

# EAAFP Corporate Engagement Guidelines

## I. Background

The Partnership recognizes that corporates are important stakeholders with respect to the conservation of migratory waterbirds and in particular their habitats. This can be because some corporates have operations impacting on migratory waterbird habitats or because they want to be (profiling themselves with) delivering better outcomes for the conservation of waterbirds and their habitats. (EAAFP Strategic Plan Objective 4. KRA 4.3). The Finance Sub Committee (FsC) meeting in Singapore in 2019 noted the need to develop principles for engaging the corporate sector and have a paper to present to Partners for consideration at MOP11. This document will assist each EAAFP Partner and the Secretariat to establish and maintain positive relationships with corporates with a view to achieve objectives of the EAAFP.

The EAAFP Secretariat has collected corporate engagement policies from several international Non-Profit Organizations [**Appendix I**] identifying the key contents and risk sectors as a basis of developing the EAAFP Corporate Engagement Principles.

**Corporate social responsibility** is traditionally broken into **four** categories: environmental, philanthropic, ethical, and economic responsibility.

## II. Guiding Principles for engagement with Corporates

1. Do no harm to migratory waterbirds and their important habitats in the East Asia-Australasian Flyway
2. Contribute to the implement the EAAFP Strategic Plan 2019-2028
3. Mutual benefits are expected between the EAAFP and the corporate
4. The engagement should not diminish EAAFP's integrity and reputation
5. Cooperation with the corporate must be transparent in financial management and follow the financial regulations and rules of the affected country(ies).
6. Do not undermine the existing relationship with other corporates or other Partners
7. The engagement should not result in negative public perceptions of the EAAFP
8. A communication protocol is in place to guide the way the engagement is presented to the outside world
9. A potential engagement candidate should not be involved in:
  - a. [weapons and war-related industries - weapons with the exception of hunting equipment?]
  - b. [Child labor]
  - c. [Violation of human rights]
  - d. [causing significant threat to human health]
  - e. [significant habitat destruction without policies to follow the mitigation hierarchy in that.....]

### III. Types of Engagement

Partnership level	
Type	Explanation
Becoming an EAAFP corporate Partner	Official membership obtained for the corporate to cooperate with the EAAFP to achieve its goals <sup>1</sup> .
Developing cooperative projects	A direct engagement with corporates to deliver an outcome within Key Results Area(s) of the EAAFP Strategic Plan 2019-2028.
Secretariat level	
Financial sponsorship	Donations toward the goals of EAAFP
In-kind sponsorship	In-kind donations toward the goals of EAAFP
Philanthropic relationships	Support EAAFP's particular conservation projects or efforts in conserving key species and habitats by providing financial support or conducting joint campaigns to raise awareness.
Joint marketing	Donations in pursuit of mutual benefits for raising brand reputations of EAAFP and the corporate across the EAA Flyway.
EAAFP Foundation level	
Financial and In-kind Sponsorship	Donations from the Republic of Korea (ROK) based corporates.
Joint marketing	Donations in pursuit of mutual benefits for raising brand reputations of the EAAFP Foundation and the corporate in the Republic of Korea
Partner level	Collaborations with INGO Partners on implementation of the Strategic Plan
Financial sponsorship	Donations toward the goals of EAAFP
Advisory role	Advise on sustainability performance of corporate (projects)
Implementation role	Deliver conservation in relation to corporate activities especially where the corporated operations are in the vicinity of important sites for migratory waterbirds.

### IV. Risk and Opportunity Assessment

*(An assessment table to be developed to quantify the level of the risk and opportunity in engaging with a corporate)*

#### Guiding questions

The following list of questions would guide the Partnership in minimizing serious risks in interacting with corporates.

- A. Is the corporate known to have had a significant adverse impact on habitats used by migratory birds?
- B. Is the corporate or the CEO antagonistic towards environment conservation?
- C. Is there any risk the collaboration will "tarnish" the EAAFP?

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.eaaflyway.net/the-partnership/partners/become-a-partner/>

## Appendix I. Corporate Engagement Guidelines in Other Organizations

It is worth to be aware of sectors that are perceived as risk sectors by other organization in the environment community. Not many environmental organizations list these sectors explicitly, but a few organizations highlight them.

### Category A. EAAFP Partners

Organization	Corporate Engagement Guidelines	
Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust (WWT)	<p><b>High risk:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Automotive (apart from EV or other environmentally friendly vehicles)</li> <li>2) Aeronautical and airports</li> <li>3) Fossil fuel derived plastics</li> <li>4) Hunting</li> <li>5) Pharmaceutical sector</li> <li>6) Nuclear power</li> <li>7) Environmentally insensitive civil engineering and construction</li> <li>8) Large scale agriculture</li> <li>9) Gambling</li> </ol> <p><b>Highly unlikely</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Arms (armaments and weapons systems)</li> <li>2) Peat, oil, gas and coal extraction</li> <li>3) Tobacco</li> </ol>	<p><b>Risk assessment questions for prospective corporate partnerships, worth &gt;£100k or operating within an identified risk sector</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has the brand had significant negative publicity for ethical, environmental or customer service issues?</li> <li>2. Has the brand taken part in any activities that are detrimental to the objectives of the Trust?</li> <li>3. Has the brand violated international conventions that bear on human rights; contravened the Modern Slavery Act 2015; or been involved in illegal activities or infringed money laundering requirements?</li> <li>4. Has the brand been reported to be in financial difficulty or is known to be up for sale?</li> <li>5. Would association with the brand deter donations or gifts from other potential 3rd party supporters?</li> <li>6. Is the partnership conditional on particular individuals or organisations being used to do work for the Trust?</li> <li>7. Will the partnership involve the sale of a product or service with a financial benefit to the charity?</li> <li>8. Are WWT being asked to provide services or benefits on favourable terms to the donor or a person nominated by the donor?</li> <li>9. Do the purposes of the partnership contravene in any way the objectives and values of the Trust; or place conditions on the Trust that tie the partnership</li> </ol>

		<p>monies in to an activity that is contrary to the Trust's objectives or values?</p> <p>10. Will the partnership incur significant additional costs or burdens?</p>
<p>Wetlands International (WI)</p>	<p><b>Guiding principles</b></p> <p>Recognising the investment needed and the inherent risks, engagements with a corporate partner should meet the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. provide significant strategic opportunity to contribute to our goals and targets.</li> <li>2. be feasible within the available or readily buildable capacity to deliver.</li> <li>3. not jeopardise other policies.</li> </ol> <p>Any engagement should trigger at least one of the points below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. support and add value to our organisational capacities and/or our past and existing programmatic efforts (thematically and/or geographically)</li> <li>5. provide opportunity for complementarity (in relation to skills, locations, networks) with the rest of our work</li> <li>6. leverage major impact (because this corporate or industry group impacts wetland condition strongly)</li> </ol> <p>Any corporate engagement will be much stronger where there is potential and mutual interest to develop a business case for improved environmental and social performance.</p> <p>A scorecard visualising the application of these principles will be used to assess the worth and risks of any particular corporate engagement.</p>	<p><b>Proposed Critical Conditions (CC):</b></p> <p>CC1: Could the engagement provide significant strategic opportunity to contribute to our goals and targets? (+)</p> <p>CC2: Is the engagement feasible within the available or readily buildable capacity to deliver? (+)</p> <p>CC3: Could the engagement jeopardise Wetlands International's core values or policies? (-)</p> <p>CC4: Could the engagement jeopardise Wetlands International's brand and reputation? (-)</p> <p><b>Proposed Supplementary conditions (SC):</b></p> <p>Any engagement should trigger at least one of the points below. The engagement:</p> <p>SC1: supports/adds value to our organisational capacities and/or our past and existing programmatic efforts (thematically and/or geographically).</p> <p>SC2: provides opportunity for complementarity (skills, locations, networks) with the rest of our work.</p> <p>SC3: leverages major impact (because this corporate or industry group impacts wetland condition strongly)</p>

<p>Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS)</p>	<p><b>CMS code of conduct for partnerships with the private sector</b></p> <p><b>General principles</b></p> <p>In engaging with the private sector, the Secretariat of UNEP/CMS should be guided by the following overarching principles, which are coherent with the UN “Guidelines on Cooperation between the United Nations and the Private Sector<sup>1</sup>”:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Advance CMS goals: The objective of the partnership should be articulated clearly and must advance CMS goals, specifically the conservation of migratory species.</li> <li>b) Objectives of partnerships: These include the improvement of the environmental impact of the private sector, awareness raising of the value of migratory species and the creation of support for the conservation of migratory species through increased local, national and regional investments.</li> <li>c) Clear delineation of responsibilities and roles: The arrangement must be based on a clear understanding of respective roles and expectations, with accountability and a clear division of responsibilities.</li> <li>d) Maintain integrity and independence: Arrangements should not diminish CMS’s integrity, independence and impartiality.</li> <li>e) No unfair advantage: Every member of the business community should have the opportunity to propose cooperative arrangements, within the parameters of these guidelines. Cooperation should not imply endorsement or preference of a particular business entity or its products or services.</li> <li>f) Transparency: Cooperation with the business community sector must be transparent. Information on the nature and scope of cooperative arrangements should be available on the CMS website and to the public at large.</li> <li>g) Commitment of private sector partners: Private sector entities engaging with CMS must commit themselves to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Analysing corporate activities with regard to their impact on migratory species.</li> <li>(ii) (Actively including CMS goals into the environmental policy of the respective organisation.</li> <li>(iii) Appointing a responsible individual within the organisation to oversee the activities relating to populations of migratory species and to report to their management and the UNEP/CMS Secretariat.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	
<p>IUCN</p>	<p><b>Risk and Opportunity Screening</b> cover issues that are critical including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental concern</li> <li>• Human rights concerns</li> <li>• Extortion, bribery and corruption</li> <li>• Labour concerns</li> </ul>	<p><b>Further issues</b> that are considered include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corporate environmental policies</li> <li>• Corporate social policies</li> <li>• Corporate standards/systems</li> <li>• Business leadership position</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negative influence on environmental standards and policies</li> <li>• Specific concerns raised by IUCN Members</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental footprint requiring action</li> <li>• Engagements with other NGOs</li> <li>• Coinciding countries of operation</li> <li>• Significant resources for conservation</li> <li>• Complementarity of priorities</li> <li>• Executive level support</li> <li>• Multi-stakeholder engagements</li> <li>• Positively influence external environmental policies</li> <li>• Free, Prior and Informed Consent</li> <li>• Reporting guidelines followed, e.g. GRI guidelines</li> </ul>
--	--	---

Category B. Non-EAAFP Partners

Stockholm International Water Institute (SIWI)	<p>SIWI does not seek sponsorship from corporations associated with;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tobacco and hard liquor</li> <li>• Arms</li> <li>• Certain types of gambling (high-risk addictive)</li> <li>• Any form of pornography</li> </ul>
WWF US	WWF does not accept funding from the fossil fuel industry and has never had a direct investment in coal, oil and gas, or tar sands.
World Bank	Listing of Ineligible Firms and Individuals: Firms that have been sanctioned under the Bank's fraud and corruption policy <sup>2</sup> .

<sup>2</sup> <https://projects.worldbank.org/en/projects-operations/procurement/debarred-firms>