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ABSTRACT

This exploratory study examines ‘Creating Shared Value’ as a framework for a new type of collaboration between NGOs and Business. Through a series of in-depth interviews with NGOs and private organisations, it investigates the potential drivers on both sides and evaluates the potential of four Shared Value strategies: Market Transformation, Environmental Service Payments, Demand Reduction and Wildlife Tourism.

It concludes that Wildlife Tourism offers the most potential to create win-win solutions for Tiger Conservation. The study demonstrates the usefulness of ‘Creating Shared Value’ as a framework in this context and provides recommendations for further action by tiger NGOs and their potential corporate partners.
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Glossary

Capitalism
The term ‘Capitalism’ has been used in this study only in a generic sense to describe the prevailing economic system in the world today.

Creating Shared Value CSV
The term ‘Creating Shared Value’ (CSV) has been used consistently in keeping with the original definition by the authors Porter and Kramer, as opposed to the inversion ‘Shared Value Creation’ introduced in later academic papers.

Non-Governmental Organisation NGO
The term ‘Non-Governmental Organisation’ (NGO) for the purpose of this research refers to voluntary and non-profit organisations in the Third Sector.

Tiger NGOs
All NGOs, as defined above, whose mission includes the conservation of wild Tigers, in particular those protecting tiger species and habitats, campaigning against poaching and illegal wildlife trade, promoting awareness and support or fundraising for any of these causes.

Umbrella Species
A wide-ranging species, which is selected for particular conservation efforts, because their protection indirectly preserves many other species that share the same habitat.
Chapter 1  INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background
What does saving tigers really have to do with us? There is strong evidence (University of Copenhagen, 2012) to suggest that amongst the many global challenges facing the human race in this century, the loss of biodiversity is the most misunderstood and underrated by the general public and those in positions of power and influence.

"With the current biodiversity loss, we are witnessing the greatest extinction crisis since dinosaurs disappeared from our planet 65 million years ago. Not only are these extinctions irreversible, but they also pose a serious threat to our health and wellbeing" (IUCN, 2013)

This study is inductive, as it focuses on one iconic species, whose plight is symbolic and representative of the global pressure that mankind is putting on the earth’s resources. So far, the tide of the escalating extinction crisis has not been reversed, and a new systemic way of thinking is urgently needed by all decision-makers in the Public, Private and Voluntary Sector.

1.2. Re-inventing Capitalism through Creating Shared Value
At the start of 2011, the Harvard Business Review published an article -under the heading ‘Big Idea’ - by two of the world’s leading corporate strategists, who called for the corporation to be redefined as ‘Creating Shared Value’, which would “reinvent capitalism and unleash a wave of innovation and growth” (Porter and Kramer, 2011, p. 63). Their theory is remarkable by suggesting that Capitalism can be transformed and the core principle of creating shareholder value can now also work for the social good. Porter and Kramer (2011) argue that the systemic problem has been made worse by the assumption of government and civil society, that economic efficiency and social progress are mutually exclusive. The business world has been under attack, even though the capitalist system has been instrumental in lifting millions out of poverty throughout the world (The Economist, 2013). Even critics, such as Karl Marx, have marveled at its achievements and seemingly endless problem-solving capacity (Wood, 1987). Over the course of history, there have been many attempts to do away or reform Capitalism, because it is also inherently unstable, and has often been the source of crises and inequality.
However, there is a strong argument that it has been the only system that has provided humans simultaneously with personal freedom, progress and opportunities (Masters of Money, 2012). Critics of Capitalism have focused on faults or flaws, but these are arguably human faults and not those of the system (Meltzer, 2009). If Capitalism is here to stay, then indeed only reform or re-invention will be feasible to combat many of its failings. These failings have been succinctly outlined in a recent report recognizing that “the way we do business has serious impacts on the world around us” (KPMG, 2012, p.1). The report identifies ten interconnected and unpredictable ‘sustainability mega-forces’, such as deforestation and ecosystem decline, and posits that the core challenge of our time is “decoupling human progress from resource use and environmental decline” (KPMG, 2012, p.1). It encourages business leaders to understand these forces and devise strategies for their risks and implied need for innovative ways to continue to build business value in a changing world (KPMG, 2012).

1.3. Saving the tiger

The desperate plight of the tiger exemplifies this core challenge of environmental decline. Today, tigers only occupy 7% of their original range (Figure 1.1).

Source: Dinerstein et al., 2007 cited in Damania et al., 2008, p.6
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The number of wild tigers has dwindled to about 3,200 (Figure 1.2).

![Figure 1.2. A Summary of Habitat and Population Trends](image)


The tiger, as an umbrella species (see glossary for definition), is dependent on abundant prey and ample space, and its decline is directly related to the destruction of its habitat. Its fragile future is integral to the global issue of Biodiversity Loss, which by its very nature is immensely complex and systemic. Habitat destruction is only one factor, but perversely Poverty (subsistence needs of surrounding human populations) and Prosperity (middle class demand in booming Asian economies) have fuelled a poaching industry, which has reached critical levels (Damania, et al., 2008). Total numbers in the wild are now well below estimated numbers in captivity.

The unsustainable level of consumption of tiger parts and the habitat loss mirror our overall unsustainable levels of human consumption. The ecological footprint of humankind has more than doubled since 1966 and based on scientific data from the Global Footprint Network (2013), human overconsumption now represents the equivalent of 1.5 planets, given the resources used and the waste absorbed, and so it takes eighteen months for the planet to replace one year of human consumption.
Humans benefit from Biodiversity in almost every aspect of life i.e. Human Health, Agriculture, Business and Industry, Leisure, Cultural and Aesthetic value and so-called Ecosystem services, the resources and processes supplied by eco-systems such as clean drinking water and air quality (IUCN, 2013). Mass extinctions are symptomatic for rapid ecological changes, and studies suggest about 25% of all mammal species will be gone in 20 years (IUCN, 2013).

The Worldwide Fund for Nature WWF is one of the main players in the efforts to save the remaining six subspecies of the tiger and cites the biggest threats to their existence as:

1. Poaching and illegal trade
2. Habitat Loss
3. Prey Loss
4. Conflict with humans

(WWF Tigers Alive, 2011)

1.4. NGO-Business Partnerships

Proponents of sustainability consistently call for Government, Business, and Civil Society to work together to develop a shared understanding and stimulate innovation (Hecht, et al., 2012). Porter and Kramer specifically refer to “blurring the profit/ non-profit boundary” (2011, p.67) and call for NGOs to think more in value terms, rather than just outcomes and money spent. We have seen that green NGOs have effectively engaged with Governments over the past decades, which has resulted in progress evident from the Convention on Biological Diversity CBD in 1992 and the designation of the current decade 2011-2020 as the ‘United Nations Decade on Biodiversity’ (United Nations, 2013).

For business, the effect of such engagement has been an enforcement model, where often one issue or species is singled out, rather than the systemic approach called for by CSV. It suggests that companies must be transformed as ‘Creating Shared Value’, “which involves creating economic value in a way that also creates value for society by addressing its needs and challenges” (Porter and Kramer, 2011, p.64).
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It is contended that such a transformation will (re)-connect business success with social progress, provided there is a broader context, which includes deeper understanding of society’s needs and company productivity, collaboration across profit and non-profit boundaries and better government regulation (Porter and Kramer, 2011).

By contrast, the current lack of NGO-Business interaction is evident by the low level of corporate financial support for charitable organisations. Funding from the Private Sector represents less than 5% of total Voluntary Sector income and is on the decline (NCVO, 2012).

There has, however, been a recent trend towards a more constructive type of engagement, where companies become direct contributors to environmental goals, rather than indirect ones through fundraising. These relationships can be on a one-to-one basis, such as Rainforest Alliance’s work to promote their ‘Green Frog’ standards to companies in agriculture, forestry and tourism (Rainforest Alliance, 2013). Alternatively, the standards are promoted on an industry-wide basis, such as the Roundtable for Sustainable Palm Oil RSPO (RSPO, 2013).

1.5. Problem Statement and Aims

Environmental NGOs are failing to halt the imminent extinction of tigers in the wild. They focus primarily on enforcement-based conservation models in cooperation with governments and public bodies, but have paid too little attention to turning the tiger into “a living wild asset” as recommended by the World Bank (Damania, et al., 2008, p.1). Can a new approach, hailed as ‘re-inventing capitalism’ by its authors (Porter and Kramer 2011), offer a model that will make business part of the solution, rather than the problem?

The aim of this study is to understand the key drivers for collaboration between Tiger NGOs and Corporate Organisations within a CSV framework, in order to:

a. Serve as a catalyst for Shared Value Initiatives in the field of Tiger Conservation

b. Evaluate CSV as an effective model for collaboration between tiger NGOs and Companies

c. Contribute to the review of literature on Creating Shared Value
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Research Question:

1. **What is the potential for Creating Shared Value for Tiger Conservation?**

Sub-Questions:

2. **How is Shared Value created in the context of Tiger Conservation?**
3. **To what extent are the drivers for Creating Shared Value resonant to Tiger Conservation?**
   a. What are the drivers for business?
   b. What are the drivers for NGOs?
   c. What are the constraints?
4. **Which Shared Value strategies are most effective for Tiger Conservation?**

The findings of this study will assist Tiger NGOs in their decision-making with regard to the opportunity for corporate partnerships and their possible impact. This is particularly helpful in the current climate of austerity and diminishing funding from public bodies. In 2010, the year of the Tiger, a specific goal was set of doubling the number of wild tigers by 2022 at the world’s first tiger summit in St. Petersburg (Watts, 2010). This numerical target of about 6,000 tigers has been operationalised into three strategies: “1. Protecting tigers, their prey and habitat 2. Eliminating the illegal tiger trade and 3. Increasing political will, commitment and funding” (WWF, 2012).

Given that the targets and operational strategies for tigers are clearly defined, this study will show how these can be interpreted by the CSV theory. In this way, a guide for identifying and evaluating existing CSV projects and deducing further projects can be devised.

With the spread of CSR Corporate Social Responsibility, there has been increasing pressure on companies to seek cross-sector collaboration, but doubts remain whether the perceived ‘win-win’ relationships for both sides do not, in fact undermine the credibility and independence of NGOs (Baur and Schmitz, 2011).
This study will address the need to move beyond the traditional types of relationships, such as sponsorships, labeling agreements and similar Cause-Related Marketing tools.

By contrast, the rigorous market-based proposition of CSV forces both sides to adapt their practices and critically consider each participant’s demands and responsibilities. Baur and Schmitz already highlighted the premise to preserve NGOs’ independence through so-called ‘Political CSR’, where the corporation changes its business practices and adopts a political understanding (2011). This study is complementary to the suggestion that such relationships can only work on a long-term basis and across entire business sectors (Baur and Schmitz, 2011).

The ultimate aim is to stimulate further Shared Value initiatives in the field of Tiger Conservation, so that NGOs can increase the impact of their work by collaborating with business and yet retain their independence at the same time. The focus on Asia may add further significance, as it can be the ‘breeding ground’ for such partnerships to flourish. An early report from China affirms that the goals of shareholders and NGO members can be combined to forge successful environmental NGO-business partnerships that “are truly collaborative, with a jointly defined agenda that focuses on a clearly measurable goal” (Turner, 2003, p. 22).

Finally, this report will contribute to the review of literature on Creating Shared Value. This topic is relatively new, since Porter and Kramer first introduced the term CSV in 2006 and subsequently clarified the theory in the Harvard Business Review in 2011. Understandably, the amount of academic literature is still limited, both from the Corporate, as well as the Voluntary sector.

1.6. Delimitations

The focus of this study will be on the top tiger range countries of Malaysia and India, which represent more than half of the total number of wild tigers (Figure 1.3) This is not only for reasons of practicality, but also because of this researcher’s familiarity with these regions and cultures.
Furthermore, the researcher’s background in business and education is relevant in presenting an underlying theoretical framework for collaborations between NGO actors and companies; research associated with the development of the literature commensurate to this study indicates that this has not been the subject of much academic research in the context of Tiger Conservation, as will be elaborated in section 2.3. This study will fill this gap in knowledge with a view of connecting practitioners and academics (Milofsky, 2000).

Figure 1.3 Tiger Range Countries - ranking

| Tiger Population Estimates Today (number of Adults) |  |
|---|---|---|
| INDIA | 1706 | BURMA | 85 |
| MALAYSIA | 500 | BHUTAN | 75 |
| BANGLADESH | 400 | CHINA | 45 |
| INDONESIA | 325 | LAOS PDR | 25 |
| RUSSIA | 360 | VIETNAM* | 0 |
| THAILAND | 275 | CAMBODIA* | 0 |
| NEPAL | 121 |  |  |

* No known source breeding population

Sources: Status of Tigers in India, 2011, Wildlife Institute of India et al, rest of data from Global Tiger Recovery Program

Chapter 2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This study draws on literature from at least three distinct academic disciplines. This is deliberate and inevitable due to the interconnectedness which underlies both CSV and Tiger Conservation, thus touching on Social, Natural and Applied Sciences. For the purpose of this review, these have been narrowed down as follows:

1. Corporate Strategy
2. Non-profit Strategy
3. Conservation Biology

2.1. Corporate Strategy and Creating Shared Value

The theory of Creating Shared Value has evolved from the convergence between Competitive Strategy and Corporate Social Responsibility. The authors themselves are pre-eminent scholars of Competitive Strategy and Michael Porter’s strategic system, which includes the value chain, the five forces analysis and generic strategies, has been the model for Corporate Strategy for decades (Magretta, 2011)

More recently, the rise of CSR has pervaded almost every aspect of business including marketing, operations, finance and investment (White, 2012). The much-quoted notion by Friedman (1970) that corporations are not responsible to society, but only to their shareholders has lost ground to the present mainstream view that companies can be held accountable for their social and environmental impact.

In the age of Internet and Social Media, companies are subject to ever-increasing demands for greater transparency and accountability. Indeed, Porter and Kramer talk of ‘a vicious circle’, in which business finds itself today, suffering from decreasing public trust and blame for social, environmental and economic problems, which in turn leads to politicians imposing further restrictions to competitiveness and growth (2011, p.63).

Many countries have started to enshrine aspects of CSR into their legislation, for example, regulations for responsible investment in the U.K. and other European countries (Williams and Conley, 2005).
The stringency and enforcement of such regulations vary greatly across the world and between developed and developing nations. A comparison into different legal and institutional frameworks indicates that Europe is generally at the forefront of this movement, as evidenced by the fact that the European Commission published a policy on CSR, which defines Corporate Social Responsibility as “the responsibility of enterprises for their impacts on society” (European Commission, 2011, p.6).

To fully meet their social responsibility, enterprises “should have in place a process to integrate social, environmental, ethical human rights and consumer concerns into their business operations and core strategy in close collaboration with their stakeholders” (European Commission, 2011, p.6).

In Europe, CSR is ‘implicit’ and the law assigns to companies “an agreed share of responsibility for society’s interests and concerns” (Matten and Moon, 2005, p. 3.). This is in contrast to other parts of the world, such as the United States, where CSR is usually ‘explicit’ in terms of voluntary disclosure of social and environmental aspects of the business (Matten and Moon, 2005).

However, the worldwide spread of CSR cannot be denied (Rangan, Chase and Karim, 2012) and its influence is expressed not only in the substantial volume of academic articles, but also through the extensive media coverage on many recent stories, ranging from the BP oil spill (BBC, 2013) to the Bangladesh Clothing factory disaster (Sadique, 2013).

Today the argument is that “every company needs a CSR strategy” to bring coherence and strategy to what is practically an ad-hoc collection of “numerous disparate CSR programs and initiatives” for “a myriad of reasons” (Rangan, Chase, Karim, 2012, p.2)

The concurrent evolution of CSV has been very apparent from the body of literature that has been published in the past decades. Starting from Porter’s own seminal article on Competitive Strategy, in which three generic strategies are outlined, Market Segmentation (or Focus), Cost Leadership and Differentiation (1980), to later versions by other authors, who made adaptations to reflect social or environmental dimensions.
For instance, Orsato stated that the debate has moved from “Whether” to “How and When to be green?” (2006, p.127), devising a framework, based on Porter’s system, for companies to decide on their environmental strategy to gain competitive advantage (Figure 2.1.)

**Figure 2.1. Competitive Strategies from an Environmental perspective**

![Competitive Strategies Diagram](image-url)

Source: ORSATO, R.J., 2006, p.131

The framework applies Porter’s two generic types of competitive advantage, Low Cost and Differentiation, and distinguishes between organisational processes and products/services.

A company’s strategy will also depend on the type of industry and markets in which it operates. Thus an ‘Eco-efficiency’ strategy may apply to process-intensive firms cutting costs by reducing the environmental impact of their processes, Additionally, Strategy 2 implies that a company will not only invest in being ‘Eco-efficient’, but – beyond compliance- also in activities such as certification, environmental reporting and communication towards consumers.
Eco-branding is more or less equivalent to Green Marketing with a focus on products and markets (Orsato, 2006). These four strategies are mirrored in the latest thinking on CSR (Figure 2.2)

**Figure 2.2. The Evolution and Hierarchy of CSR Approaches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSR as VALUE CREATION “CSR 2.0”</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create value via product/service innovation linked to social issues</td>
<td><em>Fully Integrated in company strategy, budget and operations</em></td>
<td><em>Economic and societal benefits relative to cost</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGIC CSR</td>
<td>Compliance, Risk Management</td>
<td><em>Medium to high strategic and operational impact</em></td>
<td><em>Mitigates operational risks and impacts</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRADITIONAL CSR “CSR 1.0”</td>
<td>Corporate Philanthropy, Doing good is its own reward</td>
<td><em>Not relevant to core business mission</em></td>
<td><em>Enhanced visibility/corporate reputation</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Little strategic or operational impact</em></td>
<td><em>Improved citizenship and employee satisfaction</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Provide funding or skills for social need</em></td>
<td><em>Usually short-term and diluted over many causes (minimal social impact)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Limited by CSR budget and Corporate Footprint</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*own work, derived from Husted and Allen, 2007; Touro, 2010; Visser, 2011; Porter and Kramer, 2011

The figure shows the evolutionary growth and resultant hierarchy within CSR. It illustrates the wide range of CSR practices and underlying rationale and demonstrates that there is no single concept of what constitutes CSR, but there are different schools of thought that have developed. Broadly, these can be ranked from traditional CSR, ‘CSR 1.0’, (Husted and Allen, 2007) to transformational value-adding CSR: ‘CSR 2.0’ (Visser, 2011). This is confirmed by a comprehensive study, carried out by Williams and Aguilera, who point out that there is no universal definition of CSR and consumer expectations vary dependent on industry and cultural perspective (2007). Their comparative research identifies several contexts, in which to understand different CSR practices.
The first of these has already been referred to, namely the Legal and Institutional framework, where Corporate Governance from North America, the UK and Continental Europe is compared and contrasted. Europe has an apparent leadership in CSR, both in terms of companies reporting and institutional requirements (Matten and Moon, 2005; Williams and Aguilera, 2007).

Another approach is to compare the attitudes of Managers and Consumers across different countries and industries. It appears that ‘both individual ethical perspective and organisational culture’ matter significantly. The multitude of studies on the subject affirm that motivations for CSR can be any given combination of drivers based on institutional performance, organizational and personal values and stakeholders’ perceptions and needs (Maignan and Ralston, 2002). These varying motivations are accommodated in the CSR approaches of figure 2.2 above.

The variety in these approaches also represents the spectrum of critics of CSR. At the bottom of the hierarchy, ‘civil society advocates’ brand corporate philanthropic projects as window dressing or green-washing to boost corporate image. At the other end, the ideological right rejects the role of CSR in value creation, which should, according to capitalist principles, always be for the exclusive benefit of the shareholders (Friedman, 1970; Rangan, Chase and Karim, 2012).

This wide spectrum of all types of different motivations and practices make it very difficult, both for the corporate and non-profit sector, to determine what actually represents Best Practice in CSR for a multinational enterprise (Williams and Aguilera, 2007). Some studies have even found that the more global the reach of a corporation, the more likely that it will engage in both CSR, as well as corporate irresponsibility, given the challenges of local offices adapting to different cultures (Strike, Gao and Bansal 2006). Consequently, the search for a theoretical framework to understand the relationship between business and society is equally challenging. This is also visible in much of the literature, which abounds in complex theories and models to explain this interaction.

Wayne Visser is a prolific CSR author, who promotes the idea of an evolution from CSR 1.0, which is so flawed by superficiality and inefficiency, to CSR 2.0, which is systemic and transformative (Visser, 2011).
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He eloquently puts the case for CSR 2.0 with a set of guiding principles and ingredients, borrowing from previous holistic thinkers such as Senge (1990). Visser advocates, through his new ‘DNA of Sustainability’ a move away from the shareholder driven business model and he warns that companies will ignore this at their peril in a future radically changing market environment (Thurm, 2011). However, his theory of sustainability runs over four hundred pages (Visser, 2011) and may-similarly to Senge’s seminal, but voluminous work ‘The Fifth Discipline’- take decades to be assimilated into Best Practice (1990).

The appeal of CSV lies in its simplicity. Whereas the practice of CSR is indeed often inconsistent and makeshift, the basic principle of Creating Shared Value is clear and fundamental: it requires a given business activity to generate both economic and social value (Porter and Kramer, 2011; Preston, 2013). This principle can be applied without limitation in terms of industry or geography and accordingly, it has already been adopted by market leaders such as Unilever, Nestle and HP, as an idea that is easy to understand and digest by any type of organisation (Appendix 1).

Critics have dismissed the theory of Creating Shared Value as a ‘lofty conception of CSR’ (Rangan, Chase and Karim, 2012), but in as much as it represents a simple approach to implement CSR 2.0, such criticism seems unjustified. In fact, these same critics propose their own version of the ubiquitous hierarchy of CSR culminating in integrating a social value proposition into the business (Rangan, Chase and Karim, 2012).

Thus, by using CSV as a yardstick, a degree of clarity can be established about the motivations of a business in terms of the social impact realised through its CSR activities, as is evident from the many hierarchical analyses (Figure 2.2) applied by CSR scholars (Visser, 2011; Rangan, Chase and Karim, 2012). The method of how CSV can be used as a measure for both economic (business) and social (NGO) value is essentially the purpose of this study.

Another criticism of CSV is that it is limited by its focus on shareholders and consumers, thus belying the multi-stakeholder approach of most CSR advocates (Freeman, 1984; Elkington, 2011).
However, Porter and Kramer repeatedly mention that CSV is intended to conjoin with both non-profit and public actors and actively encourage their involvement, although they leave the corresponding mechanisms open to interpretation. They posit correctly that not all social problems can be solved through a CSV approach (2011). This holistic view is also part of CSV’s appeal in continuing the basic principle advanced by other influential thinkers such as Senge (1990) and Freeman (1984), who similarly posited that no big idea should ignore our societal and global interconnectedness.

Based on the hierarchy of CSR that has been presented in the literature, CSV can be considered to equate to CSR 2.0 (Figure 2.2). Porter and Kramer have affirmed as much by stating that CSV ‘supersedes’ CSR because it is integral to a company’s mode of operation, whereas CSR is usually only loosely connected to business practices and only focused on philanthropy or reputation management (2011). Indeed, the authors’ stated aim is to re-connect business with society (2011).

**Figure 2.3: The three channels for Creating Shared Value**

![Creating Shared Value Diagram](source:image)

Source: own work, derived from Porter and Kramer, 2011
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The value that companies can share with society can be generated via three channels:

- Market based: by re-conceiving products and markets
- Supply Chain based: by redefining productivity in the value chain
- Locally based: by enabling local cluster development

(Porter and Kramer, 2011).

The diagram above depicts this triangular synergism (Figure 2.3). The three channels provide a roadmap to the potential for Creating Shared Value for any given company and any given social issue. It provides a guide to identify projects that classify as a CSV initiative. Companies have the skills and knowledge to operationalise CSV strategies, but they often lack the expertise relating to specific social or environmental problems facing society at large. For this reason, the need for collaboration is integral for to the success of CSV and this has been highlighted by the authors (Porter and Kramer, 2011). This aspect will be further discussed in section 2.6 on Opportunities for CSV in Tiger Conservation.

To complete the review of Corporate Strategy, we refer to the latest papers, which have CSV as its specific subject of study, so derived from a Boolean search of the databases Business Source Complete and AB/Inform Complete, based on having either ‘Creating Shared Value’ or ‘Shared Value Creation’ in the title. This yielded a total of five papers published after 2011.

The role of CSV evangelists such as Nestle CEO Paul Bulke and Unilever CEO Paul Polman is highlighted in a special editorial of the International Commerce Review (Jones et al., 2011). These two figures and their companies can be credited for much of the global communication around CSV. The fact that both these protagonists are CEO’s and head up European companies affirms two dimensions of CSV that have been highlighted in the literature. Several authors have noted the prominent role of Europe, both from a corporate and institutional perspective, in the rise of CSR (Matten and Moon, 2005; Williams and Aguilera, 2007). Furthermore, it has also been remarked that CSV is a ‘top-down concept’, in that it needs to be embraced by the top management.
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Some consider this a drawback (Rangan, Chase and Karim, 2012), but this seems unjustified, as any paradigm shift in corporate strategy by definition requires top management team buy-in (Senge, 1990).

In their analysis of CSV as an innovative approach to today’s environmental challenges, Leandro and Neffa conclude that CSV may be the solution. They allude to the fact that CSV could replace CSR Corporate Social Responsibility, because of its centrality of “incorporating sustainability in the capitalist production model” (2012, p.485). This researcher supports the evaluation of CSV as being groundbreaking and thus, in part, justification for this research.

A paper by Spitzeck and Chapman claims to be “the first empirical verification of the Shared Value concept”, though it covers only one case study in Brazil (2012, p.499). Two issues identified by the authors have also been recognised in this study. Firstly, there may already be many business initiatives that can be defined as Creating Shared Value and secondly, the presence of partnership between company and NGO seems crucial, as this ‘first evidence’ substantiates. (Spitzeck and Chapman, 2012)

Another paper, which examines the implementation of CSV, has identified hybrid business models, which for-profit companies have developed by engaging in strategic CSR. Apart from social benefit, these models all have the commonality of partner networks, use of knowledge and value chain (Michelini and Fiorentino, 2012), factors, which will also be considered by this researcher. However, these authors did not include Social Entrepreneurship SE, which appears to be the most natural expression of CSV, and duly commended by Porter and Kramer (2011).

Although the earlier holistic thinking (Freeman, 1984; Senge, 1990) has been reflected in the principle of Creating Shared Value, much of the current debate is around how it compares with current models such as Social Entrepreneurship SE and CSR (Driver, 2012; Pirson, 2012). Pirson makes the connection with Social Entrepreneurship by questioning whether CSV amounts to a ‘significant theoretical advance’ and suggests that Porter and Kramer declare “social entrepreneurs as paragons of said shared-value-creation” (2012, p.31).
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He argues that in practice, social enterprises struggle to balance both economic and social value in the long-term and regress to “either financial or social-value primacy strategies over time” (2012, p.31). Unlike other authors (Rangan, Chase and Karim, 2012; Pirson, 2012), the creators of CSV theory make no claims about economic and social value having to be balanced. The principle of CSV postulates that companies can create social value by adapting their business activities. NGOs are ideally placed to measure this social value and this is what makes CSV a suitable framework for NGO-Business partnership.

In conclusion, this appraisal of Corporate Strategy theory has shown that CSV is aligned to the latest thinking in both Competitive Strategy and CSR. Notwithstanding some of its reviews as being over-ambitious or not fully inclusive, the appeal is that CSV is sufficiently elementary to encourage early adoption and generic enough to invite application in different sectors and industries, and in different regions (Appendix 1). In the context of this study, the fieldwork is expected to demonstrate that CSV is an effective model of cooperation between companies and NGOs, provided that the former adapts its business practices in an innovative and cost-effective way to achieve economic value through any of the three CSV channels, whilst the latter should identify and monitor the desired and sustainable social value from the relationship. Such an impactful model will, in turn, stimulate the timely adoption of more Shared Value solutions for Tiger Conservation.

2.2. Non-profit strategy

This section will review non-profit strategic alternatives for alignment with commercial organisations. In the previous section, CSR was shown to encompass a whole array of business activities, from corporate Philanthropy with reputation enhancement to Creating Shared Value with a transformed business model.

Similarly, the rise of CSR has spurned a range of possible NGO-Business partnerships, which often presents a bewildering choice for non-profit organisations aiming to engage with the business world. Bruce outlines four types of nonprofit partnerships and defines the one with a commercial company as Cause Related Marketing CRM (2011).
Varadarajan and Menon were the first to properly define CRM, as “Cause-related marketing is the process of formulating and implementing marketing activities that are characterized by an offer from the firm to contribute a specified amount to a designated cause when customers engage in revenue-providing exchanges that satisfy organizational and individual objectives” (1988, p.60).

CRM is the alignment of corporate philanthropy and general business practices. The company improves its corporate performance and the NGO receives tangible benefits in terms of donations and enhanced awareness (Caesar, 1986). However, there is debate about the ethics of CRM and whether it can be deemed truly philanthropic. The ethics of CRM have been questioned as being too closely linked to the tangible benefits generated by the corporate marketeers, in a way that even undermines genuine corporate altruistic interest (Smith and Higgins, 2000). Consequently, it is not surprising that a ‘collaboration continuum’ has emerged to map the relationships between non-profits and business organisations, which ranges from Philanthropic, through Transactional, to Integrative (Austin, 2000). Figure 2.4 shows this continuum, which perfectly aligns with the principle of Creating Shared Value: from a situation where only social value is being created, namely Philanthropy on the left, it moves through various scenarios, where ultimately economic value is being created at the same time. It culminates with CRM, where there are tangible business benefits, but the limitations of CRM make it increasingly less attractive as a partnership vehicle, since the balance is usually skewed to favour the commercial value for the corporate. Pirson also hinted at this drawback, when the balance between economic and social is often difficult to achieve (2011). In practice, this has meant that many non-profits feel exploited by their CRM partner because of the short-term transactional nature of the partnership, rather than a long-term relationship that might prove much more rewarding.

This dichotomy has been analysed by Liu and Ko, who describe two types of dominant logic for CRM (2011). There is an ‘instrumental’ logic, which focuses on obtaining favourable consumer response to generate sales, and there is also a ‘relational’ logic, which is focused on cementing relationships. The high-intensity combination of these two types of logic gives rise to so-called ‘Integrative CRM’, which is more long-term and cause resonant with customers and stakeholders (Liu and Ko, 2011).
There is little doubt that there is an impetus to extend and enhance the current spectrum, as displayed in Figure 2.4, given the numerous suggestions for a more balanced form of partnership (Seitanidi and Ryan, 2007), Integrative CRM (Liu and Ko, 2011), Strategic CSR (Rangan, Chase and Karim, 2012) or even CSR 2.0 (Visser, 2011).

Taking the above limitations of CRM into consideration, it seems logical to place CSV at the extreme right-hand side, as a vehicle for collaboration through which both social and economic value are implicitly defined and stewarded by each partner.

This is something that NGOs have been striving for, but no partnership vehicle has so far allowed them this synergy (Thomas, Fraedrich and Mullen, 2011; Pirson, 2012). Unlike SE, where stewardship of the cause is much more challenging (Pirson, 2012), CSV is much more flexible and broader as a framework for creating economic and social value. Porter himself has clarified that SE is a transitional vehicle towards a transformation of capitalism (Driver, 2012).
The debate about what constitutes a Social Enterprise is shifting all the time, and therefore CSV is in the middle between a pure not-for-profit definition and a pure giving definition of business with philanthropy and CSR (Driver, 2012). The attractiveness of CSV as an opportunity for generating more sustainability and innovation has led to some uncritical adoption of the term ‘Shared Value’ to describe various forms of beneficial activities, such as productivity gains through employee engagement (Accenture, 2013). Such blanket use of the term CSV is mistaken. Most interactions on the continuum do not deserve the label ‘Shared Value’, since they often lack either business value or genuine social impact: both these components must be present in order to rank under the ‘Shared Value’ definition (Preston, 2013).

The debate about engaging with business must also be considered in the context of the fundamental shift that is taking place within the Voluntary Sector as whole. NGOs are under immense pressure to adopt more business-like practices, not in the least due to the climate of austerity and public demands for greater accountability (NCVO, 2013).

There is a need to move away from the focus on regulation and enforcement and adopt a more value-based approach. The case for value creation through CSV taps into this sentiment in a pertinent way by stating that NGOs and Government must change their mindset that economic development and social progress are not compatible (Porter and Kramer, 2006; 2011). This thinking has already pervaded areas such as international development, where initiatives like microfinance are used for poverty alleviation [Johnson and Rogaly, 1997]

To conclude this review of non-profit strategies for corporate engagement, it can be said that CSV is eminently suitable to enhance the ‘collaboration continuum’ (Austin, 2000) between non-profit and business organisations, because of its pre-requisite for both economic value and social impact to be present in the relationship (Preston, 2013). This researcher contends that CSV provides NGOs with the needed relational and sustainable form of partnership to shift the balance of power that pervades existing conceptualizations of corporate engagement (i.e. CSR) and realise the full potential of the relationship as a source of change (Seitanidi and Ryan, 2007).
Likewise, practitioners of CSV are not apologetic about the clear commercial interest, because this is the incentive for business to act and, as such, provides sustainability to the partnership (Preston, 2013).

In reality, many forms of NGO-Business partnership do not qualify as ‘Shared Value’, because they do not meet this all-important criterion (Preston, 2013). CSV has the flexibility to allow both parties to identify and steward the respective economic and social value that is being created, although NGOs are recommended to “assume more responsibility for the process of the relationship” (Seitanidi and Ryan, 2007, p. 261). This is apparent in the various certification schemes that have arisen (WWF, 2012; RSPO, 2013), which will be discussed further in section 2.6 under Market Transformation.

### 2.3 Conservation Biology

The mindset that economic progress and nature conservation are mutually exclusive has long influenced the practice of Conservation Biology. However, the latest reports show that a shift in thinking may be taking place. In her inspiring book “Rewilding the World- Dispatches from the Conservation Revolution”, Caroline Fraser talks of innovative methods and visionary ideas that biologists are now using to transform conservation practice (2009).

Since the 1990’s, the paradigm for conservation has been “Cores, Corridors and Carnivores”: Core protected areas can be the seed for preserving entire ecosystems by establishing corridors between them, so that wildlife- especially influential carnivores- can migrate and disperse (Fraser, 2009).

This principle has been applied in Tiger Conservation, where most NGOs are working to link fragmented tiger habitats to allow a greater range and crossbreeding. However, such desired linkage means interaction with those in surrounding areas, farmers, hunters and others in impoverished communities, for which new economic opportunities must be found. Fraser argues that such ‘rewilding projects’ will drive the economy in the future by creating jobs in developing countries in agroforestry, law enforcement and eco-tourism (2009).
As an analogy from the developing world, we can take the remarkable example in the USA, where the Mexican gray wolf has been successfully re-introduced in wilderness areas, from which it was extinct (FWS, 2013). Such programmes have not only spurned innovative use of technology, such as radio collars and GPS tracking devices, but also collective schemes by NGOs, such as the compensation funds for livestock owners (Defenders of Wildlife, 2012).

It should be noted that proposals for such predator re-introductions in the West are subject to intense political debate on wildlife legislation issues, but such institutional interest and legislation are still lacking in Asia, with the possible exception of India (Swanson, 2013).

Thus the fate of the tiger in Asia is more tied up with international monitoring and regulation, for which progress has been slow. Legislation from the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, notably the Convention on Biological Diversity CBD, has encouraged individual governments to take action at a local and national level, but generally the topic of Biodiversity has been overshadowed by the more expansive goal of Sustainability (Aras and Crowther, 2009).

The term Sustainability or Sustainable Development has become much more popularized than the underlying concept of biodiversity. It is generally defined as “development that meets the needs of the current generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (UN, 1987, p.15). It is also expressed in a diagram as the balance between the three pillars of human civilization: economy, society and environment (Figure 2.5).

In the context of Sustainability, the suitability of CSV as a promising framework has already been recognized. CSV has been ranked - together with the Green Economy and Stewardship - amongst concepts, which “present opportunities for accelerated progress in sustainability” (Hecht, et al., 2012, p.63). CSV focuses mainly on economic and social pillars (Figure 2.5), whereas the other two frameworks are biased towards respectively, economic/environmental and environmental/social.
In summary, the theoretical concepts of Sustainability (Biodiversity) and CSV have been combined with the threats faced by tigers (Damania, 2008; WWF, 2011) and a diagram created which links each threat to a pillar and related markets (Figure 2.6).

The diagram shows that in terms of tiger preservation pressure not only comes from different market forces within the capitalist system, but also that, just like the Sustainability pillars, they are interlinked and the survival of tigers is threatened by a constant interplay of these factors.

An authoritative report, by a group of tiger conservation experts commissioned by the World Bank, recognizes the imperative of a value-based approach for Tiger Conservation. It states that efforts to save the tiger are doomed to fail unless the tiger can be “turned from an economic liability into a living wild asset” (Damania, et al., 2008, p.1).
The report also suggests that it is necessary to consider alternative and innovative ways for generating resources for safeguarding biodiversity. The report advocates a ‘new conservation paradigm’ (Damania, et al., 2008).

Figure 2.6 Tiger Threats - Sustainability and Markets

Tiger Threats Triangle

Source: own work, derived from WWF, 2011.

The current conservation paradigm is focused almost exclusively on a regulatory approach or a cost-based approach related to CSR or Reputation Management. One example is the genuine work on promoting the use of a Biodiversity Accountability Framework. Whilst calling for an innovative approach, the recommendations are still founded on a type of ecosystem accountability based on self-assessment by companies (Houdet, Trommetter and Weber, 2012).

This approach is also evident in the practice of Tiger Conservation, where the main threats to tigers - driven by market forces – are being tackled by regulation or in some cases a complete ban, such as in the case of the trade in tiger parts and related consumer products (CITES, 2013).
The reality that Tiger NGOs are facing on the ground is that all the tiger range countries (except Malaysia and Russia) have a standard of living well below the world average (UN, 2013) and traditionally weak institutional and regulatory frameworks. Furthermore, most of them are in a stage of rapid economic development to lift their huge populations out of poverty. Therefore the outlook for strong political and institutional support is highly unlikely, and Tiger NGOs are finding it hard to continue this uphill battle.

As a consequence, tiger numbers have been plummeting in most range countries and wiped out in some of the weakest links such as Laos and Cambodia (Figure 1.3). In addition, some of the countries where there are still viable populations, such as Malaysia and Indonesia, suffer from a major lack of awareness amongst decision makers and the general public and a very low level of civic development with few or very small voluntary organizations.

It is this gap in resources and the “enforcement deficit” (Damania, et al., 2008), which is motivating Tiger NGOs to look at other alternative solutions, but so far few innovative approaches have been implemented and these have not been subject to much academic research. Previous studies have shown that there is by no means a professional consensus amongst tiger conservation managers and policymakers (Karanth, et.al., 2008; Rastogi et al.,2013), with the dispute largely aligned along the tiger-centric view and the people-centric view, similar to the generic ‘conservation vs. development’ debate (Rastogi, et al., 2013).

To summarize the conservation approach, it has so far depended heavily on regulation and enforcement, although the threats to the survival of wild tigers are systemic and market-driven and in countries, where economic progress is the priority and political support is generally weak. A new conservation paradigm has been proposed, which focuses on the economic value of wild tigers and advocates value-based solutions.
2.4 Literature Review Conclusions

Concluding the review of the three academic areas- all are undergoing a process of change along varying scales of operation- we can situate this research project at the intersection of these change processes. The ‘value-based’ thinking of CSV- identified in the literature surveyed- complements the ‘regulatory’ thinking of conservationists and the ‘social impact’ thinking of NGOs. This is illustrated in the overarching diagram, where the three channels of Creating Shared Value have been superimposed on the Tiger Threats and Markets. This is a demonstration of the relevance of CSV, through which current projects in the Supply Chain can be rationalized and potential ventures in Local Cluster or New Products/Markets explored.

Figure 2.7: Tiger Threats and Creating Shared Value

This diagram therefore acts as a roadmap of how NGOs can exploit the value-based strategies called for by the World Bank (Damania, et al., 2008).
Possible market-based strategies within the three channels of Creating Shared Value can be considered and assessed. The exact nature and drivers for these strategies will be examined in the next sections.

2.5 Drivers for CSV partnerships
The fundamentally dual nature of Creating Shared Value allows for the prevailing models of both ‘for-profit’ and ‘non-profit’ to be applied. The drivers for each model are explicit: For economic value it is the enduring profit motive of the capitalist system and for social value it is the mission-based desire of ‘lasting change’. Therefore, a CSV partnership between a Tiger NGO and a company can be considered along the spectrum in figure 2.4 as resulting in tangible benefits for both parties, who are driven either by the profit motive or the mission, in this case Tiger Conservation.

The metrics, by which we define economic value are well established (i.e. money expressing the price, exchange value or use value of a commodity), and are usually formulated as the ‘business case’ that generates a financial return for the company. The metrics for social value are much more difficult to denominate, but it has been the subject of academic study, which has emphasized the concept of ‘impact’ or showing results in solving complex social problems (Brest & Harvey, 2008; Crutchfield & Grant, 2008; Ebrahim and Rangan, 2009).

These results have respectively been referred to as ‘outputs’, ‘outcomes’, ‘societal impacts’ and most recently as targeting ‘root causes’ of a social problem (Crutchfield & Grant, 2008). Tiger NGOs have adopted this ‘root cause’ method to supplement the quantified target of about 6,000 wild tigers by 2022 (GTI, 2013), by addressing the tiger threats (Figure 2.6) and formulating additional ‘impact’ targets:

1. Habitat Conservation
2. Prey Conservation
3. Eradication of Poaching
4. Awareness & Education (and resultant support)
5. Community Development (to reduce Human-Tiger Conflict) (WWF, 2012).
The above impacts are all measurable to a greater or lesser extent: Habitat and Prey conservation can be quantified in space and numbers and the practice of Poaching and Wildlife Trade has been the subject of more intense monitoring and scrutiny. The last two targets of Awareness/Education and Community Development may be less easy to quantify, but can be measured through social research.

The use of CSV as a guiding principle for collaboration between Tiger NGOs and corporate partners implies that the motivation for both parties can be derived from their primary drivers, either profit-based or impact-based. This is in contrast to CSR, where a huge range of drivers has been identified as seen in figure 2.2.

This interpretation of CSV does not mean that other drivers, such as reputational risk or stakeholder pressure, are not present when NGOs and companies decide to work together, but these can be considered supplementary to the basic goal of creating economic and social value for each party (Porter and Kramer, 2011, Preston, 2013).

2.6 Opportunities for Shared Value

By using CSV as a framework, the areas of opportunity for Tiger NGO-Business partnerships have been mapped (Figure 2.7). Furthermore, the consideration of the drivers on both sides allows for operationalizing the possible Shared Value strategies within the broad parameters of the CSV framework. Some of these strategies are not new and have been applied for some time, whilst other strategies may still be in its infancy or yet to be discovered. The wide array of solutions gleaned from literature such as the World Bank report (Damania, et al., 2008) and other sources (WWF, 2012; ZSL, 2013) can be categorized within the CSV framework and summarized as follows:

A. SUPPLY CHAIN: Market Transformation
B. LOCAL CLUSTER: Environmental Service Payments
C. NEW PRODUCTS/MARKETS: Demand Reduction
D. COMBINING A, B & C: Wildlife Tourism

Characteristic for any systemic approach is the linkage of individual elements and this model is no exception.
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Each CSV strategy, as listed above, has an influence on the other parts of the ecosystem, but it has been placed in the channel where it has the greatest impact. The significant exception to this is the fourth CSV strategy of Wildlife Tourism, which has the potential to have a substantial effect in all elements. This will be considered in the following discussion of the individual strategies.

A. Market Transformation

The term Market Transformation was originally coined to promote energy-efficiency and achieve new patterns of market behaviour as expressed in the definition “the strategic process of intervening in a market to create lasting change in market behavior by removing identified barriers or exploiting opportunities to accelerate the adoption of all cost effective energy efficiency as a matter of standard practice” (NEEA, 2013).

More recently, it has been used to label interventions in other markets, notably global commodities that were seen to be key to solving some of the planet’s most pressing environmental and social issues (Clay, 2010). The foremost protagonist for this type of Market Transformation is Jason Clay, vice-president of WWF, who has written and evangelized about the concept (Clay, 2010). WWF has been instrumental in the implementation of several of such schemes, including the Forest Stewardship Council FSC and the Marine Stewardship Council MSC (WWF, 2013).

The process is invariably based on multi-stakeholder engagement and the mechanism used is certification for sustainability standards, which has now become a common practice in the food sector and for some major commodities. The trend of introducing Eco-labels and standards can be traced back to various social movements from the 1980’s such as Fairtrade in Europe and Rainforest Alliance in the U.S.A. (Fairtrade, 2013).

When related to Tiger Conservation, the most relevant of these are Sustainable Palm Oil (WWF, 2013) and Sustainable Timber (WWF, 2013), both of which impact top tiger range countries with substantial tropical forest cover, such as Malaysia, Indonesia and Thailand.
The central concept for certification of both Palm Oil and Timber is that of a High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF), which refers to "forests of outstanding and critical importance due to their important environmental or social values" (FSC, 2013, p.2). Once HCVFs have been identified and assessed by independent auditors, they provide a platform on which to base any decisions about management and monitoring of the land. When these decisions have been implemented to the required standards, then the commodity can be certified as sustainable (WWF, 2013).

**B. Environmental Service Payments**

There is a wide range of schemes already in use, both in the developing and developed world, where cash is transferred in return for the conservation of natural habitat or a particular species. Generally, these are government administered schemes such as the Agri-Environment schemes (AES) that are common in Europe and North America and which provide incentives for farmers and foresters to "produce more biodiversity" (Hanley, et al., 2012, p.93). They are mostly targeted at management actions and not outcomes, and so rarely achieve a discernable increase in a particular species (Hanley, at al., 2012).

There is also the problem that incentivizing individual landowners does little to enhance the spatial coordination required to protect wide-roaming mammals that require large habitats. This is better done in an international context, according to a study by Swanson and Groom (2012). They argue that regulation of global biodiversity is subject to a bargaining problem between countries that have already converted most of their natural reserves for development - the rich North - and those mega-diverse countries that still have unconverted natural resources.

The most high profile case study is the $1 billion donor agreement between the Norwegian Government and Indonesia, in return for a two-year moratorium on forest-clearing concessions to slow climate change (The Economist, 2013). It is derived from the argument – originally used at the Kyoto Protocol negotiations- that forest owners in the developing South should be rewarded for maintaining their forests, rather than cutting them down. The operational outcome has been a scheme called REDD Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation (UN-REDD Programme, 2013).
For tigers, however, this tool has hardly been explored. There have only been a few schemes so far and the involvement of private sector partners seems to be lacking. The Bikin Tiger Forest Carbon Project in Russia claims that it “has shown the general feasibility of using new funding sources such as income from non-timber forest products or from selling emission reduction certificates”, but it was financed mainly by public funds from Germany (BMU, 2012, p.9). For Tiger Conservation, drawbacks to such systems have been highlighted, such as the dependency on the value of the environmental service, for example carbon sequestration, and the fact that profits from unsustainable activities should be low, which is not the case for Palm Oil, Timber or Mining (Damania, et al., 2008).

C. Demand Reduction
Reduction and ideally elimination of the demand for tiger products is urgently needed to halt the tide of poaching and illegal wildlife trade. In the past the demand was fuelled by Traditional Chinese Medicine (TCM), but since legitimate TCM practitioners rejected the use of tiger parts in the 1990’s, the markets consists mainly of ‘tiger wine’, often sold at tiger farms in China, and consumption of tiger meat in China, Vietnam, Taiwan and Malaysia.

Another deep-rooted Asian tradition has been the use of tiger skin for ornamentation, although efforts by organisations such the Environmental Investigation Agency (EIA) have had some success e.g. in Tibet, where the Dalai Lama called for a total ban in 2006.

The issue of speculators stockpiling wildlife commodities has already been the subject of economic research. Economists have identified a ‘banking on extinction’ strategy (Mason, Bulte and Horan, 2012), whereby the speculator first builds his stockpile and encourages poaching to achieve extinction of the wildlife species. Subsequently, the speculator can act as a monopolist and sell his stockpile at inflated prices.

So far, Demand Reduction for tiger products has been stimulated in two ways, either by the development of Substitute Products, such as synthetic Chinese Medicines, or through Public Campaigns to change the behaviour amongst different sets of Asian consumers.
Both of these tools involve concepts of Social Marketing, for which there is great scope for application on behalf of tigers and other endangered wildlife. Social Marketing is generally considered to be distinct from commercial Marketing, in that it aims to influence behaviour, rather than encourage the purchase of some product or service (Kotler, et al., 2002).

Wildlife conservationists generally agree eliminating demand in China is the key to solving most of the pressing wildlife protection issues, but it is a hugely challenging and complicated endeavour, which NGOs cannot tackle without outside expertise. This view is echoed by the foremost author in the field of Social Marketing, who recently argued that the entire taxonomy of Marketing should turn itself upside down by accepting that non-profit and Social Marketing, in fact, represent the pinnacle of marketing theory and practice due to their complexity and difficulty, whereas commercial marketing merely represents a simplified variety concerning the sale of services and products (Andreasen, 2012).

Demand Reduction efforts must not only address ‘the primary drivers of human behaviour’, but also the lives and lifestyles of the consumers (Zain, 2012). This is in fact the essence of all marketing, which is “ultimately about influencing behaviours, whether these behaviours are consumer purchases or people taking up more healthful lifestyles” (Andreasen, 2012, p.37).

It follows the general shift that the marketing paradigm has experienced, away from consumer products and towards services initially, and now a further move towards a social setting. Indeed, this radical thinking about the new parameters of marketing seem to align very well with the new boundaries set by Creating Shared Value: both a business and a social domain.

Another parallel is the debate about the dominant logic in Cause Related Marketing (Liu and Ko, 2011). For a social-dominant logic to apply, a new terminology will have to be adopted, such as ‘target audience’ instead of ‘consumers’ and objectives expressed as behaviours: Starting or switching a behaviour, and Decreasing or Stopping a behaviour (Andreasen, 2012). In the context of this study, these behaviours are, for example, the gifting of tiger wine or meat by Chinese businessmen (Nowell and Ling, 2007).
D. Wildlife-Tourism

There is a growing body of academic literature on the correlations between conservation and eco-tourism, or more specifically Wildlife Tourism (Higginbottom and Tribe, 2004; Nielsen and Spenceley, 2010; Karanth, et al., 2012). The latter has been deemed to follow the ecotourism principles of sustainability and education, but also to support conservation (Newsom, Dowling and Moore, 2005). The debate about what exactly constitutes Wildlife Tourism is ongoing and academics have categorized it from various angles. It has been classified, based on visitor experiences (Moscardo, 2008), ranging from captive (zoos), controlled (high control of visitor experience) to non-captive (observing animals in their native habitat). One common distinction is between consumptive and non-consumptive Wildlife Tourism: the former involves animals being hunted or removed, whereas the latter represents non-harmful activities such as observing and filming wildlife (Reynolds and Braithwaite, 2001).

In this study, only the non-consumptive type of Wildlife Tourism is considered. The originators of the conceptual model in Figure 2.8 contend that this type of tourism basically represents a continuum between observing animals in zoos and watching wildlife in their natural habitat (Higginbottom and Tribe, 2004). There is undoubtedly a growing trend to use tourism as a conservation tool and the model (figure 2.8) describes the broad range of mechanisms that allow wildlife tourism to make a contribution to conservation (Higginbottom and Tribe, 2004).

All these contributions are applicable in the field of Tiger Conservation and include:

1. **Direct Wildlife Management and Research:** For example, tourists in Ranthambore Tiger Reserve (India) have made suggestions to improve the routes and zone management system inside the park (Karanth et al., 2011)

2. **Financial:** For example, entrance fees to the Indian Tiger Parks go towards park management and employment: a survey of park visitors showed that 42% were willing to pay higher gate fees (Karanth et al., 2011)

3. **Education:** Karanth et al. report an opportunity for widening support for conservation and awareness of conservation challenges. For example, tourists who participated in a tour group were more likely to have a positive perception of park management (2011).
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1. **Lobbying:** For example, tourists recommended that patrols inside the parks be increased to strengthen existing conservation efforts (Karanth et al., 2011).

2. **Socio-economic incentives:** For example, Tiger Park visitors in India wanted more local people to be employed in the park and more information about local cultures (Karanth et al., 2011).

(Higginbottom and Tribe, 2004)

**Figure 2.8: Potential positive consequences of wildlife tourism for conservation**

The development of Wildlife Tourism has been described as growing from limited numbers of motivated wildlife watchers at the beginning, to large numbers of mass market tourists, who may cause negative impact to the wildlife and the tourist experience alike (Catlin, Jones and Jones, 2011).

This can be seen from examples such as the high-end and low volume of exclusively foreign visitors to Rwanda’s mountain gorilla parks, which has been hailed as a success story (Nielsen and Spenceley, 2010). The massmarket scenario can be said to apply to the market for tiger tourism in India.
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The success of the Rwandan model has been based on a clear commitment from the government and the early development of an appropriate policy and strategy, which includes a role for the private sector and direct involvement of the local community to reduce poverty (Nielsen and Spencely, 2010). In India, where today more than 70% of park visitors are Indian nationals, the institutional framework for the development of wildlife tourism has been weak and there are additional challenges such as high-density of population and infrastructure immediately around the parks (Karanth, et al., 2012). These pressures have even led to a temporary ban on tiger tourism in 2012. It has also spurred a campaign, called TOFT Travel Operators for Tigers, championing the interests of the tiger tourist industry and advocating better wildlife tourism practices across the Indian park network (TOFT, 2013). Interestingly, TOFT regards itself as a ‘supply chain’ initiative to reflect its global and industry wide scope (TOFT, 2013), which therefore fits within all three of the CSV channels: Supply chain (between destination and consumer), New markets (Asian markets for wildlife watching) and Local Cluster (infrastructure at destination) (Figure 2.7).

2.7 CSV as framework for NGO-Business partnerships

Figure 2.9 completes this review of literature by pulling together all the sub-conclusions from this section:

- Representing the latest thinking in Corporate Strategy, CSV offers an appealing and generic roadmap for tiger NGOs and companies to cooperate through the three CSV channels (Fig.2.3). This can be tested through the main research question 1: What is the potential for Creating Shared Value for Tiger Conservation?

- From a non-profit perspective, CSV enhances the ‘collaboration continuum’ (Fig.2.4) to engage with business and facilitates a more balanced relationship, where the creation of both economic and social value is identified and stewarded by each party. This is reflected in the research question 1 (above) and question 2: How is Shared Value created in the context of Tiger Conservation?
The current Conservation paradigm has not been wholly effective in reversing the decline of the tiger and can be complemented by CSV (Fig.2.7; 2.9). This will transform the debate of ‘conservation vs. development’ towards value-based solutions, which accommodate the drivers for both conservation and development: 3.

To what extent are the drivers for Creating Shared Value resonant to Tiger Conservation?

a. What are the drivers for business?
b. What are the drivers for NGOs?
c. What are the constraints?

Figure 2.9: Creating Shared Value as a framework for NGO-Business partnerships

Creating Shared Value as a framework for NGO-Business partnerships


Convincing results from the final research question:

4. Which Shared Value strategies are most effective for Tiger Conservation?

will fulfill the research objectives of this dissertation (see 1.5), which focus on how to reverse the decline in the number of wild tigers by transforming their status from an enforcement-dependent species to a valuable wild asset. The success of Shared Value strategies will stimulate more such initiatives and will establish CSV as an effective partnership model.
Chapter 3 - METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

To determine the Research Design, the fundamental theoretical concepts underlying the course of this research can be mapped (Figure 3.1). This is critical to ensure academic credibility (Ates, 2008).

Figure 3.1: The Research Design Map

The subjective ontology, where reality is subjective and socially constructed (Ates, 2008), is very much applicable to the position of the tiger in our world, where its existence is viewed in discrepant ways: to some a ruthless pest which should be exterminated, to others a majestic icon which should be protected at all costs, to others still a natural resource whose mythical powers are to be exploited.
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This researcher’s attitude has been interpretivist, in that the research topic did not come from theory or hypotheses, but from personal observation and engagement with the tiger conservation community (Easterby-Smith, Thorpe and Jackson, 2001). The underlying motivation is not to generalize in an objective way, but to interpret and gain understanding about the views of the different backgrounds, in particular non-profit or impact-based vs. for-profit or value-based (Ates, 2008).

The motivation for this study can also be characterized as ‘action research’ to some degree, since it was driven by a desire for changing the mindset of the decision makers within the tiger conservation community and involving them in the research process itself (Easterby-Smith, Thorpe and Jackson, 2012). This participatory dimension is expressed in the choice of Co-operative Enquiry, which has been described as “Research ‘with’ rather than ‘on’ people” (Heron, 1996).

The exploratory nature of this study has been prescribed by the novelty of CSV as a research topic (Leandro and Neffa, 2012; Spitzeck and Chapman, 2012). Although underrated by some critics, Exploration is in fact a superior way of presenting social research “with its open character and emphasis on flexibility, pragmatism and the particular, biographically specific interests of an investigator” (Stebbins, 2001, p. v).

The explorative approach matches well with the pioneering aspect of CSV and also with the practice of Tiger Conservation, characterized by a very global interaction of social and economic forces, as presented in Figure 2.7. Most of the funding is still based in the Western World, whereas the fieldwork is carried out in tiger ranges on the Indian sub-continent and South East Asia. Furthermore, the economic demand pressures are local, regional and global (Fig.2.7). Such multi-faceted and multicultural dimensions tilt towards an interpretivist approach, where the different cultural perceptions, not just ethnic, but also professional (business vs voluntary) and societal (value-based vs impact-based), require careful interpretation based on qualitative fieldwork (Gilbert, 2008). Indeed, the practice of Tiger Conservation sounds remarkably like the process of exploration in research as described by Stebbins “It is a lengthy, cumulative process characterized by a myriad of difficult choices and competing interests” (2001, p.vi).
In summary, a qualitative interpretivist approach has been applied and the research method of interviews has been chosen as the most appropriate for the field of tiger conservation: it allows for selection of a group of key respondents, given the high level of specific knowledge and experience required by the topic, and for a degree of geographical spread to reflect the global nature of the research problem. Alternative methods such as observation or participation are less suited for these aspects of the study. The semi-structured format of the interviews also best matches the multi-faceted character of the research topic, which addresses strategies drawn from different disciplines and practices, where the rigidity of a highly structured interview would not be effective.

The research track is thus:

1. **Ontology:** Subjective
2. **Epistemology:** Interpretivist (some bias to Action Research)
3. **Methodology:** Co-operative Enquiry (Primary)
   - Inductive (Secondary) (see page 1)
4. **Techniques:** Interviews and Secondary data

Methods to search for literature have included the use of Cass Library’s subscribed databases: Business Source Complete, AB/Inform Complete (containing the Proquest Business Collection) and ScienceDirect. This was supplemented by searches in Google Scholar and Academica.edu. Furthermore, specialist material was collected from organisations, such as WWF World Wide Fund for Nature, MYCAT Malaysian Conservation Alliance for Tigers, RSPO Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil, TOFT Travel Operators for Tigers and TRAFFIC The Wildlife Trade Monitoring Network. The Researcher also made use of textbooks on respectively business, research and conservation, and subscribed publications such as the Economist newspaper.
3.2 Sample design

To safeguard the validity of this study, the sample group was composed of respondents from both for-profit and non-profit organisations: A total of 10 respondents, who should be:

1. Representing a Tiger NGO or potential business partner
2. Working within an existing CSV relationship, based on one of the three elements Supply Chain, New products/markets and Local Cluster

It was expected that the element of Supply Chain would yield the most potential participants, as there are several high-profile collaborations, such as the RSPO and the FSC. For the other two elements, the pool of possible respondents appeared much smaller, as desk research had uncovered very few existing projects that could be termed Creating Shared Value. The only other sector, which offered a defined group of CSV stakeholders, was that of eco-tourism or more specifically tiger tourism in India.

Figure 3.2: Matrix/map for Targeting of interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSV Category:</th>
<th>NGO participants</th>
<th>Business Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply Chain</td>
<td>NGOs involved in Market Transformation: WWF, Rainforest Alliance, IDH</td>
<td>Palm Oil producers/ processors, Timber companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Cluster</td>
<td>NGOs involved in Outreach and Community Development: WWF, MYCAT</td>
<td>Eco-tourism operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Products/Markets</td>
<td>NGOs involved in anti-poaching and Demand Reduction: TRAFFIC, EIA</td>
<td>Companies involved in substitute products or Demand Reduction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The initial intention for the sample group was to have NGOs and Business presented in equal measure, but during the pilot testing, it became apparent that Business participants were not likely to have sufficient knowledge of tiger conservation to be able to provide feedback about motivation, effectiveness and other relevant factors.
Therefore, an additional criterion was added:

3. Participants must have working knowledge of the tiger conservation aspects of the CSV partnership

Due to this addition, the fact arose that some interviewees were working in business, but were also actively involved in NGOs or had been in their career. This was not considered to affect the validity of the research, given the duality of the topic under review. The breakdown of the final sample is listed in Appendix 2.

3.3 Research process
All respondents were individually approached by phone or email and interviewed face-to-face for at least 90 minutes to two hours. (Only two interviews were done via Skype and lasted approximately one hour). The interviews were conducted during the period April to June 2013 and took place in Malaysia, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. Some personal interviews were also followed up by phone for additional comments or information.

The interviews were deliberately managed to enhance social interaction by omitting the use of any recording devices and by clearly stating the personal interest of the researcher in the cause of tiger conservation. Interviewing is part of a range of qualitative research methods, which are not necessarily suited to statistical analysis, but rather focus on the meaning of words and ideas. The aim is to uncover the viewpoint and experiences of the participants (Baral, 2013) and to describe these phenomena through the investigator’s own interpretations and understanding (Ritchie and Lewis, 2003).

3.4 Research tools
The Primary Research Tool for this study has been a semi-structured interview with a brief topic questionnaire, which was ‘piloted’ (Lofland and Lofland, 1995 in Gilbert, 2008) and continuously re-fined throughout the interview period (Appendix 3). The topics for the questionnaire were strongly guided by the literature review in general and the CSV framework in particular. The prompt questions were adapted and enhanced following feedback from interviewees and academic peers.
This process has reflected the intended transparency and some degree of action learning, which is one of the stated goals to catalyze solutions for Tiger Conservation. It should also be pointed out that there has been an element of participation, given that the decisive input for the Research Topic came from one interview participant, who represents a leading NGO player in Tiger Conservation. An understanding exists that this research is carried out with and for the participants to address live and pressing issues in their work. As such the project can be defined as ‘Transparent Research’, in which there is a level of partnership and engagement (Milofsky, 2000). Consequently, all respondents were provided with an information sheet about CSV and were actively prompted by being shown, in face-to-face conversations, an image of the diagrams ‘Tiger Threats and CSV’ (Figure 2.7). Furthermore, the aims of the study in terms of finding effective CSV solutions for tiger conservation with particular suitability to Malaysia and India were communicated to each respondent, in addition to information about the researcher’s background and position within the study.

To achieve further transparency and participation, all respondents were sent a full transcript of their interview for their comment, which was incorporated in the final write-up.

As a Secondary Research Tool, documentary evidence from a variety of sources was collected and used to strengthen the credibility of the fieldwork during data analysis. This can be deemed a way of Methodological Triangulation, which means that more than one method was utilized to gather data as a way of cross-checking and providing a more balanced view of the situation (Denzin, 1978; O’Donohue and Punch, 2003; Altrichter, et.al., 2008). These data sources ranged from academic papers and newspaper reports to statistical surveys.

3.5 Thematic Analysis
Thematic analysis is a method for identifying, analysing, and reporting patterns (themes) within data. It minimally organises and describes your data set in (rich) detail. However, it also often goes further than this, and interprets various aspects of the research topic (Boyatzis, 1998; Braun and Clarke, 2006).
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It is considered the ‘foundational method’ of analysis for qualitative data and appropriate due to this study being early in the author’s qualitative research career (Holloway and Todres, 2003; Braun and Clarke, 2006).

The dominant gauge for selecting themes was related directly to the original research questions with regard to the potential, the drivers and the effectiveness of the CSV strategies. Therefore, in first instance, the criteria applied were whether the defined CSV strategies did in fact:

a. create both economic and social value, and if so, to what extent.

The extent to which either economic or social value had been created was not quantified as such, but assessed on a scale of ‘high, medium, low’ in line with the exploratory and qualitative nature of this research.

Apart from the relevance to the research questions, the second determining criterion, relating to the validity and reliability of the study, which was applied, when analyzing the interview transcripts, was:

b. whether any theme had been articulated by two or more respondents.

The interview data yielded various themes that were grouped according to the CSV elements, whilst also taking account of the interrelation: for example, some of the respondents in the Supply Chain channel also provided feedback for other areas such as Local Cluster, and vice versa.

The Thematic Analysis was in line with the epistemological stance of this study: the themes were identified in a ‘bottom up’ way and represent an inductive approach where the emerging themes are strongly linked to the actual data (Patton, 1990; Frith and Gleeson, 2004 cited in Braun and Clarke, 2006).

Based on the above two criteria, a link to a secondary data item (or several data items) was then sought to corroborate the significance of the theme through Triangulation. A data item has been described as “an individual piece of data collected, which together make up the data set or corpus” (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p.6).
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The analysis, with the themes identified and the items of data used for the complementary triangulation (Appendix 4), has been presented in a tabular format according to each of the four chosen CSV strategies.
Chapter 4  ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH FINDINGS

So far, the theory of Creating Shared Value has been used in this study as a framework to deduce and operationalize the range of possible win-win strategies for Tiger Conservation and to identify and select the sample of interviewees. Likewise, the CSV framework has been applied when analyzing the data collected from the interviews. The results have been presented below, as they relate to each of the above Shared Value strategies. The next stage in the development of the research findings associated with this study was to apply the learning achieved from the semi-structured interviews (reported below) to the previously developed CSV framework (Figure 2.9), culminating in the Shared Value (matrix) analysis in section 4.5.

4.1  Analysis: Market Transformation

From the analysis of Market Transformation as a CSV strategy (Table 4.1*), the following conclusions can be drawn:

- There is evidence of tangible Economic Value. However, the extent of this value appears LOW to MEDIUM, based on the information from the two data sources. Firstly, most of the value is still derived from higher efficiencies that are captured mainly at the consumer end (Table A). Secondly, so far only 15% of all Palm Oil produced is certified as sustainable (RSPO, 2013) and the momentum for this percentage is decreasing (Table A).

- There is little evidence of Social Value, in terms of reduced impact, which is not standardized or measured in the certification process (Clay, 2012). Whilst the benefits of certification in general cannot be denied, the value for the moment must therefore be deemed as LOW.

- Whilst the positive impact of recognizing and managing High Conservation Value Forests is yet to be measured and quantified, the impact for Tiger Conservation seems negligible for the time being. Participants attested to this fact during the interviews.

* Data items used for the Triangulation are listed in Appendix 4 and referenced where appropriate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY THEME</th>
<th>INTERVIEWEE COMMENTS</th>
<th>TRIANGULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. MARKET TRANSFORMATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TANGIBLE ECONOMIC VALUE:</strong></td>
<td>“The main beneficiaries are at the other end of the supply chain”; &quot;profits have</td>
<td>“There is also increasing evidence that certification makes producers more profitable by driving efficiencies in their operations” (Clay, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW TO MEDIUM</td>
<td>gone up in recent years” Palm Oil Producer</td>
<td>* business benefits gained from adopting the RSPO Principles and Criteria typically outweigh the costs of implementation” (WWF, 2012, p.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“…the consumer companies that capture most of the premium” NGO Market Transformation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL VALUE UNSPECIFIED:</strong></td>
<td>“There are examples of Creating Shared Value, but they are in their early stages”</td>
<td>“there is a clear lack of evidence of broader, longer-term improvements because to date, very few certification programs have standards that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW</td>
<td>NGO Market Transformation</td>
<td>measure reduced impacts” (Clay, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Whether biodiversity goals are achievable, depends on what view you take”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RSPO auditor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Biodiversity in plantations itself is minimal” Local Tiger NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO OR LITTLE DIRECT IMPACT:</strong></td>
<td>“With regard to biodiversity, this is still rare” RSPO auditor</td>
<td>“as standalone instruments, voluntary certification programs won’t get us where we need to be” (Clay, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON TIGER POPULATION</td>
<td>“I was not aware there are tigers in this area” Oil Palm Grower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“…environmental conservation can also be expressed in values, metrics…difficult in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>some countries, such as Indonesia, where they are not accustomed to this” NGO Market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transformation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DECREASING MOMENTUM</strong></td>
<td>“European nations… have been very vocal on the issue” RSPO auditor</td>
<td>“global markets are being dominated more by Bric countries… and less by traditional powers in North America and Europe…this trend will only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“In the long-term, it is unlikely that these processes can be shaped by European</td>
<td>increase” (Clay, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>players” NGO Market Transformation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Analysis: Environmental Service Payments

From the analysis of Environmental Service Payments as a CSV strategy (Table 4.2*), the following conclusions can be drawn:

- There seems to have been NO economic value generated from any of the existing carbon credit schemes for tigers, since none of these projects have any corporate partners and thus the antecedent for value creation and profit is lacking.**

- The social value created for tigers by preservation of their habitat is evident and can be deemed MEDIUM. Since the viability of the carbon credit mechanism is still very much in doubt, there is no certainty that this social value will be maintained.

- The political and economic complexity of these ‘virtual market’ mechanisms has been confirmed, from the interview data and the secondary data sources.

- The potential for controversy and abuse is considerable, as mentioned not only by the participants and in the data items, but apparent from the growing number of green NGOs that now object to carbon trading (Carbontradewatch.org, 2013).

* Data items used for the Triangulation are listed in Appendix 4 and referenced where appropriate

** Apart from the two tiger projects, which are based on a carbon trading model, there are currently other projects in Indonesia, which stimulate forest restoration through management licences granted by the forest Ministry to private organisations e.g. Harapan rainforest and Tambling Conservation, both located in Sumatra. These projects are NGO-initiated (Public-Private partnerships), but do have involvement by corporations in the role of sponsors and contributors to the financing. Such management approaches are not considered, strictly interpreted, as ESP instruments (Damania, et al., 2008), but are showing early signs of success and a possible financing and governance model for future forest restoration (Birdlife International, 2013)
Table 4.2 - THEMATIC ANALYSIS OF DATA: B – ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICE PAYMENTS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY THEME</th>
<th>INTERVIEWEE COMMENTS</th>
<th>TRIANGULATION**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICE PAYMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO ECONOMIC VALUE</strong></td>
<td>“…the mechanism, which is dependent on the credits being sold to other parties” International Tiger NGO</td>
<td>“the world’s failure to establish effective carbon markets in order to cut greenhouse-gas emissions” (Economist, 13 July 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Schemes like REDD are also unlikely to be acceptable, because they are deemed to frighten away investors” Local Tiger NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL VALUE UNCERTAIN</strong></td>
<td>“With regard to Environmental Service Payments, the results so far are inconclusive” International Tiger NGO</td>
<td>“carbon trading will not and cannot provide the systemic changes required to avert runaway climate change” (Fern, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Potential for financing schemes is very limited” Local Tiger NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VERY COMPLEX POLITICALLY AND ECONOMICALLY</strong></td>
<td>“Offset payments are politically very complicated…” International Tiger NGO</td>
<td>“...to judge by a United Nations panel looking into the workings of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) is: you’d say it is a shambles” (Economist, 15 Sept. 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basically, schemes involving environmental service payments are in their infancy in Malaysia and have not yet taken off” Local Tiger NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TARGETTED AT HABITAT, BUT NOT DIRECTLY AT TIGERS</strong></td>
<td>“We are aiming to stop the destruction and degradation of the forest through a management system” International Tiger NGO</td>
<td>“using forestry projects to offset the carbon dioxide produced by fossil fuels…Offset credits do little to help development in poor nations” (Fern, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“…such handouts are not preferable in the long-term. You need a permanent change of life style from the local community…” Tiger Tourism NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPEN TO CONTROVERSY AND ABUSE</strong></td>
<td>“The success of the scheme is greatly dependent on the rationale that the Indonesian government will apply” International Tiger NGO</td>
<td>“An oversupply of permits to pollute is an endemic problem.” (Economist, 15 Sept. 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“the management of forestry or any related activities are deemed the sole domain of the government, and not accessible to any other party” Local Tiger NGO</td>
<td>“Europe’s scheme is almost ten years old—and still isn’t working” (Economist, 19 June 2013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Analysis: Demand Reduction

From the analysis of Demand Reduction as a CSV strategy (Table 4.3*), the following conclusions can be drawn:

- NO clear economic value has been connected with Demand Reduction campaigns so far, as there has been no or very limited corporate involvement for any awareness campaigns, especially in China.

- With regard to Substitute products, the economic value appears very LOW, as there are considerable cultural barriers to acceptance by Asian consumers.

- There is acknowledgement in the NGO community, that so far the campaigns have had limited impact, because they have been lacking in scale and consistency. Consumer demand for tiger products has not been curbed yet, and therefore social value must still be rated as LOW.

- There is much scope to enhance the appeal and reach of awareness campaigns to Asian consumers, given that for the most part these have been small-scale campaigns by the government or NGOs, with the exception of broadcast media campaigns using Chinese and other celebrities. Furthermore, there is no evidence that any campaigns so far have targeted pivotal audiences identified in relevant studies e.g. members of the institutional and business elite, who gift or consume tiger products.

- Tiger farms are a big influencing factor in the trade for tiger parts and this problem needs urgent resolution, given that this issue has been festering for many years.

* Data items used for the Triangulation are listed in Appendix 4 and referenced where appropriate
**Table 4.3 - THEMATIC ANALYSIS OF DATA: C – DEMAND REDUCTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY THEME</th>
<th>INTERVIEWEE COMMENTS</th>
<th>TRIANGULATION*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. DEMAND REDUCTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO DISCERNABLE ECONOMIC VALUE</td>
<td>“There is no clear role for companies here” “So far, the efforts have been mostly small scale” Wildlife Law Enforcement Specialist</td>
<td>No corporate involvement in Demand Reduction campaigns (Appendix 4) Very limited scope for Substitute Products (Cavaliere, 2010)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“one has to accept that tiger conservation will never generate a profit” International Tiger NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE SCOPE FOR SOCIAL VALUE</td>
<td>“I believe there is still a lot to be gained from effective Demand Reduction campaigns” Wildlife Law Enforcement Specialist</td>
<td>“…approaches…overall they have failed, because they were not pursued at a scale large enough to have an impact, or for a long enough duration to achieve measurable change” (TRAFFIC, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Behaviour change is important and hopefully, the young generation of Chinese will make some progress towards this” International Tiger NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REACH AND APPEAL TO ASIAN CONSUMERS NEEDS TO BE ENHANCED</td>
<td>“There has been some progress e.g. there are campaigns online such as the ‘Love tigers’ in Mandarin&quot; International Tiger NGO</td>
<td>“…go beyond ‘analytical science’ of the past, and transform this knowledge into ‘actionable science’ that will produce a measurable impact on reducing the demand for endangered species” (TRAFFIC, 2012) Review of Demand Reduction Campaigns (Appendix 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We can only win the battle if these Demand Reduction campaigns become much more effective” Wildlife Law Enforcement Specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIGER FARMS ARE A BIG FACTOR THAT NEEDS RESOLUTION</td>
<td>“..one big constraint is definitely the current tiger farms and the internal trade in tiger products in China” International Tiger NGO</td>
<td>“…allowing any trade in captive-bred Tiger products threatens to waste all the effort that China has so far invested in saving wild Tigers” (Nowell and Ling, 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“There is also an urgent need to address the issue of tiger farms in China” Wildlife Law Enforcement Specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Analysis: Wildlife Tourism

From the analysis of Wildlife Tourism as a CSV strategy (Table 4.4*), the following conclusions can be drawn:

- Wildlife Tourism creates economic value for the companies involved. This value can be considered HIGH, based on its proven business case for companies that derive 100% income from Wildlife Tourism plus the many businesses in transport, hospitality and other services, which benefit indirectly to a varying extent.

- Wildlife Tourism creates social value for tigers in many different ways, provided that the negative impact associated with large numbers of tourists can be mitigated. If so, then this social value can be deemed MEDIUM to HIGH.

- Wildlife Tourism benefits the local community at tiger habitats, but there is much scope to augment these benefits provided the appropriate mechanisms are in place.

- The social value from Wildlife Tourism is not only limited to habitat preservation, but also extends to enhanced surveillance, which reduces the risk of poaching, and greater awareness and support, not just from the tourists, but also from the local community.

* Data items used for the Triangulation are listed in Appendix 4 and referenced where appropriate
### Table 4.4 - THEMATIC ANALYSIS OF DATA: D – WILDLIFE TOURISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY THEME</th>
<th>INTERVIEWEE COMMENTS</th>
<th>TRIANGULATION*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. WILDLIFE TOURISM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POSITIVE VALUE FOR TIGER CONSERVATION</strong></td>
<td>“I am convinced that Wildlife Tourism is the only solution that delivers long-term viability for tigers” “only parks with high visitor numbers also have high numbers of tigers” Tiger Tourism NGO</td>
<td>Confirmed by data from Wildlife Protection Society of India (WPSI Oct. 2011) showing that the top 9 Tiger Reserves have high tiger density and a large number of day-time tourists in core area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“our fundamental objective .. is the preservation of tigers…this is also in the self-interest of the businesses” Wildlife Tourism Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROVEN BUSINESS CASE</strong></td>
<td>“the numbers have exploded. Instead of in the thousands, the numbers are now in the hundreds of thousands, even millions” Tiger Tourism NGO</td>
<td>Reported revenue from entry fees as high as $ 3 million and growing in the top parks (Karanth &amp; DeFries, 2011) “one Ranthambhore tigress can generate some $130 million in direct tourism revenue in her adult life…” (NY Times, 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“It is a viable model, with which we are working and the numbers involved are quite large” Wildlife Tourism Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BENEFITS FOR LOCAL COMMUNITY</strong></td>
<td>“It has provided alternative livelihoods to replace the grazing and poaching activities of the local communities” “It generates a lot of income for the community” “a park like Ranthambore provides direct employment to about 3,000 people” Tiger Tourism NGO</td>
<td>Singh, Shaikh and Jha report that “est. 3,863 individuals are directly associated with the tourism industry” (2011) “Positive impacts from wildlife tourism include economic benefits, infrastructure benefits and social welfare benefits (Karanth. et al., 2012, p. )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“In terms of added value, this can also have a positive effect on the local community” Wildlife Tourism Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRENGTHENS SURVEILLANCE</strong></td>
<td>“It ensures eyes and ears on the ground” “it requires private enterprise and proper regulation to go hand in hand” Tiger Tourism NGO</td>
<td>“Operators and tourists can contribute positively to conservation of wildlife and their habitats by participating in management activities, monitoring or research…” (Higginbottom, 2001, p.ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Revenues should go to improved surveillance and anti-poaching measures” Wildlife Law Enforcement Specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERATES AWARENESS &amp; SUPPORT</strong></td>
<td>“It brings publicity, awareness and education” Tiger Tourism NGO</td>
<td>“ Our results indicate the potential for the growth of domestic wildlife tourism and support for conservation among tourists but highlight the need for increasing education and awareness” (Karanth, et al., 2012, p. )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The parks provide them with information and awareness and this is also an important aspect” Wildlife Tourism Company</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5 Shared Value Analysis

A further analysis of the Shared Value created (Figure 4.2) was conducted to provide greater understanding of the various impacts on Tiger Conservation, as broken down in the desired mission-based outcomes listed in section 2.4. The value was assessed in terms of high, medium, low or no value. Also, the potential for creating value in the future through improving the CSV strategy was considered and marked accordingly.

For Wildlife Tourism, a distinction should be made between generic Wildlife Tourism and the type of Sustainable Wildlife Tourism that is advocated by organizations such as TOFT. The latter promotes better tourism practices in a supply chain fashion by providing specific guidelines for operators, services, accommodation providers and visitors. In accordance with sustainability principles, it also aims for local community empowerment through employment and business opportunity, and a variety of socially and environmentally beneficial activities, such as proper water management and fair wages (TOFT, 2012). Based on these guidelines, this CSV strategy has been rated in four impact categories. For prey conservation, there is potential due to specific efforts by operators to focus attention on other wildlife in the tiger parks.

For Market Transformation, the impact value has only been rated for preserving forests, but there is potential for other positive outcomes, if current biodiversity guidelines are more widely implemented and supplemented by stronger coordination in the field (Clay, 2012). It should be pointed out that ‘awareness & education’ and ‘local community development’ are considered here in the context of Tiger Conservation, and have thus been rated as resp. ‘potential’ and ‘low’, although the social contribution of plantations as a means of poverty reduction in rural areas has been widely accepted (WWF, 2012; RSPO, 2013).

For Environmental Service Payments, the positive impact on the forest has been rated, but the effects on the local community in terms of a permanent change in lifestyle (awareness) and livelihood are yet to be realized and have been rated as ‘potential’.
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For Demand Reduction, the desired outcomes of a change in the buying behaviour of Asian consumers and a corresponding decrease in poaching activities have been assessed in the light of current market conditions and the stated need for scaling-up current efforts.

This type of Shared Value analysis not only highlights possible opportunities for NGOs and business to work together, but it also affirms the precept of CSV theory that not all social problems can be solved by a CSV approach. It demonstrates the synergy implicit in CSV, where private enterprise and public action must go hand in hand (Porter and Kramer, 2011).

**Figure 4.2. Shared Value (matrix) analysis for Tiger Conservation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared Value Strategy/Value</th>
<th>Habitat Conservation</th>
<th>Prey Conservation</th>
<th>Eliminate Poaching</th>
<th>Education &amp; Awareness</th>
<th>Community Development</th>
<th>Economic Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Tourism</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Transformation</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Serv. Payments</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Reduction</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own work
Chapter 5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Upon scrutiny of the research aims (section 1.5), these conclusions can be made:

The first aim of catalyzing CSV initiatives has been met through this study, since it has involved applying a new, innovative framework to an existing complex conservation dilemma in a way that differs considerably from the prevailing mindset in the Tiger NGO community. As such, it has highlighted various opportunities for Creating Shared Value for Tiger Conservation that have so far been under-exploited or untapped. It contributes to the aim of consensus amongst conservation practitioners by moving away from the divisive ‘conservation vs. development’ debate and offering inclusive and effective strategies through the less recognised ‘science and tourism-led approach’ (Rastogi, et al., 2013).

This study has also met the second aim of evaluation of the CSV framework. Its application in terms of Threats and Opportunities (Figure 2.8) and Possible Solutions (Figure 2.9) has been effective in generating functional strategies, which are already being implemented or have the scope for future deployment. In addition, the CSV framework has proved useful as a tool to assess the Shared Value of such strategies in a rudimentary way, thus allowing NGOs and their partners to prioritize and re-evaluate their collaboration activities.

Given that the CSV framework has been applied effectively in the intricate setting of Tiger Conservation, its possible use in other contexts is definitely feasible. CSV, as a strategic concept, has already been embraced by a number of market leaders in areas ranging from consumer food and household products (Unilever, Nestle, Coca Cola) to IT and technology products (HP, Intel) and services (Intercontinental Hotel Group) (Appendix 1). Case studies of its practical use in non-profit/commercial partnerships already exist (Spitzeck and Chapman, 2012; Peterson, 2012). Moreover, the creators of CSV are actively creating their own global network of Shared Value initiatives through their non-profit consultancy Foundation Strategy Group FSG (FSG, 2013). They have just announced the setting up of the Shared Value Initiative, with an ‘online community of practice’ at sharedvalue.org and an affiliated Professional Services network. These developments “reflect the advancement and continued momentum of the shared value field” (FSG, 2013)
Finally, this research has contributed to the growing body of academic literature on Creating Shared Value, which is set to expand based on the above activities and on the concrete growth of nongovernmental and business CSV ventures, such as the support that CARE has provided to Unilever and other companies to boost their rural sales networks in Bangladesh. It illustrates that “NGOs are rethinking their relationship with the private sector to better meet their social missions” (Peterson, 2012).

5.1 Recommendations

- This study suggests that Tiger NGOs should engage more with Wildlife Tourism, given that this sector offers the most potential for Creating Shared Value. The results support the contention that Wildlife Tourism is underrepresented, as a stakeholder in current global tiger conservation efforts, and that it provides an opportunity for developing into a ‘powerful conservation tool for tigers’ (Matthews, 2010). Such engagement and inclusion can influence the survival of wild tigers in different ways in the top tiger range countries, India and Malaysia, which are at opposite ends of the tiger tourism scale. The former, where tiger visibility is high, will benefit from appropriate consultation and regulation of tourism and other development in and around the parks, whereas the latter, where tiger tourism is negligible, might gain more visibility and awareness for wild tigers.

- This research endorses the use of CSV as a model and analytical tool for NGOs to prioritize and re-direct their strategies for business engagement, which is timely and effective during the present climate of austerity. In particular, for Tiger NGOs, this could translate into more focus on achieving and measuring positive biodiversity impact in partnerships for Market Transformation. It could also mean re-thinking approaches involving Environmental Service Payments, such as Carbon Credits, and possibly considering other options such as alliances to undertake private management licences, in order to achieve reforestation and effective management of tiger eco-systems.
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- NGOs and their corporate partners can be guided by the fact that the use of the CSV model implicitly shows areas where economic value is not feasible, such as consumer Demand Reduction campaigns, where corporate contribution is nonetheless desirable, either as sponsors for dominant media or powerful CRM messages to change the behaviour of consumers in general, and the business and institutional elite in particular.

- Perversely, the pragmatism of a value-based approach may have merit even in painful dilemmas such as the elimination of tiger farms. The fate of the 6,000 or so farm tigers must be considered in terms of their market value as dead commodities vs. live assets, which would need re-location and rehabilitation. This would require more cooperation between Tiger NGOs and their counterparts, who look after the interests of Captive Tigers, in order to integrate their approaches. Such integration would also benefit possible future strategies, for example breeding and re-wilding projects.

Finally, as an exploration, this study represents an implicit call for further investigation, given that the CSV theory has proven useful to frame collaboration between Tiger NGOs and companies in multiple ways. This need is amplified by the wide-ranging scope of this study, covering a variety of strategies for multiple goals, which has meant that each aspect has only been subject to elementary evaluation.

Therefore, further research is suggested:
- beyond the stated delimitations (section 1.6) to cover all tiger range countries (figure 1.3)
- to investigate in more depth each individual CSV channel and/or CSV strategy to expand and improve on the range of potentially effective tools for tiger conservation
- with regard to the application of the CSV framework in a wider scope, both from the social and business perspective.

Such research will contribute to the anticipated convergence of profit and non-profit, which will surely advance the cause of biodiversity protection.
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Appendix 1: Companies integrating CSV into their mission

(Excerpts from Trade Journals and other online sources)

Source: Food & Drink Technology, 2007

Source: FSG.org, 2012
Foreword by Paul Polman, CEO of Unilever

Readers beware. This is no ordinary business book. But then the author is no ordinary businessman. As the personal stories and anecdotes in Defining Moments make clear, Kees van der Graaf is a man driven by a higher purpose.

In particular, he embodies the concept – recently embraced but for so long dismissed in business circles – of “shared value”, the idea that a company has a set of responsibilities that go well beyond a financial return to shareholders. As he argues, business does not operate in a silo, but instead needs to reach out and engage with a much wider group of stakeholders in the common effort of making the world a better place.

It is this understanding that recently led Unilever to commit to doubling the size of its business while reducing its overall environmental footprint. Firm targets are set out in the Unilever Sustainable Living Plan (USLP). For the first time, we want to decouple growth from environmental impact. It’s a new way of doing business, though it builds on a long history of shared value within Unilever, of which Kees was one of the key proponents.

Source: Foreword to ‘Defining Moments’, IMD book by Kees van der Graaf

Sustainable palm oil: Unilever takes the lead

On 1 May 2008, Unilever Group Chief Executive Patrick Cescau announced that all Unilever’s palm oil will be certified sustainable by 2015. He also told the audience at the Prince of Wales’ May Day Climate Change Summit in London that Unilever was supporting the call for an immediate moratorium on any further deforestation in Indonesia for palm oil plantations.

Before this announcement, Unilever had been targeted by pressure group Greenpeace as part of a campaign to highlight the environmental impact of the global increase in demand for palm oil.

Unilever shares Greenpeace’s concerns. The soaring global requirement for palm oil – for both food and fuel – is contributing to the destruction of the world’s rainforests, with devastating implications. As one of the largest

“We are only part of the solution, of course, but we want to be an agent for positive change as we have been in tea, fish and other areas.”

Patrick Cescau, Unilever Group Chief Executive

Source: Unilever, 2012
All the respondents listed below have been characterized in terms of their expertise in relation to this study and not necessarily how they or their organisations are described in public.

1. Palm Oil Producer (Malaysia)*
2. Local Animal Welfare NGO (Malaysia)*
3. International Tiger NGO (Malaysia)*
4. RSPO auditor and social entrepreneur (Malaysia)**
5. NGO - Market Transformation (Netherlands)*
6. Local Tiger NGO (Malaysia)*
7. Travel Operator -Tiger Tourism (Netherlands)*
8. NGO - Responsible Tiger Tourism (UK and India)*
9. Wildlife Law Enforcement Specialist (Netherlands)*
10. International Tiger NGO (U.K.)**

* Face-to-face interview
** Interview via Skype

Note: The above list reflects the order in which each interview was completed (including follow-up by phone or email to complete the final transcript)
Appendix 3: Interview Materials

A. Consent Form

**CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH**

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Barbara de Waard, post-graduate student at Cass Business School, City University London. Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. Please read the information below and ask questions about anything you do not understand, before deciding whether or not to participate.

**TOPIC:** Green NGO-Business Partnerships for Tiger Conservation

You have been asked because your organisation is a participant in such a partnership and your experience and insights will be of value to NGOs and Companies in this field. A total of 10 subjects will be interviewed for this study, from both environmental NGOs and Companies.

Please initial box

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I have read and understood the project information sheet dated 5.4.2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I have been given the opportunity to ask questions about the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I agree to take part in the study. Taking part will include being interviewed and recorded (written transcript)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I understand that my taking part is voluntary. I can withdraw from the study at any time and I do not have to give any reason.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Select only one of the next two options:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- I would like my name used where what I have said or written as part of this study will be used in reports, publications or other research outputs, so that anything I have contributed to this project can be recognized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- I do not want my name used in this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I understand that my personal details such as phone number and address will not be revealed to people outside the study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. I understand that my words may be quoted in publications, reports, web pages, and other research outputs, but my name may not be used unless I requested it above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. I agree that other researchers will have access to this data only if they agree to preserve confidentiality of that data to the terms I have specified in this form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I understand that other researchers may use my words in publications, reports, web pages and other research outputs according to the terms I have specified in this form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I agree to assign copyright I hold in any materials related to this study to Barbara de Waard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of participant</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Contact details:
Email: info@barbaradewaard.com
Mobile: +31-6-30700704
Address: Laan van Vredestein 55, 2552DT The Hague, NL
Problem statement:
Environmental NGOs are failing to halt the imminent extinction of tigers in the wild, having focused primarily on enforcement-based conservation models in cooperation with governments and public bodies. There has been too little attention on turning the tiger into “a living wild asset” as recommended by the World Bank (Damania et al. 2008). Can a new approach, hailed as ‘re-inventing capitalism’ by its authors (Porter and Kramer 2011), offer a model that will make business part of the solution, rather than the problem?

This exploratory study aims to evaluate ‘Creating Shared Value’ (CSV) as a framework for a new type of collaboration between NGOs and Business. It examines the potential drivers on both sides to guide decision-making and spur new thinking for creating win-win solutions for Tiger Conservation.

Relevance:
This research will benefit Tiger NGOs and companies that are in existing CSV partnerships, such as Market Transformation initiatives like the RSPO Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil. It will provide insight into possible Shared Value strategies and which ones are most effective for Tiger Conservation, in areas such as Eco-tourism, Supply Chain and Innovation with new sustainable Products and/or Markets.
THE THEORETICAL CONCEPT: CREATING SHARED VALUE
Introduced by Michael Porter and Mark Kramer in 2006 and elaborated in 2011:
http://hbr.org/2011/01/the-big-idea-creating-shared-value

The Context:
• Lack of legitimacy and trust in business (and government) on an unprecedented scale.
• Companies focusing on short-term financial performance, rather than long-term positive impact, indicating a systemic problem.
• Government and Civil Society make it worse by presumed trade-off between economic efficiency and social progress.

The Concept:
The solution lies in the principle of SHARED VALUE, which involves creating economic value in a way that also creates value for society by addressing its needs and challenges (Porter and Kramer 2011)
CSV is (re)connecting business success with social progress

The Framework:
• Knowledge: Such as a far deeper appreciation of societal needs, a greater understanding of the true bases of company productivity, and the ability to collaborate across profit/nonprofit boundaries.
• Government must learn how to regulate in ways that enable shared value rather than work against it.
• The purpose of the corporation must be redefined as creating shared value, not just profit per se.
• There are three key ways that companies can create shared value opportunities:
  1. By reconceiving products and markets
  2. By redefining productivity in the value chain
  3. By enabling local cluster development (Local community & infrastructure)

The principle of shared value creation cuts across the traditional divide between the responsibilities of business and those of government or civil society:
• Managers in each sector need wider skills and knowledge
• NOT ALL societal problems can be solved through shared value solutions, but it can produce unrivalled solutions by corporations using their capabilities and resource


Please read the projection information sheet prior to answering the general questions below. Thank you.
The interview format is semi-structured i.e. a ‘conversation with a purpose’ where the interviewer would like to address specific topics, but allows the interviewee the scope to take different paths or explore different thinking. It is intended as a two-way dialogue.

### INTERVIEW GUIDE AND PROMPTS

#### 1. POSSIBLE OPPORTUNITIES FOR CREATING SHARED VALUE FOR TIGER CONSERVATION?

**Prompts:**
- To what extent do you have knowledge of CSV? Have you read the project information sheet? (Show the project information sheet)
- To what extent have you applied these precepts in seeking to develop effective partnerships with [NGO/Business, specify if possible]? How have these been amended?
- What opportunities exist to develop relationships with [..]? Based upon these precepts? Do they involve any of the three channels for Creating Shared Value? (Show figure 2.4)
- Which are more or less important? What are the practical constraints? For you, and for the other party?

#### 2. HOW IS SHARED VALUE CREATED IN THE CONTEXT OF TIGER CONSERVATION?

**Prompts:**
- What is the process? Is it individual or industry-wide? Who is responsible?
- Does it involve any of the threats/markets for tigers (show figure 2.8 and 2.9)
- Does it involve changing operational practices? Source of change?
- Is there collaboration between NGOs and Companies? How? Could you regard this as a CSV strategy, such as Market Transformation, ESP, Demand Reduction or Tourism?
3. **WHAT ARE THE DRIVERS?**

**Prompts:**
- What are the Drivers resp. for NGOs and Companies to collaborate?
- To what extent are you motivated by deriving value? in terms of cost/benefit (company) or lasting impact (NGO)?
- To what extent are there any other motivations, such as risk, reputation? How important are these motivations vs. creating value?

4. **WHAT IS EFFECTIVE?**

**Prompts:**
- What are the constraints?
- To what extent are the following a constraining factor (for company): economic feasibility, management buy-in or other issues? (For NGO): measurable impact, behaviour change, sustainability of impact?
- How might it be amended to have the desired impact?
- What strategy would you utilize and why? From the four named CSV strategies or other options?
- To what extent do these represent innovation? And growth?
- To what extent does the profitability contribute to the relationship?
- To what extent does the lasting impact influence the relationship?

*Any other comments or suggestions? THANK YOU!*
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1A - ANALYSIS OF DATA: A - MARKET TRANSFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Guardian News paper article by Jason Clay, WWF Director and one of the main advocates for this strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 “Profitability and Sustainability in Palm Oil Production 2012” Report by WWF in cooperation with CDC UK’s Development Finance Institution and FMO Netherlands Development Finance Company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1B - THEMATIC ANALYSIS OF DATA: B – ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICE PAYMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The above analysis is based on the two known tiger projects utilizing the strategy of Environmental Service Payments: Bikin Tiger Carbon project (Russia) and Berbak Carbon Value Initiative (Indonesia). Both these project are aiming to generate carbon credits for sale to third parties as a way of financing the protection of the forest. Therefore, other forms of Environmental Service Payments were not considered in this analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designated to fail: The concepts, practices and controversies behind Carbon Trading” by Fern.org, 2010.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles from The Economist:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - “Carbon Markets: complete disaster in the making” (15 September 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - “Carbon Emissions: the cap doesn’t fit” (19 June 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - “Nature’s Banker: Lessons from the Nature Conservancy” (13 July 2013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1C - THEMATIC ANALYSIS OF DATA: C – DEMAND REDUCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review of Demand Reduction campaigns (websites of anti-wildlife trade campaigners -NGOs)- Appendix 4 (below this table)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Article by Cavaliere in Herbalgram, ABC American Botanical Council magazine, 2010: “Medicinal Use of Threatened Animal Species and the Search for Botanical Alternatives” extract: “... in TCM, domesticated animals are typically considered more appropriate substitutes to endangered animals than plants. “There is a big difference between animal and botanical substances,” said Dr. Livingston. “Chinese medicine says ‘xue rou you qing,’ which translates roughly as ‘animal substances have an affinity for the human body.’ These substances are easily absorbed, have strong effects, and can penetrate to a ‘deeper’ level of the body and thus affect physiological processes in a way that many botanical substances cannot.” Convincing TCM proponents in Asia to accept botanical alternatives to endangered animal species may therefore prove particularly challenging, although botanical alternatives may be more appropriate for other audiences”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Report by TRAFFIC International on “Creative Experts’ meeting on messaging to reduce consumer demand for tigers and other endangered wildlife species in Vietnam and China”, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1D - THEMATIC ANALYSIS OF DATA: D – WILDLIFE TOURISM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 Survey by the Wildlife Protection Society of India WPSI, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Report by Singh, Shaik and Jha on impact of tourism on local population “ Transforming lives”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Higginbottom, K., 2001. Positive effects of wildlife tourism on wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Karanth, K.K., DeFries, R., Srivatha, A. &amp; Sankaram, V., 2012. Wildlife tourists in India’s emerging economy: potential for a conservation constituency?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 4: Data items used for Triangulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEW OF DEMAND REDUCTION CAMPAIGNS</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>by search of website only</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 21st Century Tiger</td>
<td>9 Aug. 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Animals Asia</td>
<td>9 Aug. 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. EIA Environmental Investigation Agency</td>
<td>11 Aug. 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. DSWF David Shepherd Wildlife Foundation</td>
<td>11 Aug. 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Panthera</td>
<td>11 Aug. 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. TRAFFIC</td>
<td>11 Aug. 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. WildAid</td>
<td>11 Aug. 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. WWF Worldwide Fund for Nature</td>
<td>11 Aug. 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. WSPA World Soc. F. Protection of Animals</td>
<td>12 Aug. 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. ZSP Zoological Soc. of London</td>
<td>12 Aug. 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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