



CORPORATE COMMUNICATION PRODUCT GROUP

# GLOBAL PERCEPTIONS OF CONSERVATION & SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: 2002 - 2003

Prepared by

Dr. Marta Andelman (Argentina), Dr. Lars Berg (Sweden); Dario Berginc (Slovenia), Ep Booneman (Netherlands), Nathaniel Arap Chumo (Kenya); Dr. Jinie D.S. Dela (Sri Lanka), Marco A. Encalada (Ecuador), Andreas Glanznig (Australia), Dr. Denise Hamú (Brazil), Francisco Heras Hernández (Spain), Frits Hesselink (Netherlands), Edward Idle (UK), Dr. Mihael Kline (Slovenia), Sylvi Ofstad Samstag (Norway), Jean Perras (Canada), Mercedes Sanchez (Brazil), David Smith (Jamaica), Dr. Kathy Greaves Stiles (South Africa), Dr. Keith Wheeler (USA)

Edited by

Frits J. Hesselink

**CONTENTS**

I. Introduction	p. 3
II. Results of the Survey	p. 5
III. Conclusions and recommendations for the IUCN Program	p. 7
IV. Recommendations for the survey	p. 10
V. Background and contacts participating experts	p. 11

**ANNEXES**

1. List of major public concerns	p. 15
2. Ranking of Conservation and Sustainable Development	p. 17
3. Priority for other ministries	p. 21
4. Priority for the corporate sector	p. 25
5. Major NGO campaigns in 2002	p. 28
6. Major Corporate Campaigns in 2002	p. 31
7. Major Governmental Campaigns in 2002	p. 34
8. Major NGO campaigns planned for 2003	p. 37
9. Major corporate campaigns planned for 2003	p. 39
10. Major Governmental Campaigns planned for 2003	p. 41
11. Major findings of recent communication research	p. 43
12. What is useful & how to improve the survey	p. 48
13. Questionnaire	p. 50
14. Partial Comments and reflections on Dutch Study by Phil Smith	p. 53

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

### **Background**

IUCN exists to influence, encourage and assist societies to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature and ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable. To carry out this mission and to plan the most effective interventions of IUCN, it is important to know how societies perceive issues such as nature conservation, biodiversity and sustainable development.

The IUCN Commission on Education and Communication exists to help IUCN achieve its mission. In this report of a quick scan, CEC experts monitor and analyze the perceptions around the globe, with an aim to provide additional information for strategic planning of the IUCN program.

At the same time this survey can be of interest as bench marking information for communication professionals in the CEC network. These benefits might be a reason for them to spend time also in future on this exercise, share information and provide input to the IUCN program.

### **Survey**

The CEC product group on corporate communication has taken the initiative to start this first survey among communication experts of 16 different countries around the world. The idea was to start small and develop and improve the survey over time on the basis of lessons learned.

A questionnaire was developed by communication experts from government and private sector in the Netherlands. On 23 February 2003 the questionnaire was distributed among the thirty members of the CEC corporate communication product group. The last of the responses were sent in on 30 March 2003.

Over 50% response on the questionnaire in a relative short time is a remarkable good result. The same can be said of the geographical spread of participants. A qualitative analysis was carried out and this was sent for comment and text suggestions to the participants and other members of the product group. On the basis of the feedback received, the final text was prepared in May 2003.

**Qualitative character**

This is the first time CEC has carried out this type of survey. As CEC may wish to continue this effort, an important element in the quick scan has been to check the method and learn how to improve it.

The survey is based on information provided by experts in different countries. Some of the information provided is backed up by reference to sources; some is not. Some may be based on the ‘best educated guess’. This means that the survey provides basically qualitative information. This fact and the small number of countries involved in this first survey, mean that one can not speak of ‘watching global trends’ in perceptions about nature conservation and sustainable development.

However the survey does contain:-

- important indications of how non-conservation experts perceive conservation and sustainable development issues,
- what priority the issues have for other agendas,
- what campaigns have been initiated
- what major findings have been provided by opinion polls and communication research.

Last but not least the survey also provides some interesting suggestions for the IUCN program.

**Acknowledgements**

To help put together this report, CEC members have made available their time and their knowledge, often using their own professional networks to access the necessary information. In most cases a considerable number of hours have been spent on this work. On behalf of IUCN and CEC, I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation for the voluntary efforts of all.

Denise Hamu  
IUCN Chair of the Commission on Education and Communication

## II. RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

### **Major public concerns**

In the countries of all of the participants, nature conservation, environment and sustainable development do not feature among the top three major public concerns. It is clear that other concerns are more important in the perception of the public: poverty, health, crime, terrorism, war, education, national economy, unemployment, food and water security are issues that have a high 'brain position' with the public.

### **Ranking of Nature**

In most countries it seems that nature conservation, environment and sustainable development do feature among the higher numbers of the top ten of public concerns. There is though a *caveat*: nature conservation as term has been submerged in many countries into other wider concepts: environment, sustainable use of natural resources and health. This means that ranking refers often to these wider concepts. In most countries sustainable development is seen as 'the environment'. In some countries it is a way to reduce poverty.

### **Priority other Ministries**

It seems that external integration is still a problem in most countries. Nature conservation and sustainability are not yet 'mainstream issues for other ministries than the ministry responsible for environment and nature conservation. In Northern countries it seems that more progress has been made with external integration than in most southern countries.

### **Priority Corporate Sector**

The response indicates that in many countries big companies are aware of the importance of their image as a 'responsible corporate citizen'. Mostly this 'improved' behaviour seems to have to do with the brown agenda, while providing funding in some cases for the green agenda. Some sectors of business are closer related to nature conservation and sustainable development, and thus may take these issues into consideration more readily than other parts of the business community. In Northern countries the corporate sector seems to see nature conservation and sustainable development as more important than their counterparts in countries of the South. There are also questionmarks whether companies from the north when operating in the South, apply the same standards as at home.

### **Major campaigns in 2002**

A broad variety of NGO campaigns were mentioned relating to many conservation and sustainable development issues, often related to specific national or local situation and circumstances. Genetically modified organisms is a theme that featured in more countries. The UN Year of the Mountains was only mentioned once as a theme for major NGO campaigns.

Similarly a broad variety of corporate campaigns were mentioned. Some corporate campaigns are directed against conservation and sustainable development objectives, e.g. the Kyoto protocol, peat mining. Other corporate campaigns support and promote these objectives, e.g. green products, water, recycling, clean production etc.

In many countries the governments did not engage in major campaigns. In some countries campaigns were mentioned relating to a variety of conservation and sustainable development issues. The Kyoto Protocol and WSSD were the theme in more than one country. Mass media is also mentioned more than once as a tool for governments. Only Slovenia mentioned some of the “World Days” (World Biodiversity Day, World Swamp Day etc.) as themes for government campaigns. It would be of interest to know what the other parties to the various Environmental Conventions invest in national components of these international campaigns.

### **Major Campaigns in 2003**

Participants mentioned the following campaign themes: Climate Change, Biodiversity, International Waters, and Fresh Water are themes mentioned in many countries. For some countries the information is not available to the experts. Greenpeace and WWF are mentioned more than once as the major campaigners. Participants from most countries had no information available about corporate campaigns for 2003.

In many countries the following government campaigns were mentioned for 2003: water conservation, watershed management, species at risks and biodiversity, energy conservation & climate change. For some countries the information is not available for the participants of this survey.

### **Major findings communication research**

The survey indicates that systematic surveys of public opinion with regard to nature conservation, environment and sustainable development and related research by Ministries of Environment or governmental institutions are not a common phenomenon all over the world. Only in a few countries this seems to be the case and often not on a regular basis. In countries like USA, Australia, the Netherlands, Spain, surveys seem to be normal. In other countries, e.g. Ecuador and Sri Lanka respondents indicate that no such surveys exist. In countries like Argentina and Jamaica it seems that surveys are carried out on an irregular and often thematic basis.

### **Survey as management instrument**

Not all participants answered this question. Comments were made about the questions of the survey being too open ended; about the need to know more about financial investment in campaigns; and about the concept ‘sustainable development’ (often other word for environment). Comments were also made in the sense that surveys often have a too general approach, and participants questioned the ability of respondents to provide enough information, the degree of real involvement of the corporate sector, and the degree of commitment to sustainable development. Finally, participants questioned the degree in which the national surveys actually become a real tool for environmental management .

### III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE IUCN PROGRAM

#### Conclusions

Bearing in mind the limitations of the method, scope and extent of the survey it is possible to draw some general conclusions, which are relevant for the IUCN program:

1. The perceptions about nature, environment and sustainable development seem to be quite different in countries in the North and the South.
2. Both in North and South environment is not top of mind. Other issues are far more important: safety, health poverty, education etc.
3. However environment is still on the agenda. The ranking of environment in most countries – after the hype during the early nineties – seems to be rather stable in the second half of the top ten. It seems as if environment is accepted as one of the normal concerns of the human existence.
4. Nature conservation and biodiversity are increasingly perceived as part of a container concept: environment-nature-sustainable development- health.
5. The ranking of development cooperation seems to slip back dramatically in some (donor) countries.
6. External integration (environment on the agenda of other ministries) is a difficult and slow process. There is a large difference here between countries in the North and those in the South.
7. Environment is not a priority for the corporate sector in the South. In the North especially large companies have integrated environmental concerns into management practices either motivated by the trend of ‘corporate responsibility’ or by legal measures, especially with regard to the brown agenda.
8. Unlike Greenpeace and WWF, IUCN is not seen as a campaigner. In many countries some major campaigns involve both government and NGOs. This could provide an opportunity for IUCN National Committees to play a role as a platform to facilitate or implement these campaigns.
9. No thematic pattern seems to emerge from the various major campaigns by either government or NGOs in the different countries. The corporate sector – although in some cases willing to provide funds - is not involved in major campaigns in most countries.

10. Not all countries engage in regular public opinion surveys and public communication research. Those who do – e.g. Australia and the Netherlands - generate interesting and important information about what works and what does not work in environmental information and communication. This information could be used as benchmark for those elements of the IUCN program related to knowledge, information and empowerment.

### **Recommendations**

On the basis of this survey and the conclusions formulated above, the following recommendations can be made for the IUCN program:

**1. The IUCN program should provide proof that nature conservation is an underpinning element of sustainable development and or poverty alleviation.**

IUCN sees conservation of biodiversity and nature conservation as underpinning elements for sustainable development. This proposition (which makes IUCN attractive for donors) does not fit easily in the way most people think. Proof for this proposition is often lacking. Much (non jargon) explanation, real life illustrations and testimonials from credible beneficiaries are needed to get conservation in this way on the agenda. The IUCN program components should be (partly) designed to provide building bricks for such explanation, illustrations and quotes.

**2. Where the IUCN program intends to influence other ministries or sectors, it is advisable to link biodiversity to issues higher on the public agenda.**

In order to have more effect on the ground, IUCN program components should link biodiversity issues explicitly with issues high on the public agenda of the society where the program operates. Where applicable they should link with ongoing national campaigns.

**3. Where the IUCN program intends to generate knowledge and information as a tool to change practices, a strategic rethinking of the communication strategy is advisable.**

Recent communication research is quite clear about the limited role environmental information plays in changing practices and behavior. The research quoted in the research from Australia and the Netherlands provide basis for new strategic approaches. CEC could advise the IUCN program to develop communication strategies which take into account the findings of recent communication research.

**4. The CEC program should - on a regular basis - make available to IUCN the results of communication research in various countries, relevant to the IUCN program.**

Part of the CEC program component should be directed to make relevant information and communication research available to the IUCN program and to provide advice how to make optimal use of this information. This could be combined not with a (complete) survey of major campaigns, but of major lessons learned from one or two important (national) campaigns in a specific year.

**5. The CEC program should - on a regular basis - make available to IUCN a survey of the ranking of environment and development cooperation in a representative and relevant number of countries.**

Part of the CEC program component should be directed to monitor the ranking of environment and development cooperation in a representative number of countries; make the results available to the IUCN program and provide advice how to make optimal use of this information.

#### **IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE SURVEY**

On the basis of the feedback and an analysis of the response, the following recommendations to improve the survey can be made:

1. To make comparisons possible next time, use more or less the same questions.
2. See this first exercise as a test of the questionnaire: improve the questionnaire after analysing how well the questions were understood. Focus some questions more on facts and figures. Ask for more research details.
3. Make sure next time the questions are answered by small country teams (3-4 experts from different background) to improve the quality of the answers to a level beyond personal opinions.
4. Make sure that a next time the questions ask more explicitly for sources backing up the information to avoid personal opinions and educated guesses.
5. More time should be available for participants and they should be provided from the start with a clear time table with milestones.
6. A next survey should aim to cover between 30 – 40 countries with a proper regional balance.
7. A next survey should not focus on providing a complete overviews of campaigns. To be complete would make the survey difficult to read, and it would be difficult to have an objective criteria for what is a complete overview of major campaigns. It is preferable to focus on a survey as an instrument that provides indications for opportunities and threats for environmental communication and that gives inspiration and ideas on how to improve one's practice. It would be advisable to ask next time e.g. which has been the best campaign and why and what major lessons learned (or which things went wrong) in other campaigns.
8. A next survey should also explicitly monitor the ranking of development cooperation (especially among donor countries) and provide examples illustrating the major trends.
9. The survey could also provide information where capacity building in communication might be needed.

## V. BACKGROUND & CONTACTS OF PARTICIPATING EXPERTS

**Marta Andelman** (1950), communication and education consultant, specialized in participation strategies and biodiversity planning. Member of Fundación para la Conservación de las Especies y el Medio Ambiente, FUCEMA, Argentina. Contact: mandelman@fibertel.com.ar

**Dr. Lars Berg, Ph D** (1969), is the secretary of the Swedish Scientific Council on Biological Diversity, and is stationed within the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, where he co-ordinates the agency's activities with regard to the Convention on Biological Diversity. He is also the national focal point for the Subsidiary Body for Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice within CBD. He has a background in conservation genetics and the pharmacogenetical industry.

**Dario Berginc, MSc** (1973) is marketing consulter in Kline&Partner, Slovenia, specialized in strategic marketing, relationship marketing, cause related marketing and stakeholder management. Contact: dario\_berginc@hotmail.com

**Ep Booneman** (1941), a retired senior communication specialist of the Netherlands Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment now works as an independant free lance advisor. His topics are the relation agriculture/ environment and water. Contact: ep.booneman@tiscali.nl.

**Nathanial Arap Chumo** is the executive director of the Eastern Africa Environmental Network, and a former Chairman of East Africa Regional Committee of the IUCN, CEC. A former National Organizer of the Wildlife Clubs of Kenya and Wetland Ecologist at the National Environment Secretariat (now renamed NEMA).

**Dr. Jinie D.S. Dela** (1957) was former Head of IUCN Sri Lanka's Education and Communication programme; also a primatologist. Currently a freelance environmental consultant in Sri Lanka on environmental topics and for technical editing. Her specialities are environmental communication, threatened species and biodiversity. Contact: shirindra@itmin.com

**Dr. Marco A. Encalada** (1942), Communication and education specialist, General Manager of Corporacion OIKOS, Ecuador ([www.oikos.org.ec](http://www.oikos.org.ec)), which deals with issues related to environment, production and technologies as well as education and communication. Currently he is the Regional Chair for South America of the CEC-IUCN.

**Andreas Glanznig** (1964) is biodiversity policy manager with WWF Australia. He was formerly national coordinator of the Community Biodiversity Network, a national biodiversity community education initiative under the National Strategy for the Conservation of Australia's Biological Diversity. He is Regional Chair for Oceania of the CEC.

**Dr. Denise Hamú** is Chair of the IUCN Commission on Education and Communication since 2000. Over 15 years of experience in the field of environmental education and communication both nationally and internationally. At the national level she has been involved in national policy and strategy, awareness campaigns, working in rural areas with local communities, managing large information and education projects in the field of nature conservation and in natural history museums. Contact: [denisehamu@terra.com.br](mailto:denisehamu@terra.com.br).

**Frits Hesselink** (1945) is managing director of HECT Consultancy ([www.hect.nl](http://www.hect.nl)) in the Netherlands, specialized in communication strategies, interventions for effective interaction, stakeholder management, training and knowledge management. From 1992 – 1994 he was a deputy Chair of CEC. He was Chair of CEC from 1994 – 2000. Currently he chairs the CEC product group corporate communication.

**Francisco Heras Hernández** (1961) is coordinator of the Education and Cooperation Unit at the Spanish National Center for Environmental Education ([www.mma.es/ceneam](http://www.mma.es/ceneam)). He works on environmental education, communication and participation as social instruments for the environmental policy.

**Edward Idle** (1937) is Director of Inch Consultancy in U.K. which aims to assist nature conservation organisations, governmental and NGO, with policy, science and management programmes. He was a Director of English Nature, the government agency responsible for nature conservation and a President of Eurosite, the European network of nature management organisations. Contact: [edward.idle@virgin.net](mailto:edward.idle@virgin.net)

**Dr. Mihael Kline** (1945) is professor in at the Faculty for Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana, and general executive of the marketing company Kline&Partner. His special topics are: integrated marketing communication, visual communication, psychology of marketing communication, brand management and reputation management. He is the author of a range of articles in marketing magazines and academic publications.

**Sylvi Ofstad Samstag** (1939) is a senior advisor to the Norwegian Ministry of Environment on communication and education, mainly dealing with biodiversity questions ([www.miljo.no](http://www.miljo.no)). She was previously the director of information with the Norwegian Society for Conservation of Nature, and later also the deputy director general for the information department within the Ministry of Environment. The integration of communication into biodiversity issues as an incentive to obtain faster and better results through participation is one of her special topics. She is elected chair for the UNEP/COE PEBLDS for the period 2003-2005.

**Jean Perras** (1949) is Mayor of the Municipality of Chelsea, Québec, Canada ([www.chelsea.ca](http://www.chelsea.ca)). He is a consultant in organizational development. He chairs Canada's Advisory Committee of the North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation ([www.naaec.gc.ca](http://www.naaec.gc.ca)). He has been a member of CEC since 1996.

**Mercedes Sanchez** (1960) is Web Journalist and Communication Consultant in Brazil, specialized in creating and designing Web sites, Usability Tests, Information Architecture, Web content and e-environment, i.a. working for the Federal Ministry of Environment. [www.mercedessanchez.com.br](http://www.mercedessanchez.com.br)

**David Smith** is Managing Director of his own consulting company, and a Senior Fellow of the Synergos Institute. He also works with UNDP in Jamaica as Programme Specialist for Energy and Environment. He was an opinion journalist for the *Jamaica Herald* and has authored many technical publications. As Director of the lead environment NGO in Jamaica, he often advised the media, and once co-hosted a live radio show, 25 feet under the sea in the Montego Bay Marine Park. Contact: [www.consultjamaica.com](http://www.consultjamaica.com).

**Kathy Greaves Stiles** is an environment and education consultant who has worked in the SADC region of Africa for the past 15 years, currently finishing a PhD in education policy and law. She has been involved with CEC to facilitate EE/ESD policy development in Zimbabwe using stakeholder processes. Her specializations include environmental management (especially biodiversity and biogeography) teaching, project evaluation, and capacity building with adult educators/trainers.

**Dr. Keith Wheeler** (1953) is Executive Director of the Center for a Sustainable Future (<http://csf.concord.org>) and Director of the Foundation for Our Future ([www.ffof.org](http://www.ffof.org)) in the United States. He specializes in sustainable development education and communication R&D, strategic and scenario planning. He is member of CEC from 1994 – the present. Currently he chairs the CEC in North America.

# ANNEXES

## **I. LIST OF MAJOR PUBLIC CONCERNS**

### **Argentina**

Unemployment; growing increase of poverty; financial crisis and lack of credit.

### **Australia**

Recent national public surveys identify health (30%), crime (26%) and education (17%) as the three most important concerns. The 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> concerns are unemployment (13%) and environment (9%) respectively (Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics, 1999) .

### **Brazil**

Inflation, social welfare reform, tax reform, 'Fome Zero' - campaign against hunger. According to the Last National Opinion Research on "What Brazilians think of Environmental Issues and Sustainable Development (2001): unemployment (66%), violence (55%), Health (48%), Education (28%)

### **Canada**

War in Iraq & national security issues, health system, national and global economy.

### **Ecuador**

The poor economic national growth; low levels of international competitiveness in markets; personal security

### **Jamaica**

Crime and violence, the state of the economy and the devaluation of the Jamaican dollar, poverty and unemployment

### **Kenya**

Corruption in public offices; extreme poverty especially in rural areas compounded by the spread of HIV Aids and malaria; depletion and misuse of forest wildlife and water resources.

### **Netherlands**

According to the latest Survey (Belevingsmonitor Rijksoverheid – februari 2003 – Projectnummer P1041, 20 March 2003, [www.regering.nl](http://www.regering.nl)) the three major public concerns are: safety in society, norms and values, health care and wellbeing.

### **Norway**

The war in Iraq, disappointment with US and UN, slow or bad economy in the municipalities leading to negligence within school systems, hospitals, nurseries etc. , increasing unemployment, tax reliefs

**Slovenia**

Slovenian citizens are concerned about future and position of Slovenia in European Union and NATO, especially in NATO (connected with future mission of this organization). Next such concern is dilemma about “national interest”: what is national interest? That leading and successful Slovenian companies keep Slovenian ownership? Or that companies do their business well (workers are satisfied etc.) without looking on ownership? There are strong defenders on both sides.

Inflation is not such a problem (ca 7,2% in year 2002); it is also expected from Slovenia to have lower inflation before entering in European Union.

Other concerns are: privatisation of Slovenian railway (yes/no), open time of commercial centres also on Sundays (yes/no) etc.

**Spain**

According to the latest survey (n° 2.474, December 2002) the three major public concerns are unemployment (64,9%), terrorism (46,6%) and the oil spill of the Prestige (28%)

**South Africa**

Poverty reduction; food and water security and quality; pollution. Social justice through retribution and equity within the context of post-apartheid and the above public concerns (I think this is very critical to HOW the public views poverty for instance – certainly the 25 million or so who are still economically disadvantaged)

**Sri Lanka**

Achieving peace and ending civil strife in the north and east of Sri Lanka, thereby ensuring a united Sri Lanka; economic development and more job opportunities; reducing the cost of living.

**Sweden**

Medical services, education, geriatric care (according to two independent opinion polls in 2002)

**UK**

Improvements to National Health System; transport problems; education system at Primary and University levels; law & order

**USA**

Economy, homeland security, impending war in Iraq

## II. RANKING OF CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

### **Argentina**

Very low ranking

### **Australia**

Environment ranks 5<sup>th</sup> (9%); 69% of people reported having environmental concerns compared with 71% in 1998, 68% in 1996, 69% in 1994 and 75% in 1992 (Source: ABS, 1999).

### **Brazil**

On the 11<sup>th</sup> place is the ranking that the official poll reveals. Even so, more than half of the population considers that the concern about the environment is not exaggerated (64% in 2001). There is also an increasing percentage of the population that disagrees with the idea that Brazil has so much natural wealth that its exploitation does not need to be controlled (57% in 2001),

Brazil has macroeconomic problems as priorities, so environment is not on the top of the list, but it is an important public concern of our new government. The new Minister of Environment, Marina Silva, who didn't know how to read and write until she was a teenager, has a history in fighting for environmental and social questions, for life. She promised to put environment in the heart of the government of Brazil. She took office 3 months ago, so we have to wait and see. Important: last month, government cut 56,68% of the Ministry budget for 2003.

### **Canada**

Among the top 10 issues – closer to 5 or 6 if you link it to health and the environment.

### **Ecuador**

The poor economic national growth

Low levels of international competitiveness in markets

### **Jamaica**

Both issues are recognized by government as important but not given much attention or funds. There is a good policy base for nature conservation, but it is often not backed up in law. Laws that exist are often not enforced. The question of the mechanism by which SD will be managed by government is the subject of a consultancy at the moment. Most SD is seen as environment and little activity takes place on it outside of the National Environment and Planning Agency. The government has recently established a Sustainable Development Unit in the Planning Institute of Jamaica, a part of the Finance Ministry.

### **Kenya**

Sustainable development/nature conservation features strongly in the search for solution to the above issues. The new government is enacting legislation against corruption and the office of the President coordinates cross-sectoral anti-Aids campaigns. The world Bank imposed Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) is also coordinated by the Ministry of Planning and Natural Development. The issues of depletion of natural resources are handled by programme in the sectoral ministries.

### **Netherlands**

On place 9 of the list of major public concerns rank 'Nature and Environment'. Development cooperation though slipped back to position 14. The previous government which lasted only a few months gave this item a very low priority. Long term plans such as transforming low yielding agricultural areas into nature where postponed. The new government which is expected in April/May will probably put nature/environment on a higher level, but it seems not to be a real issue in the current talks between the expected coalition partners. The recently published plans for the application of the European Habitat Regulation confirm the idea that nature does not seem to be a major preoccupation. Resuming: we are on the way back. A positive point seems to be the fact that local governments take over some of the long term promises of the central government. The number of citizen that support in one way or another one or more of the numerous NGOs related to environment/nature still show some growth. At least one out of four citizens is member of an organisation as WWF, Green Peace et al. The assassination of the populist politician Pim Fortuyn by a staff member of a green NGO has not done any good to the cause.....

### **Norway**

Mr Brende our Minister of Environment is extremely good at getting stories into the media. He is mainly focusing on the protection of forests, national parks and a sustainable tourism. Internationally he is focusing on the Kyoto protocol and the following up of Johannesburg. NGOs like the WWF, Nature and Youth groups are focusing on conservation and the pollution from the oil industry. One oil field Snohvit (Snow white) was nearly stopped by the NGO Nature and youth and a consensus has been obtained to do an assessment in the Lofoten area to evaluate the consequences of starting oil drilling in this very rich fish spawning area. As part of a white paper on the management of the Norwegian oceans, the governments has also decided to assess the Barents sea to evaluate the consequences to the environment before letting the oil companies start searching for oil.

### **Slovenia**

Slovenia has relatively good preserved natural environment. It is not so high in the public concern in the direct sense, it is more in connection with other processes. In the last years there are more and more debates about the natural environment, because of different projects (supported from EU) and the establishment of new ecological parks. People (especially from countryside), often say: "We really do not know what we have got here". So they are learning to value the natural environment. The protection of nature is more

and more connected with sustainable development, biological/ecological agriculture, rural tourist, and with regional development.

### **South Africa**

*Nature conservation* as a sustainable concept has been subsumed within the concept of *sustainable use of natural resources*, which latter conceptual framework is the base of sustainable development in SA and the region. Sustainable development is seen as the way forward to reduce poverty, provide better living conditions for the population. Pollution and the environmental and health related side affects of industry (SA has more industry and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions than any other African country) are of concern to government, the corporate sector and civil society.

### **Spain**

Environment issues are always in the list of major public concerns, but usually on the 4<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> place. Unemployment or terrorism are a more important source of concern for people.

### **Sri Lanka**

Relatively low among the greater majority of the general public. For example, environmental concerns do not win elections or influence sale of products. The government does, however, give attention to both aspects when formulating major developments and have many laws and regulations to support this. Unfortunately actual enforcement/implementation on the ground is poor.

The national report on SD to the World Summit says that “Agenda 21 is considered a reference point by all development sectors in the state system, private sector and civil society”. However, this is more perhaps what the government wants to achieve rather than the actual situation. In reality most people in the country are not even aware of Agenda 21 or what SD means. The report also says “the principles of sustainable development are **enshrined in most development programmes**”. It is certainly true that EIAs are required for all major development projects by law, and is true for government policy and proposals for major development schemes and prescribed projects - but the actual weight given to SD during implementation is questionable and there are many instances of contravening environmental concerns during development despite the requirement for EIAs, etc. Despite all this, environmental education has been incorporated into the formal education system since the 1980s. Most people are aware of environmental needs though commitment if lacking, but the principles of SD are not well known.

### **Sweden**

“Environmental issues” showed up at number 7 in one of the polls held in 2002.

### **UK**

## Global Perceptions of Conservation & Sustainable Development

Nature conservation tends to feature quite low in public concerns. 'Sustainable development' is a term that has been widely used in relation to many aspects of public life. It is now being replaced by 'sustainable communities' in political jargon. This produces difficulties in understanding and definitions of what 'environment' means. There is only a vague understanding of the term 'sustainable development' so that it is used by many in support of their own particular views. Nevertheless a generalised concept may be most use at this stage.

### **USA**

In most polls taken in the US, people see the environment as important (top 10) but the notion of nature conservation or SD are not differentiated from the environment.

### **III. PRIORITY FOR OTHER MINISTRIES**

#### **Argentina**

Secretariat of Agriculture, Cattle and Fishery and Ministry of Economic affairs is the only sector who revealed some concern but not as a priority nor as a specific issue. This is because actually the Argentinean economy is highly dependent of grains (wheat, corn, soya) and meat production and export. GMOs and organic cultivations, approaches of quality for the export, sustainable fisheries and fishery resources are some issues that evenly concern in relation to nature conservation and sustainable development in this sector.

#### **Australia**

Nature conservation has received a reasonable priority by central government (e.g. funding of over \$1 billion for the Natural Heritage Trust); however, integration of biodiversity conservation objectives into key ministry policies has been patchy. A good example of this policy failure in relation to unsustainable agricultural policy is the high continuing rate of land clearing, occurring in parts of Australia (446,000 ha of remnant vegetation were cleared in Queensland annually between 1997-99). The consequence is continuing pressure.

#### **Brazil**

President Lula's government proposal is to transform environment in a transversal question. He wants the actions of the Ministry of Environment being incorporated to other political and social areas.

#### **Canada**

It is not a major issue but it is a minor one – compared to 10-20 years ago, when it was not an issue at all. The debate on Kyoto has helped a lot in Canada to link sustainable development, CO2 emissions and transport, energy efficiency, agriculture.

#### **Ecuador**

Economic Affairs: by no means it is a priority; Planning: within a scale 1-10, nature conservation may record 1 (one); Public transport: it may be 1 out of 10; Agriculture: nature conservation would be last issue to think about

#### **Jamaica**

Not a major priority. Environmental conservation will eventually be mainstreamed as part of a CIDA financed "greening of government" project. However, the issues are not seen as mainstream.

### **Kenya**

Sustainable development/Nature conservation is a priority in concerned ministries in that programmes established to address them reflect the emphasis. National Environment Management Authority Coordinate prioritised issued cross-sectorally.

### **Netherlands**

The Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries and the Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment form a kind of green axe. The Ministry of Transport and Water Management is divided between “black” (roads) and “blue” (water and nature). The Ministry of Economy slowly moves into activities that promote principles of responsible care, clean producing etc. Alas since the elections of 2002 which lead to a centre/right/populist government has not been positive for this trend (subvention cuts etc.).

### **Norway**

The ministry of agriculture is cooperating well with the ministry of environment. Transport not so well, but has its good moments like planning roads away from cultural and natural sites if possible. Transport also rehabilitate areas that has been disturbed previously by road construction for instance blockage of water into wetlands. This is due more due to pressure from environment authorities than a part of a strategic plan. Spatial planning is a part of the Ministry of environment's responsibility, but is left to the communes to follow up locally. This is very often due to bad local planning and loss of environmental areas like outdoor areas for children, small community forests, biodiversity and cultural heritage sites. Protests from local NGOs or county authorities are not always sustained by the ministry of environment. 16 ministries have made their own plan for protecting biodiversity. Very few have started the hard process on fulfilling the plan.

### **Slovenia**

The Government has a Ministry of Environment, which cooperates also with other government sectors: Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Transport. The government leads some projects, connected with environment and sustainable development, and in collaboration with NGO-s and EU projects.

### **Spain**

In my opinion, nature conservation and/or sustainable development are not a priority at all for economic affairs, planning or public transport. The issue has a certain relevance for agriculture

### **South Africa**

Nature conservation in the old sense is still important, as one of the key natural resources here is our national park system and tourism. Conservation, inclusivity of communities in tourism and other uses of the protected areas is a major concern to the government (Ministry of Environment and Tourism and Dept of Parks). As a signatory to the CBD

ministries concerned such as agriculture, mines and industry are involved with responses to the convention and creating strategy in SA.

### **Sri Lanka**

In my opinion, in terms of economic affairs very high priority is not given in reality, though policy formulated by the Ministry of Environment accepts that there should be an environmentally friendly macro-economic framework.

The Ministry dealing with Planning and Plan implementation - medium priority appears to be given and EIAs are mandatory for prescribed development activities. Very high priority is given for conservation and SD in planning for the forest and wildlife, and fisheries sectors. For example, the government no longer clears high forests for agriculture or development in the biodiversity rich wet zone, and there is no state run timber felling in any natural forest. This rating is not valid for planning in all other sectors having a role in development, and there is poor inter-agency coordination to meet the national needs of environmental conservation and sustainable development.

Tourism sector - high priority is being given in the tourism sector now for environmental concerns and SD of the sector.

Public transport – environmental conservation and sustainable development have not been given very high priority, although some concerns have been met with. For example air pollution is now addressed through introduction of unleaded petrol; congestion (which compounds air pollution) is being addressed through road development. Action is slower than expected, and no move has been taken to regulate import of vehicles or to check existing vehicles for exhaust fumes.

Agricultural sector – both environmental concerns and SD are fairly well accepted, but the use of excess fertiliser and pesticides continues to be major problem for water pollution in both inland and coastal areas. Also despite laws and regulations, soil erosion/land degradation is rampant in agricultural lands. There is also no concerted move to safeguard traditional varieties *in situ* and the country lacks a land use policy.

### **Sweden**

National legislation places responsibility for environmental issues on each sector of public or commercial activity.

### **UK**

Nature conservation and sustainable development are accepted or seen as important considerations in most Ministries in U.K. Their connection with the quality and sustainability of urban and rural life and communities has been expressed in a range of delivery programmes, which are Government funded through statutory agencies. Two major target indicators are used – statutory protected sites (SSSIs) and farmland birds.

Some Ministries are more ‘switched on’ than others. A major issue across several Ministries is the implementation of ‘precautionary principles’ in individual cases.

Agriculture (DEFRA) is progressing towards delivery of the nature conservation targets. Planning also is evolving to take account of stakeholders in ‘community well-being’

## Global Perceptions of Conservation & Sustainable Development

strategies. As yet there is a poor understanding of the contribution wildlife can make to healthy communities.

### **USA**

In the current administration these issues are very low priority as a whole. One can find little pockets where they are a priority, but not many. This facet changes from US administration to administration often leaving to large swings in policy making and project funding.

#### **IV. PRIORITY FOR THE CORPORATE SECTOR**

##### **Argentina**

Secretariat of Agriculture, Cattle and Fishery and Ministry of Economic affairs is the only sector who revealed some concern but not as a priority nor as a specific issue. This is because actually the Argentinean economy is highly dependent of grains (wheat, corn, soya) and meat production and export. GMOs and organic cultivations, approaches of quality for the export, sustainable fisheries and fishery resources are some issues that evenly concern in relation to nature conservation and sustainable development in this sector.

##### **Australia**

Nature conservation is an issue mostly for those industries impacted by biodiversity conservation policies and programs, an examples being the constraints placed on the mining sector by restricting access to protected areas.

##### **Brazil**

It is an important issue for almost every company nowadays. Some of them have an environmental department or even a foundation to promote nature conservation and others give financial support to NGO and/or governmental campaigns. In general every company wants to show they care about environment and that they are doing something. On the National Survey with key Brazilian Leaders, it is stated that there has been a widespread acknowledgement of the improved institutional design of the area of environmental policy in Brazil. Nevertheless, the survey states that there is clear gap between the current institutional situation and the results that should be achieved. In the same poll, the leaders consider that “there is a complete divorce between the economic area and the environmental area” in Brazil. The clear conclusions about the matter of the process of internalisation of “the vector of sustainability” in government policies are that the urgency of achieving development at any cost prevails and that considerations about the environment are still marginal among government decision makers.

##### **Canada**

It is slowly appearing on the radar screen. Unfortunately, many in the private sector, as well as many politicians, see this as a liability, thus a cost, that will/does affect the bottom line.

##### **Ecuador**

The commercial sector would not care for nature conservation at all. The industrial sector has some slight interest on issues associated to nature conservation, as it is functional to their marketing. Yet actions are too poor. The financial sector has no priorities associated to nature conservation at all; not for sponsoring actions, nor for launching loan programs for these ends.

**Jamaica**

Not a major priority, though some companies make donations to environmental NGOs and see it as “a good cause”

**Kenya**

Sustainable Development/Nature Conservation is increasingly becoming recognised by the corporate sector. For example, the Nation Media is spearheading fundraising to fence off Aberdares National Park, Total Kenya is promoting tree planting campaign in Kenya.

**Netherlands**

Although the corporate sector is aware of their responsibilities, they do not really stress this. A number of companies is obliged by law to publish a kind of yearly eco-account. These accounts are hardly do get publicity.

**Norway**

The corporate sector is indeed aware of their responsibilities, but is still working out their strategy for this very difficult issue. The oil industry (Statoil) is for instance promising a zero emission from their activities/oil platforms/installations (at least in Norway). The forest industry is working very close up to international stewardship schedules and the fish farming companies are trying to control the pollution from the farms and the escape of trouts and salmons from the net pens in order to prevent genetic pollution of the wild species in the rivers. The tourist industry is now getting very interested in how to use nature areas sustainable and we have a very good cooperation with their organisations.

**Slovenia**

Only a few-minority of corporations are taking this issue seriously. Some “value” or “green” oriented companies try to practise cause related marketing (some projects connected with environmental protection) or make products which are friendly to nature (green products).

**Spain**

I think the interest about this topic is growing, mainly because of the new environmental laws and economic possibilities linked to environmental best practices.

**South Africa**

The corporate sector within the policies and laws of SA have to reclaim any areas that they have destroyed...eg in Richard’s Bay area (KwaZulu) companies mining sand dunes must reshape and replant the dunes with indigenous flora. Corporations take opportunities for promotion of tourism and wildlife conservation as part of their corporate image. Within Local Agenda 21 which is followed in most cities...for example Durban where industry, business and citizen groups have worked well together to reclaim the harbour and protect the mangroves. This combines with anti-pollution programs which are working to some extent.

**Sri Lanka**

Overall low. There are some companies that actively promote soil conservation and tree planting, but generally there is poor understanding of the overall needs of nature conservation and sustainable development. There is also low priority for funding nature conservation in the corporate sector. For example, a study carried out by WCMC/IUCN found that the funding for biodiversity conservation from the business sector was negligible in the mid 1990s.

**Sweden**

National legislation places responsibility for environmental issues on each sector of public or commercial activity.

**UK**

Some large companies now have nature conservation and sustainable development represented at top Board level. Some directors of large companies have informed views on environmental matters. This is less so among the many small companies, though programmes for environmental audit are growing and support programmes are developing. Overall, delivery of nature conservation from the corporate sector. Overall, delivery of nature conservation from the corporate sector is still too weak and not well focussed. We still have examples of developments where the effect is not known, understood or recognised. Corporate development and operations are guided by planning law and experience of confrontations with the environmental movement in the past. Larger problems seem to arise with U.K. companies operating abroad. There the same standards do not seem to apply.

**USA**

I would say that these issues are much higher in the corporate sector in the US ( at least for the multi-nationals) than with the government. They are also important issues for the private foundations.

## V. MAJOR NGO CAMPAIGNS IN 2002

### **Argentina**

In general campaigns are at local level. At national level, Greenpeace institutional campaigns in biodiversity (whales, transgenic, forests), toxics (incineration, persistent organic contaminants) and energy are those with the highest society and communication media impact. Another NGO Fundación Vida Silvestre (FVSA), (WWF Argentine Chapter) develop marine ecosystems campaigns and lobby at national level but with more specific target and law impact.

### **Australia**

The major nature conservation campaign aimed to reduce land clearing rates and strengthen protective measures for native vegetation. The other major campaign related to water and wetland conservation, particularly in relation to seeking an increase in environmental flows to rivers in the Murray Darling Basin.

### **Brazil**

We did not have major campaigns last year, one that appeared intensively on the media or that mobilize the population, but there were some leading actions that should be pointed out:

Mogno - Greenpeace and WWF - campaigns to protect the wood called the 'green gold' of Amazonia.

Transgenic - Greenpeace, WWF and other local NGOs

Wild animals' traffic - SOS Mata Atlântica (NGO of São Paulo to protect the Atlantic rain forest) and Renctas (a national organization against the traffic)

'Mico leão dourado' - WWF finished its campaign with good results. To celebrate it, the govern of Brazil printed the image of the little monkey on the new 20 'reais' note.

### **Canada**

The Kyoto Protocol and climate change

### **Ecuador**

Public communication six-month campaign to demand from Ecuadorian Presidency candidates, in general elections period, to give priority to nature conservation and environmental issues within their government agenda proposals. Lead by the NGO Corporacion OIKOS.

Nation-wide, and international, twelve-year public campaign to mobilize public, private, and community support for nature conservation in the Galapagos Islands by any means, either staying in site or in the continent or abroad. Lead by Corporacion OIKOS.

No major campaigns yet small environmental communication, education, and interpretation small ones in support of the most of the 21%-size of the country natural reserves system were carried out by several NGOs.

Nation-wide mass media campaign against a brand-new law that allowed free mining activities in natural protected areas, and size reduction of them over time. Performed by the Association of Ecuadorian Nature Conservation Organizations (CEDENMA)

### **Jamaica**

Green Expo 2002, a biennial exposition was held in June and viewed by some 7000 people. The expo featured exhibits on all aspects of environment including nature conservation, though the main theme for this year was conservation of energy.

### **Kenya**

The NGO campaigns on nature conservation/sustainable development were carried in Kenya by:

Eastern Africa Environmental Network – conservation education and networking

East African Wild Life Society – Biodiversity conservation issues

Youth for Conservation – Removal of snares in wildlife protected areas

WWF, IFAW, AWF, Action Aid, AMREF, OXFARM – financing projects on sustainable development

IUCN

### **Netherlands**

To influence the outcome of the 2002 elections several activities were developed to get/ to maintain the eco issue.

### **Norway**

UN's Year of the Mountains. More than 100 arrangements throughout Norway focusing on the protection, the use of and the values connected to mountains. Very good publicity in 2002 and also very good response from the public.

### **Slovenia**

Umanotera, the Slovenian foundation for sustainable development, organized the following major projects/campaigns in y. 2002, connected with nature:

“Slovenia without genetically modified organisms”; “Waste in Slovenia”; “Estimation of influence on environment”; “Process RIO + 10 in Slovenia”

### **South Africa**

Most large NGOs were working on projects which they could show at the WSSD in Johannesburg. One such promotional and educational tool was produced by Birds of Africa (SA branch) on the WSSD and sustainable development for school children...project worked on in collaboration with the Ministry of Education and distributed to schools to explain what WSSD was all about. Clean up campaigns were ongoing in Johannesburg and other cities, and promotion of tourism (especially eco), and

## Global Perceptions of Conservation & Sustainable Development

all projects that affect sustainable development. The year was special in that it having WSSD in SA provided an opportunity for groups to reflect on their work and to promote it at a global summit.

What one did see (e.g. at the Summit) were projects, programmes and communication that related to community based natural resource management (CBNRM). This is especially true with the regional programmes sponsored initially by USAID on CBNRM. This catch phrase has been the most talked and written about concept and framework for conservation within development at grassroots. It was heavily promoted within the country and at the WSSD (including the IUCN displays).

### **Spain**

Campaign for a wise use of water and against the National Hydrological Plan (Several Groups)

Campaign about Prestige Oil Spill (Several Groups)

Campaign for the closure of Trillo nuclear plant (Greenpeace)

### **Sri Lanka**

No major environmental campaigns with a wide reach were carried out by NGOs in 2002, although these have been sporadic exhibitions, educational initiatives etc. on various aspects of nature conservation, many of which were project based.

### **Sweden**

Sustainable fisheries – WWF

### **UK**

Public campaign to stop the use of peat in horticulture.

A levy (tax) on the use of sand & gravel and peat.

The use of Genetically Modified Organisms in agriculture.

Public campaign to change fishing practice to avoid deaths of dolphins/ porpoises and other marine mammals.

Campaigns to promote changes to the Common Agriculture Policy, Common Fisheries Policy, Water Framework Directive of EU.

### **USA**

On Nature Conservation the WWF, National Wildlife Foundation, Conservation International, The Nature Conservancy, Nature Serve. In sustainable development – CERES, National Council for Science and the Environment, the Business Council, the Business Roundtable, World Resources Institute.

## **VI. MAJOR CORPORATE CAMPAIGNS IN 2002**

### **Argentina**

There wasn't, but CEADS (WBCSD Argentine Chapter) organized a workshop with the Environmental Secretary about strategies alliances private-public sectors to achieve S.D goals with corporate cases. When companies certificate ISO 14000 develop a diffusion campaign about their environmental goals and politics.

### **Australia**

The peak farmer lobby organisation has been running a minor campaign opposing the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act, 1999. The Act is a major piece of second generation law.

### **Brazil**

Again, no major campaigns, only some isolated actions:

Sustainable Industry - The National Industry Confederation created a website with information about sustainable practices in industry and about Rio+10.

<http://www.industriasustentavel.org.br/ingles/index.asp>

Ecological cosmetics - The leader national company, Natura, created a new cosmetic line - 'Ekos' - based on Amazon products obtained by sustainable development.

[http://www.natura.net/port/site.asp?link=/port/produtos/main\\_produtos\\_linha.asp](http://www.natura.net/port/site.asp?link=/port/produtos/main_produtos_linha.asp)

Technology for recycling tyres - Petrobras, the leader oil company, created a new technology to produce gas and oil from recycled tyres. It has been exported to Asiatic countries. [http://www2.petrobras.com.br/portal/ingles/meio\\_ambiente.htm](http://www2.petrobras.com.br/portal/ingles/meio_ambiente.htm)

### **Canada**

The major campaign was one against the Kyoto Protocol.

### **Ecuador**

Five-month public campaign on the irrelevance of environmental impacts from civil works of oil pipeline construction throughout some natural reserves. Carried out by private petroleum firms.

### **Jamaica**

None

### **Kenya**

Corporate sector campaigns featuring on conservation of nature/sustainable development in the year 2002:

Fundraising for Conservation work among NGOs and Government Departments

Tree planting and anti-poaching campaigns

Save the African elephant and rhino campaign

Save indigenous forest campaign  
Water and wetland conservation.

**Netherlands**

None

**Norway**

No campaigns, but individual processes between the corporate sector and the ministry of environment, our agencies or NGOs that in the long run can give results.

**Slovenia**

Some projects on this field in Slovenia:

Helios: “Protection of water: cleaning of carst water”; “Reviving of local fountains”

Renault: “Ford award for conservation of natural and cultural heritage«

Mobitel: Connection with association for observation and investigation of birds”

Renaultovo “Let us make our national park green«

**South Africa**

There was an award scheme for conservation projects, which was widely advertised in newspapers and corporately sponsored. Within industry 2002 saw a continuation of anti-pollution as part of sustainable development. The most common programme sponsored and adopted continues to be Cleaner Production. There are also some new projects such as CBLA from Canada which is working with industries which are large carbon emitters...as part of Climate Change reduction. Voluntary controls are to date being pushed by corporate and government in line with what some western countries such as US and Canada are doing. The new Environmental Management Act has not specified whether to use tight legislation for pollution control or a mixture of legislation and voluntary controls.

**Spain**

Saving water campaign (Canal de Isabel II, the water company for Madrid region)

**Sri Lanka**

No major environmental campaigns during this period by the corporate sector.

**Sweden**

Forest Stewardship Council

**UK**

Campaigns to stop the use of peat in horticulture, tax on sand, gravel and peat, GMO and fishing the use of sand & gravel and peat and the campaign to change fishing practices

## Global Perceptions of Conservation & Sustainable Development

(see under NGO campaigns) involved the corporate sector. In addition campaigns about port development in relation to Natura 2000 were important, time-consuming and expensive.

### **USA**

General Motors and TNC partnership, Conservation International and the Gordon Moore Foundation, TNC had a 1.5 Billion dollar capital campaign funded by corporations for nature conservation.

## **VII. MAJOR GOVERNMENTAL CAMPAIGNS IN 2002**

### **Argentina**

It is not possible to speak about national campaigns, it doesn't exist. But the National Secretary of Environment and Sustainable Development implemented a National Radio Program 1 hour a week on national environment issues about different concerns (Biodiversity, climate change, native forests, indigenous communities, etc).

### **Australia**

No major campaigns per se. Most important policy reform processes underway relate to native vegetation conservation, landscape salinity, water reform, and oceans policy.

### **Brazil**

No major campaigns, but important leading actions

Rio+10 Brasil - a big meeting to prepare Brazil and some countries of Latin America to Johannesburg

Renewable energy - the Brazilian proposition of 10% of renewable energy (that was not approved in Johannesburg)

Kyoto Protocol - Brazil ratified it

New preserved areas - Government created new protected areas and new National Parks including Tumucumaque, the biggest protected area of tropical forest in the planet

### **Canada**

The Kyoto Protocol, water conservation, banning of pesticides, watershed management.

### **Ecuador**

Public 12-month campaign on energy efficiency at the industrial level, and energy savings at households, by mean of mass media and formal education. Held by the Ministry of Energy.

Public 6-month campaign on ecotourism and conservation of natural protected areas conducted by the Ministry of Tourism

### **Jamaica**

Government was associated with Green Expo and solicited comments from the public on matters of importance to the WSSD.

### **Kenya**

The government campaigns on nature conservation sustainable development featuring in 2002 included:

Tree planting campaign

Soil conservation work

Political campaign concerning conservation of natural resources.

**Netherlands**

Energy saving

**Norway**

Protection of nature reserves and national parks, follow up UN's year of the mountains in cooperation with the NGOs. Lesson learned: we should do more campaigns linked to concrete conservation projects.

**Slovenia**

Projects of Slovenian government:

“Today I create tomorrow” (Slovenian initiative for sustainable development in partnership with Umanotera, Slovenian (non-governmental) foundation for sustainable development)

“Tender for Water Detective” (collaboration with non-governmental ICRO, Institute for Integrative Development and Ministry for Education, Science and Sports)

“Eco-school as the way of life (lifestyle)” (leading Society for education in European environmental protection in Slovenia - DOVES)

Projects of Agency for environment:

“Geitip” (action of announcement about geological heritage - protection of mountains) (included all interested organizers which lead action on local level)

“World swamp day” (2.2.)

“World biodiversity day (22.5.)

“Parks day” (24.5.)

(publications, press conferences)

Projects connected with NATURA 2000 and MATRA.

**South Africa**

The government was the lead in setting up NEPAD which exemplifies sustainable development and the environmental, economic and social development priorities of Africa, including SA. With the Protected Areas Congress in Durban later this year the ministry of Environment and Tourism is busy working on its programs and the promotion of them...such as the major shift within Parks to include Social Ecology...working with communities bridging on Parks land.

**Spain**

Environment Ministry TV campaign on sustainable development and campaigns on prevention of forest fires (several campaigns by Central government and Regional Governments).

**Sri Lanka**

No major campaigns for nature or SD, but there have been major government projects initiated in the forestry and coast conservation sectors that have education and awareness components woven into them.

## Global Perceptions of Conservation & Sustainable Development

### **Sweden**

Climate change awareness

### **UK**

The England (not G.B.) Biodiversity Strategy

Green Ministers

Genetically Modified Organisms

Community Strategies

Follow-up on Foot-and Mouth Disease and countryside development.

Revision of programmes for rubbish disposal (Land-fill tax credit scheme), in line with European Directives.

### **USA**

None

## **VIII. MAJOR NGO CAMPAIGNS PLANNED FOR 2003**

### **Argentina**

Greenpeace, against specific project on development of extractives gold mines in Patagonia and continuing with biodiversity and toxics campaigns. FVSA continuous with marine coasts, parks and species.

### **Australia**

Native vegetation conservation, landscape salinity, water reform, and oceans policy.

### **Brazil**

Greenpeace: toxical pollution, transgenic, deforestation in Amazonia.

WWF: Water will be the great theme of their campaigns until 2007

### **Canada**

The Kyoto Protocol, sustainable forestry , banning of pesticides, water conservation , sustainability of fisheries, sustainable agriculture and GMO

### **Ecuador**

Public education campaign on fresh water, to protect the watersheds, and to save water at industries and families.

Public communication campaign on the need of a new biodiversity law, as well as of forestry one.

Public environmental education on the appropriate use of pesticides in some rural areas of the country.

Communication and education campaign on environmental citizenship aimed at political, religious, educational, and governmental leaders, with the participation of six civil society networks. Issues to be addressed are: Climate Change, Biodiversity, International Waters, and Fresh Water.

Communication and education campaign on climate change

### **Jamaica**

Unsure

### **Kenya**

Same as in 2002

### **Netherlands**

Unknown

### **Norway**

UN's Year of the freshwater (follow up Johannesburg)

**Slovenia**

Umanotera, Slovenian foundation for sustainable development, is planning these major projects/campaigns in y. 2003:

“Train the trainers: promotion of sustainable waste management in local communities”

More information: [www.umanotera.org](http://www.umanotera.org). There are many more projects, supported with EU funds (PHARE, NATURA 2000) or EU countries (e.g. MATRA) connected with some NGO and local associations.

**South Africa**

The WWF website will show some of that they are doing...e.g. coastal. Water and sanitation are featuring heavily within the context of NEPAD in SA. Water week is always a partnership campaign between government and NGO's and sometimes community groups. All the major environment days are focused on for communication and promotion through the EE network in SA...through the Regional EE Network as well (located at Howick in SA). I should mention here that the NEEP (schools and curriculum programme of EE) and the NGO's involved with EE work together on campaigns, pilot projects etc. They have over the years been very successful in this partnership...and bringing on board for example the Water Authorities such as Rand water and Umgeni Water. Film, material resources etc produced, including new ones planned on Climate Change.

**Spain**

I have no information

**Sri Lanka**

No such plans known of specific campaigns till now

**Sweden**

Sustainable palm-oil production (in developing countries) – WWF

**UK**

Long-line fishing and threats to large animals e.g. Albatross species

**USA**

Ongoing TNC and CI work

## **IX. MAJOR CORPORATE CAMPAIGNS PLANNED FOR 2003**

### **Argentina**

There are not planned.

### **Australia**

Native vegetation conservation, landscape salinity, water reform, and oceans policy.

### **Brazil**

Ecolatina 2003: 16 - 19 September, Belo Horizonte, VI Latin America Conference on Environment focus on sustainable development

### **Canada**

Not sure.

### **Ecuador**

Semi-public campaign on cleaner production and its relationship with nature conservation.

### **Jamaica**

Unsure

### **Kenya**

Tree planting campaign

Soil conservation work

Political campaign concerning conservation of natural resources.

### **Netherlands**

None

### **Norway**

None as far as I know, but still a slow but steady cooperation with the corporate sector to make them change their concept

### **Slovenia**

From companies which started to connect their business with environment (Renault, Helios, Mobitel, Ford) it is expected that they will continue to organize such campaigns and projects also in the year 2003.

**South Africa**

Business is pushing tourism...where much is concentrated around protected areas and the sea. There is usually some conservation focus as the watchdog NGO's in SA are fairly strong. Education ministry will be continuing its EE projects (NEEP...National EE programme) and gearing up for the Decade of Education for Sustainable Development. They are already in the preparation stage on this. Industry and economic planning are continuing with the struggle towards sustainable development, both to increase the industrial base, while staying within some limits of pollution. Campaigns of Cleaner Production, ISO guidelines and Cleaner Development (emission control) are continuing.

**Spain**

I have no information

**Sri Lanka**

No such plans known of specific campaigns till now.

**Sweden**

No information

**UK**

Not known

**USA**

Ongoing work with CERES and GRI

## **X. MAJOR GOVERNMENTAL CAMPAIGNS PLANNED FOR 2003**

### **Argentina**

There is none planned.

### **Australia**

Native vegetation conservation, landscape salinity, water reform, and oceans policy.

### **Brazil**

President Lula said during his campaign that the priority of his government would be the Green Agenda (biodiversity), which includes conservation and sustainable development of the Amazon rain forest as well as the combat against the 'bio-piracy'. He intends also to promote meetings to discuss the implementation of the Agenda 21. State governments are preparing special events to celebrate the International Year of Water.

### **Canada**

Water conservation, watershed management, species at risks and biodiversity, energy conservation & climate change

### **Ecuador**

Public nation-wide campaign on the importance of pollution prevention in both urban and rural areas affected by contaminants from certain agriculture activities, slaughter houses, and homes. An initiative of the Ministry of Environment.

### **Jamaica**

Campaign will be centred around world environment day in June.

### **Kenya**

None

### **Netherlands**

Energy saving

### **Norway**

In cooperation with the NGOs follow up the UN Year of the Freshwater

### **Slovenia**

Projects of Slovenian government:

“Pearls of Slovenian nature”

“International year of continental water “(Foundation for preserving Slovenian water, partnership with Helios company, reconstruction of fountains)

## Global Perceptions of Conservation & Sustainable Development

“We are uncovering pearls of Slovenian sea (partnership with Petrol company: “Preserve tortoise in Slovenian sea”, “Preserve Slovenian water sources”...)

“Tender for Water Detective” (collaboration with non-governmental ICRO, Instituts for Integrative Development and Ministry for Education, Science and Sports)

“Eco-school as the way of life (lifestyle)” (leading Society for education in European environmental protection in Slovenia - DOVES)

“European day of mobility and European day without car”

Projects of Agency for environment:

“Geitip” (protection of continental waters)

“Natura 2000”

Projects connected with NATURA 2000.

### **South Africa**

The only thing I am aware of (and haven't had time to ask folk in government) is a continued push by Ministry of Environment and Tourism for tourism which uses the natural environment. This focus is perhaps the saviour for small conservation areas and coastal regions. There is continued programme of coastal management in collaboration with cities and communities (e.g. those involved with Local Agenda 21).

### **Spain**

TV advertising campaign to thank the volunteers their valuable contribution on the Prestige oil spill problem (Ministry of Environment)

### **Sri Lanka**

No such plans known of specific campaigns till now.

### **Sweden**

Climate change awareness (continued)

### **UK**

More of those already mentioned particularly those involving community participation.

### **USA**

none

## **XI. MAJOR FINDINGS RECENT COMMUNICATION RESEARCH**

### **Argentina**

In 2000 Fundación Vida Silvestre (FVSA) developed a national environmental poll, to identify social perceptions. 8300 persons participated from the Capital (Buenos Aires) and some provinces. Thematic and regional perceptions show that problems are perceived like critical, serious, and considerable, depending on the regional experience and specific environmental impacts in that places. The general trend in order of importance was:

- fresh water contamination,
- air contamination,
- soil contamination,
- flood,
- poaching,
- illegal trade fauna and flora
- forest fires
- deforestation
- fisheries overexploitation
- endemic flora and fauna extinction.

The importance that participants (urban people ) gave to the problems was very close to contamination and urban problems. Although the 87% of the people recognized nature benefits for men, they couldn't focus the benefits, in relation to daily economy. (Source: 2000 Bertonatti Claudio & Javier Corchera. Situación Ambiental Argentina .Fundación Vida Silvestre Argentina)

### **Australia**

The level of community concern about the environment is steady. Protection of trees, forests and bush-land was identified as the most important environmental issue by only 5% of NSW respondents (compared to say 27% for water quality). (Sources: Australian Bureau of Statistics. 1999. Environmental Issues – People's Views and Practices, March 1998. ABS Catalogue No. 4602.0. ABS: Canberra. NSW EPA. 2000. Who Cares About the Environment. NSW EPA: Sydney. Urban Wildlife Renewal "Growing Conservation urban Communities" (NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service).

Australians still have a very low awareness of the term, biodiversity, and a poor understanding of the concept. A national AC Nielson phone poll undertaken in 1999 found that while about 4 in 10 Australians thought they had heard of the term, only 1 in 10 understood the concept. The remainder thought the term was concerned with financial planning (buy-diversity) or alternative lifestyles (AC Nielson 1999). Recent focus group research suggests that most of those that understood the biodiversity concept had learnt about it through the school or university system (Consumer Contact 1998, pg.20).

This 1 in 10 awareness rate has remained static since the early 1990s when a major national quantitative study found that the term, biodiversity, remains virtually unknown (ANOP 1993). Additional social research undertaken in 1993 found that where there is awareness, it

tends to be associated with conservation. This qualitative study found that most participants thought that biodiversity was vaguely related to plants and animals, with a stronger association with animals. Insects and bacteria, either as species or as part of an ecosystem, was rarely raised, even after prompting (Michael Gill and Associates Pty Ltd 1993). Various US sources suggest that only 1% to 30% of people know what biodiversity means. By the mid 1990s, social marketing approaches and cognitive research was emphasising the limits of the science and environment education approaches used to date. In 1995, for example, Chipeniuk (1995, pg.25) challenged the lasting value of educating the public about a complex scientific concept such as biodiversity:

...little evidence suggests that teaching biology to lay citizens actually transfers lasting concepts, much less that it is the best way to equip lay people with the ability to think appropriately about biodiversity. On the contrary, cognitive scientists are starting to find that, for purposes of daily life, folk-generated common-sense ideas about the environment can be superior to those half-learned from the sciences (Chipeniuk 1995:25).

While most government agencies were designing their environmental education programs based on the assumption that increased knowledge will lead to a change in attitudes and behaviour, the poor relationship between information driven campaigns and behavioural change led to critiques of this approach:

...Because Australians invariably register a high level of environmental concern, we tend to assume there is a groundswell of popular support just waiting to be tapped. All the evidence is, however, that peer group pressure, stand out advertising and a catchy jingle may be more effective than the kind of sensitive, information-rich campaigns government bodies like to run (Said 199\*:11).

### **Brazil**

'What Brazilians think about environment' - public opinion research coordinated by the Ministry of Environment and the NGO, Iser

'From Rio 92 to Rio+10, a balance' - research of what has changed in the environmental sector in these ten years, coordinated by the Ministry of Environment and the NGO, Iser

'Brazil 2002, the sustainability we want' a document produced by WWF and Brazilian Forum NGOs with proposals to Johannesburg.

Based on the National Survey, it is stated that looking at the three rounds of this research (1992, 1997, 2001), the general findings are that there have been few changes. However, such changes are significant, because they refer to the broader diffusion of environmental notions and policies in the public agenda, and above all to the manner by which each citizen feels more and more committed to the solution of environmental problems. The Survey also states that in 1997 a narrow conception of the environment persisted among Brazilians- which was confirmed also in 2001. For Brazilians, the environment is synonymous with the fauna and flora, and the protection of "green areas". The Survey also underlines that "there remains an immense task for environmental educators so that this notion can be expanded. It is disturbing, for example, that even individuals with high level of schooling do not include men and women as part of the environment".

In terms of pro-active attitudes, there is a growing trend in the figures that show how the population is willing to help in the control of environmental problems. In the matter of

evaluating actors and their actions towards the environment, a strong trend was found in favour of giving expanded responsibilities to local governments. The Survey also mentions that it is worth adding that international indicators show that Brazil is fairly well positioned in terms of the concern with the environment and that there are reasons to be optimistic about the future of Brazil.

### **Canada**

See this web site – it reflects pretty much where Canadians are at regarding the environment: [www.communication.gc.ca/survey\\_sondage/index\\_e.html](http://www.communication.gc.ca/survey_sondage/index_e.html) .

### **Ecuador**

All major mass media (press, radio and TV) of the country enthusiastically joined the campaign to attract institutions' economic, political, and scientific support for the conservation of the Galapagos ecosystems. An anti-nature conservation brand-new law was modified. Parliament opened opportunities to discuss proposals for new laws of biodiversity and forestry. Five out of nine political candidates to the Presidency of the Republic of Ecuador modified their political government agenda proposals during election campaign, in order to include nature conservation concerns and proposals. No one report has been issued in English. Spanish reports are not available either.

### **Jamaica**

Knowledge Attitude and Practice survey on watersheds and rivers. Survey on Green Expo [www.greenjamaica.org](http://www.greenjamaica.org). Reports on the National Environmental Education Committee (still being written, available in June). Some can be viewed on the NEPA website [www.nepa.gov.jm](http://www.nepa.gov.jm) or [www.enact.org](http://www.enact.org)

### **Kenya**

No recent communication, marketing or public opinion research in relation to nature conservation/sustainable development has been conducted in Kenya.

### **Netherlands**

A recent publication worth to be mentioned: Marketing for Sustainability. Toward Transactional Policy-Making, Eds, Gerard Bartels and Wil Nelissen, published jointly by IOS Press and Omsha. ISBN 158603 204 6 // 4 274 90509 C 3034.

A 1999 Study by the Sociaal Economisch Plan Bureau ([www.scp.nl](http://www.scp.nl)) highlighted some interesting research conclusions<sup>1</sup>:

Environmental publications are only read by those who are already interested in the subject in the first place. Not by other audiences.

Mass media do not influence opinions of people. At best they play a role in agenda setting: to a certain extent they determine about what people think

---

<sup>1</sup> Comments and reflections on the implications for environmental education and communication of these conclusions by Phil Smith can be found in the Annexes on page

Environmental messages have to compete with millions of other important messages. People select messages in mass media on the basis of their interest. Social groups and processes influence this filtering.

People's opinions are formed by informal conversation in their own social context (peers, family, friends, pub, club etc.). Networking communication is the most effective way to influence opinions.

Many people who hold dissident views in a certain social group normally keep silent and will provide political correct answers and behave according to group norms, until a critical mass of like minded people in the group is formed.

Environmental information reaches the public mostly through TV, radio, newspapers and magazines. The credibility of these channels is lower than information directly from scientists, trade unions or consumer and environmental organizations. The most powerful channel is face to face.

Environmental disasters lose more and more their impact. At the one hand there is too much competition with other disasters. At the other hand the alarm feeling of an environmental disaster today begins to diminish and disappears quickly: people get tired and indifferent, as they do not see any direct personal consequences.

Economic interests are an important criteria for the public to judge the credibility of environmental information. For the rest credibility is based on preconceived sympathies or antipathies, e.g. climate change measures are perceived as another trick of governments to raise taxes.

Environmental information in general faces a credibility problem: it has to face so much conflicting information and so much environmental information was presented as alarm in the past decades, and later had to be shaded by the same sources; this leads to attitudes of 'lets wait and see' or pure disbelief.

Environmental information, education and communication are important policy instruments to steer behaviour through persuasion and increased knowledge. These instruments need to be transformed into the right mix of tailored networking interventions per issue towards the main stakeholders. To do so effectively expert advice is needed for both planning and implementation stages. Especially when one wants to involve new media and internet.

### **Norway**

In spite of low interest for conservation matters according to recent public polls our ministry and particularly the minister himself have promoted/communicated the urgency in protecting the biodiversity. Results of this campaign show that Norway has protected more than 700 areas with large biodiversity potential since Mr. Brende took office in 2001. He has also followed up nationally the Johannesburg decisions and are still planning to finish the forest reserve plan and the national park plan within 2010. Just one thought: It is incredible what a decisive minister is able to do for the environment when he/she is using political skill, will, engagement in the right manner. Well followed up by positive elements in the society whether it is NGOs, media or political parties. As one has actually knew all the time. The will and the skill.

### **Slovenia**

We could not find recent studies which would show how campaigns, connected with environmental protection, influence public opinion. But we could say that awareness of nature protection among people in Slovenia is growing. People start to recognize that they live in environment with rich biodiversity, that they are responsible for such environment. People like campaigns for environmental protection, but they like much more practical actions, that they see the result, especially in the local area. We expect a lot from project "NATURA 2000", which will make several sites into protected areas. We are expecting more and more ecological awareness in next years.

### **South Africa**

I have been unable to find any written research within these areas...this is not to say they don't exist but I haven't found them. However there are writings from research within areas of CBNRM...which may be found at WWF regional research centre in Harare. Use website of WWF to find. Suggestion is to go to the government website for information re documents (governmental) and the WWF international one re conservation

### **Spain**

Survey n° 2.474, December 2002 (Spanish Center of Sociological studies,)

Item 29: You'd like more scientific and technological progress in (max. 3 choices):

Organs transplant: 73,8 % ; Non pollutant energies (wind, solar...): 65,4% ; Computers, robotics: 19,7%; Genetic engineering: 18,6.

Main environmental concerns: According to a recent Vasque country survey (2001):

Water pollution: (very concerned + rather concerned): 92%. Destruction of landscape and natural sites: 91%. Water pollution: 90%. The reports are in Spanish. An interesting source of information is the web page of the Spanish Center of Sociological Studies (Government Organization) [www.cis.es](http://www.cis.es)

### **Sri Lanka**

Not aware of any such public opinion research on nature conservation or SD (in contrast public opinion is sought on the political processes, the peace process, cost of living, etc).

### **Sweden**

Not available

### **UK**

Not aware of any such public opinion research on nature conservation or SD (in contrast there have been many on the peace process and cost of living). University Research into participative decision-making has begun in London (University College) and York, reflecting a growing interest in the importance of this subject in the management of biodiversity organisations. English Nature has funded post-graduate research to assist with potentially difficult Natura 2000 designation cases. 2002 Studd, K. 'An introduction to deliberative methods of stakeholder and public participation'. English Nature Research

## Global Perceptions of Conservation & Sustainable Development

Report No.474. A wide range of research subjects and reports available through, [www.english-nature.org.u.k](http://www.english-nature.org.u.k).

### **USA**

TNC and CI ongoing; TNC and CI www sites.

## **XII. WHAT IS USEFUL, HOW TO IMPROVE?**

### **Australia**

Questions were open ended, which made them quite difficult to answer

### **Brazil**

This exercise is very important for our CEC-IUCN Programme. Maybe it would be useful to develop a more systematic methodology, maintaining the qualitative nature of this survey. Questions need to be more precise and answers should be edited. It would be interesting to include in CEC the people in charge of the National Surveys on Environment. The suggestions and conclusions of this first exercise are very useful.

### **Canada**

None.

### **Ecuador**

If you had much more time, it would be nice to learn how much money organizations are investing for education and communication campaigns or for non public private activities.

### **Jamaica**

In Jamaica, “sustainable Development” is often understood and used as simply the latest buzzword for “environment”. Consequently it has often been marginalized as a concept. Most activities end up in the purview of the Ministry of Land and Environment and little work has been done in the central part of government. Until efficient communication as to the relevance of SD to economics and social conditions takes place this is unlikely to change.

### **Netherlands**

The response to the questionnaire is very positive. Repeating the exercise seems a very good option. Use more or less the same questions next time. See this exercise as a test of the questionnaire. Improve the questionnaire after analysing how well the questions were understood. Focus some questions more on facts and figures. Very promising might be to ask for more research details. Make sure next time the questions are answered by small country teams (3-4 experts from different background) to improve the quality of the answers to a level beyond personal opinions. Questions should also ask more explicitly for sources backing up the information.

### **Slovenia**

Too general approach, for future maybe more specific areas or categories.

### **South Africa**

I'm sorry I'm not working in Government so some of what I have said may lack the latest examples. My husband is heading the CBLA project with reduction of carbon emissions through energy management ...training. He might be a good contact for you Frits: Email....gstyles@iafrica.com. He has been working with the various business and industry sustainable development networks.

### **Spain**

It could be interesting to collect some information about the main campaigns developed in each country: target audience, communication instruments used, messages delivered. It could be interesting to use different sources to analyse environmental concerns in addition to rankings. Some researchers, using data from different surveys, have showed that when people from poor countries are asked to rank the most pressing problems environmental issues are ranked lower. Yet if the people are asked to rate the severity of different problems, environmental issues rank high. Some authors think that in poor countries ranking reflects more the reality of scarce economic resources and not the lack of environmental concern.

### **Sri Lanka**

To accurately reflect the level of government. public commitment it would have helped to have a box on the major activities undertaken by the government/NGOs in addition to campaigns. For example, the government of Sri Lanka has initiated an ADB funded massive forestry project that is ongoing geared at assisting with conservation of Sri Lanka's forests as well as using them sustainably. This will indirectly help with sustainable development. Also Sri Lanka has many laws and policies in place that promote nature conservation and sustainable development. While this does not show actual commitment to both NC and SD, it does show that the country has the basic background to move forward – in contrast to other countries that may need to start from scratch. This aspect is not sought in the questionnaire. Also more indirect questions that show importance of environmental concerns/commitment to SD could be included. e.g. (a) rate as low /medium /high: whether environmentally friendly products have a better market among the general public. Similarly rating the importance of environmental issues in the last election campaign.

### **UK**

This questionnaire, or something like it might be a useful nature conservation management tool to monitor developments during the year. I (we) have had some difficulty remembering all the events of 2002. Perhaps 2 or 3 times a year might be one approach, or alternatively 3 or 4 respondents as a team.

### **US**

Very good report, text was spot on. I hope that we continue to do these kinds of surveys, and can expand the scale someday beyond the CEC to broader audiences...its very important work!



CORPORATE COMMUNICATION PRODUCT GROUP

# GLOBAL PERCEPTIONS OF CONSERVATION & SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: 2002 - 2003

## QUESTIONNAIRE

Please return this questionnaire before 15 March 2003 to Frits Hesselink: [hesselink@hect.nl](mailto:hesselink@hect.nl)

The names of all respondents will be mentioned as co-authors of the CEC paper which CEC will prepare as input into the new IUCN program 2004 - 2008.

Name & email address	
What are the three major public concerns in your country ?	
Where does nature conservation and/or sustainable development feature on the list of major public concerns in your country?	
To what extent are nature conservation and/or sustainable development an issue or priority for ministries of economic affairs, planning, public transport, agriculture in your country?	
To what extent are nature conservation and/or sustainable development an issue or priority for the corporate sector in your country?	

## Global Perceptions of Conservation & Sustainable Development

What major NGO campaigns on nature conservation and/or sustainable development featured in your country in 2002?	
What major corporate sector campaigns on nature conservation and/or sustainable development featured in your country in 2002?	
What major governmental campaigns on nature conservation and/or sustainable development featured in your country in 2002?	
What major NGO campaigns on nature conservation and/or sustainable development are planned in your country for 2003?	
What major corporate sector campaigns on nature conservation and/or sustainable development are planned in your country for 2003?	
What major governmental campaigns on nature conservation and/or sustainable development are planned in your country for 2003?	
What were the outcomes of recent communication, marketing or public opinion research in relation to nature conservation and/or sustainable development?	
Are these reports in English? If so what is the title? Where can they be ordered?	
What other comments or suggestions do you have in relation to this questionnaire?	

## Partial Comments and reflections on Dutch Study by Phil Smith

Below are comments and reflections by Phil Smith on the highlights of the findings on the Dutch Study ‘*Duurzaam milieu, vergankelijke aandacht. Een onderzoek naar meningen, media en milieu.*’ (A sustainable environment. A study on opinions, media and environment)<sup>2</sup>. Phil Smith is a CEC member from Australia ([phil.smith@resource.nsw.gov.au](mailto:phil.smith@resource.nsw.gov.au)) and was made aware of an early version of this exercise through the CEC focal point and formulated independently from the group his reflections. As the reflections are valuable for further discussion they are printed below in italics.

1. Environmental publications are only read by those who are already interested in the subject in the first place. Not by other audiences.

### *Implications for Education:*

- *Need to integrate environmental messages into the other things people are interested in and read (I do not believe people are apathetic; instead, they are ‘otherwise interested’)*
- *Haven’t come across anything directly supporting statement 1*

2. Mass media do not influence opinions of people. At best they play a role in agenda setting: to a certain extent they determine about what people think. [*opinions/think....distinction needed*]

### *Implications for Education:*

- *This is fine...support the media to set the agenda*
- *May need training for media on environment & sustainability*
- *(wonder how this was asked...do people know the extent to which they are influenced by community/social norms and the role the media plays in influencing community norms?)*
- *A couple of program evaluations (Vic Australia, Scotland) talk about the importance of multi-media approaches in their program strategies, particularly “mass media”. Scottish EPA project survey indicated over 70% recall of campaign messages (agenda setting) and around 60% respondents said they were now, or will be adopting actions from campaign (behaviour change?).*

3. Environmental messages have to compete with millions of other important messages. People select messages in mass media on the basis of their interest. Social groups and processes influence this filtering.

### *Implications for Education:*

- *Target other interests with sustainability messages*
- *“It’s a Living Thing” is overarching message which identifies further information as part of ILT picture*
- *Interesting to find out how people “use” ILT message in everyday activities. Is it perceived as general awareness raising message, or as a “flag” that forthcoming*

---

<sup>2</sup> Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau, Cahier 165 ([www.scp.nl/boeken/cahiers/cah165/nl/samenvatting.htm](http://www.scp.nl/boeken/cahiers/cah165/nl/samenvatting.htm))

*information is for those who have environmental interests? Or both? ILT has evaluated well*

4. People's opinions are formed by informal conversation in their own social context (peers, family, friends, pub, club etc.). Networking communication is the most effective way to influence opinions.

*Implications for Education:*

- *Be innovative in education initiatives in a range of social contexts*
- *Don't undervalue benefits of (particularly in regional/rural areas) informal word-of-mouth as major communication tool.*

5. Many people who hold dissident views in a certain social group normally keep silent and will provide political correct answers and behave according to group norms, until a critical mass of like minded people in the group is formed.

*Implications for Education:*

- *Need to build that critical mass in the community...mass media would be an important tool in this*

6. Environmental information reaches the public mostly through TV, radio, newspapers and magazines. The credibility of these channels is lower than information directly from scientists, trade unions or consumer and environmental organizations. The most powerful channel is face to face.

*Implications for Education:*

- *Get face to face in creative and wide settings*
- *Influence those who already have contact with others in this way*
- *(Research in NSW during the 90s asked people about levels of trust they have in info from a range of organisations and agencies)*

7. Environmental disasters lose more and more their impact. At the one hand there is too much competition with other disasters. At the other hand the alarm feeling of an environmental disaster today begins to diminish and disappears quickly: people get tired and indifferent, as they do not see any direct personal consequences.

*Implications for Education:*

- *Link to lifestyle (and other individual impacts) consequences for individuals and communities*
- *Link to lifestyle causes for individuals and communities*
- *Build advocacy skills in the community*
- *Build commitment and action at local level...how do we enable communities and individuals within those communities to protect something, achieve something important at the local level for the local community?*

8. Economic interests are an important criteria for the public to judge the credibility of environmental information. For the rest credibility is based on preconceived sympathies or antipathies, e.g. climate change measures are perceived as another trick of governments to raise taxes.

*Implications for Education:*

- *(am not clear what the first part of this one means...does it mean that if an oil spill is “quantified” in terms of economic losses, rather than dead/dying flora and fauna, that it has more credibility as the measure of the disaster is not solely “touchy-feely-greenie” evidence?)*
- *...maybe it’s about just supporting the ‘sustainability’ approach – talking about sustainability in terms of economic, enviro and social impacts?*

9. Environmental information in general faces a credibility problem: it has to face so much conflicting information and so much environmental information was presented as alarm in the past decades, and later had to be shaded by the same sources; this leads to attitudes of ‘lets wait and see’ or pure disbelief.

*Implications for Education:*

- *Is environmental information alone in this?! Is the community more likely today to question the validity and source of information than they were decades ago?*
- *Bringing impacts back to local level may help; talking about local problems from their being problems from the local perspective may help...*
- *Agree on local approach, especially when talking of sustainable communities – small projects, local ownership, network of such projects - - bigger things in long run. Capitalising on power of word-of-mouth. Capitalising on local “I don’t want to miss out on what’s going on” mentality.*

10. Environmental information, education and communication are important policy instruments to steer behaviour through persuasion and increased knowledge. These instruments need to be transformed into the right mix of tailored networking interventions per issue towards the main stakeholders. To do so effectively expert advice is needed for both planning and implementation stages.

*Implications for Education:*

- *What is the right mix? Situations are dynamic...therefore the mix changes; is it knowable? Where has it been tested?...*
- *Depends on how you define “expert” advice... “Experts” might be locals with local knowledge...local expertise (after all, local have to live with local solutions!). “Experts” might be consultants. “Experts” might be other organisations. Needs to be situation-specific...although, target audience should always be considered “experts” in some capacity, and involved in development process*

## COLOPHON

**IUCN - The World Conservation Union** was founded in 1948 and brings together 79 states, 112 government agencies, 760 NGOs, 37 affiliates, and some 10,000 scientists and experts from 181 countries in a unique worldwide partnership.

Its mission is to influence, encourage and assist societies throughout the world to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature and to ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable.

Within the framework of global conventions IUCN has helped over 75 countries to prepare and implement national conservation and biodiversity strategies.

IUCN has approximately 1000 staff, most of whom are located in its 42 regional and country offices while 100 work at its Headquarters in Gland, Switzerland. More information: [www.iucn.org](http://www.iucn.org)

**IUCN Commission on Education and Communication - CEC** is one of the six Commissions of IUCN. It contributes its communication expertise to support IUCN's mission.

CEC is a global network of voluntary, active and professional experts in environmental communication and education, who work in NGO, mass media, government, international organizations, academic institutions and the private sector. They have a special interest in applying their knowledge and skills for biodiversity and sustainable development issues.

More information: [www.iucn.org/cec/](http://www.iucn.org/cec/). Contact: [wendy.goldstein@iucn.org](mailto:wendy.goldstein@iucn.org)

### **CEC Product group Corporate Communication**

Is one of the thematic product groups of IUCN Commission on Education and Communication. It consists of a group of CEC members, who are experts in corporate and strategic communication and are working in this field either in government, academia or private sector.

The group aims to advise IUCN on corporate and strategic communication and build capacity in this field within IUCN. Contact: [hesselink@hect.nl](mailto:hesselink@hect.nl)