Georgia Pacific, 30
- Global Compact, 14
- Global Reporting Initiative, 42
- Greenpeace, 16, 25, 27, 39, 41, 52
- Green Power Group (the), 32
- Greenwashing, 37, 54, 132
- Havas Voyage, 34
- imitative impulse, 49
- indicators
 - attributes of, 154
 - Four levels of, 152
 - joint vs individual, 142–143
 - see also* success factors vs indicators, 145
- insular type of management, 109
- inter-dependence of interests, 76
- interest
 - active vs passive, 119
 - positive, 119
 - pre-existing vs built, 118
- interface
 - definition, 81
- IUCN, 31
- Kellogg's, 45
- knowledge
 - knowledge articulation, 104
 - knowledge sharing, 107
 - see also* levels of alliance knowledge, 89
- Lafarge, 5, 27, 3, 40, 47, 49, 68, 83, 91–5, 121, 146–8, 151, 166
- land stewardship, 89, 156, 164, 171
- learning
 - horizontal learning, 105
 - vertical learning, 105
 - see also* linked to alliance capabilities, 147; linked to alliance content, 147
- Living Earth, 30
- Loblaws, 26, 27, 39, 40, 58, 186
- McDonald, 26, 43, 47, 49, 81
- managers (alliance managers)
 - main functions, 97

- Marine Stewardship Council (MSC), 33, 40
- money
alienating potential of, 39
- motivations,
the 4 'Cs' of corporate motivation, 24
the 4 'Cs' of NGO's motivation, 38
see also negative motivations, 24;
positive motivations, 24
- multinationals
definition, xiv–xv
- Nature Conservancy (the), 30, 31
- NGOs (environmental)
areas of expertise, 28
definition of, xv
as watchdogs, 37
typologies, 53–5
- Nike, 43, 49
- opposition
active vs passive, 116
characteristics of, 117
individual, 116
internal vs external, 116
Ostensible vs secret, 117
see also factors of strong opposition, 117
- partner fit, 69
- partner identification, 66
- partnership mindset, 94
- performance
four levels of, 152
process performance, 143
result performance, 143
see also importance of measuring of, 68; narrow vs extended vision of, 152
- personalisation, 106–8
- Plus Group Alliance (the), 33
- POEMA, 31
- Pollution Probe, 26, 27, 39, 40, 76, 117, 186
- Rain Forest Alliance, 31
- relational return, 70
see also relational capital, 87;
relational quality, 87; social exchange, 87
- Rio Tinto, 5, 15, 68, 83, 91, 92, 94, 95, 102, 111, 124, 147, 150, 162
- Round Table on Sustainable Palm Oil, 32
- Safe Climate, Sound Business, 32
- Shell, 30, 31, 47, 49, 178
- Smile Car Project (the), 41
- stakeholder approach
definition of, 112
- stakeholders
bridging, 129, 136, 137
negative stakeholder, 113
positive stakeholder, 113
stakeholder strategy scale, 131–2
three fundamental attributes of, 113
three levels of influence of, 115
see under interest; opposition; support
- Starbucks, 39
- strategic incentives, 3, 22, 23
- strategic positioning
Hamel's model, 20
Courtney and colleagues' model, 20
- strategy scale (for stakeholder involvement), 131
- Suez, 30
- support
active vs passive, 117–18
pre-existing vs built, 118
- sustainable development
definition, xii–xiii
see also Brundtland Report, 10;
Rio Summit, 10, 11; Tripple Bottom Line, 10, 42
- typologies. *see under* alliances; companies; NGOs

Unilever, 32, 33, 40, 47

World Business Council for
Sustainable Development
(WBCSD), 5, 29, 49

World Wide Fund for Nature
(WWF), 5, 14, 16, 27, 31, 32, 33,
34, 40, 48, 49, 68, 79, 83, 92, 94,
95, 105, 116, 121, 124, 147, 150,
151, 166–73