

# Technical and Evaluation Report

## Building Capacity for Effective Communication for Biodiversity - Phase 3



Project implemented by IUCN Commission on Education and Communication

September 2000- March 2002

Funded by Netherlands Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries and Ministry of Foreign Affairs



NL Relation Number 122309 Obligation Number 3010561  
Pin Matra Project 00-A-2.37 IUCN – 75880-000

# Contents

<b>Project Summary</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Background</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>The project concept – phase 3</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Objectives</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Methodology</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Participants</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Programme Delivery</b>	<b>16</b>
➤ <b>Czech Republic</b>	<b>Yellow</b>
➤ <b>Hungary</b>	<b>Pink</b>
➤ <b>Poland</b>	<b>Green</b>
➤ <b>Slovenia</b>	<b>Blue</b>
➤ <b>Slovak Republic</b>	<b>Grey</b>
➤ <b>International workshop</b>	<b>Brown</b>
<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Conclusions and Recommendations</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Financial Report</b>	<b>46</b>
	<b>Yellow</b>

.

<b>Annex Czech Republic</b>	<b>Pink</b>
<b>Annex Hungary</b>	<b>Green</b>
<b>Annex Poland</b>	<b>Blue</b>
<b>Annex Slovenia</b>	<b>Grey</b>
<b>Annex Slovak Republic</b>	<b>Brown</b>
<b>Annex International Workshop</b>	<b>Yellow</b>
<b>Annex Brochure Mainstreaming Biodiversity</b>	<b>Pink</b>
<b>Annex Evaluation</b>	

# Project Summary

**Project name**

Building Capacity for effective communication for the Pan European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy: Phase 3

**Location**

Poland, Czech Republic, Slovak Republic, Hungary, Slovenia

**Theme**

Environmental communication in support of the PEBLDS Action Theme 3, so as to stimulate and facilitate public support and participation in biodiversity and landscape conservation.

**Target group**

Government staff responsible for the implementation of biodiversity strategies on the national, regional and local level.  
Communication staff in state institutions and NGOs in the field of nature and landscape conservation.

**Project managed by**

IUCN, Education and Communication Program, contact person: Wendy Goldstein, Rue Mauverney Gland CH 1196, fax 41 122 999 0025; tel. 41 22 999 0282, email: wjg@hq.iucn.org  
With SPAN Consultants, the Netherlands

**Duration**

September 2000 – March 2002

**Total project budget**

Dfl. 614,420

**Total expenditure**

**Dfl 599,278.88**



▪

The project sought to integrate interactive communication processes in the way conservation organisation's work while undertaking projects determined by the country. Interactive communication aims to listen to the issues in the society and to plan communication based on those issues so as to motivate and involve stakeholders to become part of the biodiversity problem solving approach and thereby also to become part of the implementation.

This project

## Background

In 1997 IUCN started phase 1 of this planned 4 phase project to develop effective communication capacity in 5 Central European countries.

Phase 1 consisted of a 12 day training course in Debe, Poland, held in June 1998, for representatives of government and NGOs on how to plan communication. During the training course country groups applied their learning to plan a communication activity in their own country. In phase 1 we were able to immediately follow up to mentor on the initial communication plans in two of the countries, Slovenia and Poland.

The experiences from phase 1 suggested the need to consolidate the competence of those who had undertaken the training course, to expand the number trained in communication, and to make communication materials available in local languages. This was undertaken in phase 2.

▪

Reflection was stimulated after each activity so as to learn from what went well and what needed to be improved.

The value of communication was promoted internally by advocacy of the facilitators, through decision makers' participation in workshops and through exposure to the products and publications. Support for communication was built in some agencies but more was needed to consolidate and integrate communication.

Towards the end of the project an international workshop was held to which 2-



## The project concept – phase 3

The phase 3 of the project was based on the indicators for success determined at the close of phase 2 of the project.

These indicators include support for developing individual communication skills, impacting on the organisation's appreciation of and use of communication, and changing institutional practices in regard to stakeholder approaches. The group also sought intercultural exchange.

The indicators for the project are set out below.

### *For individual learning*

- ⇒ Build confidence, credibility and advice through the help desk
- ⇒ Support to analyze, prioritize and plan communication activities
- ⇒ Increase facilitation and communication skills
- ⇒ Encourage a supportive attitude in bosses and colleagues
- ⇒ Increase the critical mass of those who understand and practice interactive policy making
- ⇒ Develop the leadership and core group from the Poland training course 1998 in Debe.

### *At the organisational level*

- ⇒ Build a basically positive attitude towards communication as an instrument
- ⇒ Provide building bricks for cultural change in the organisation associated with more effective communication management
- ⇒ Encourage more attention for internal communication
- ⇒ Financial and moral support of bosses for activities

▪

*At the institutional level*

- ⇒ More attention for exploring win- win approaches between ministries and other actors
- ⇒ Willingness to look with fresh eyes at traditional conservation issues
- ⇒ Acceptance of added value of social and stakeholder approaches
- ⇒ Acceptance of the importance of a communication strategy
- ⇒ Using existing institutions for communication capacity building

*At the international level*

- ⇒ IUCN credible as an initiator of the concepts and project
- ⇒ Technical support to the countries
- ⇒ Opportunities to get mirror from other countries and discover blind spots or new approaches
- ⇒ Inter cultural exchange

## Objectives

The project sought to achieve the following objectives relevant to each country and its institutional capacity to:

1. integrate the stakeholder management approach in ongoing national biodiversity strategies and action plans being developed, such as in Slovenia.
2. to implement communication planning, development and evaluation of communication programmes and materials and to undertake necessary research on the population.
3. to institutionalise capacity building for the stakeholder management approach in their country, through training and by establishing partnerships with existing education and training facilities for conservation managers.
4. share lessons learned in each of the countries in an international event.
5. stimulate further interest in participatory approaches to communication through a high level meeting amongst decision makers.

At the inception of the project IUCN was asked to make these objectives more specific. In each country a project plan was prepared to define the objectives. These were reported to the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries in the inception report and are shown in the Annex.

This report will therefore detail the results from each country against the objectives in the project plans in detailed sub sections of the report.

The objectives per country and sub project are listed over.

## Country Sub-project Objectives

### Hungary Objectives

1. Finalize the communication framework for wetland conservation as follow up to the commitment of Hungary to the Ramsar Wetlands Convention CEPA Outreach Programme 1999-2002.
2. Show how effective communication can increase impact on wetland conservation in an existing Ramsar-site;
3. Strengthen capacity and develop instruments to optimally use communication as an instrument in wetland management and planning.

### Czech Republic Objectives

The overall goal will be to demonstrate the value of communication in helping to solve Natura 2000 and Biodiversity problems and to increase capacity for its further development and use.

#### Objectives

1. To increase the facilitation skills and expertise of the core group within the Czech Republic.
2. To increase the numbers of staff within National Parks, Protected Landscape Areas, Local Authorities and NGOs with communication understanding and practical skills.
3. To build capacity among selected Agency/Institute, PLA, National Park and Local Authority staff in project planning and management.
4. To identify and disseminate lessons learned from Phase 3 of the project.
5. To implement 2 successful communication projects relating to Natura 2000 problems.
6. To give convincing feedback to the Minister of Environment of the value of Communication as a tool to support the Natura 2000 and Biodiversity work of the Ministry of Environment.





# Methodology

The essential elements of the methodology were:

- ❖ The three facilitators from SPAN consultants from phase 2 continued. Frits Hesselink worked with Slovenia and Slovak Republic; Eddie Idle with Poland and Czech Republic; and Rutger Jan Schoen and later Gwen van Boven with Hungary.
- ❖ Initial planning meeting to agree on results to be achieved, activities to be undertaken and methodology.
- ❖ Some of the core group of people from Debe led as the trainers in the country, or project managers. In other cases new operatives were drawn in to manage the project or play a role in the training.
- ❖ A wider circle of contacts has been built in the country to expand the basis for the work, to involve regional institutes of the government.
- ❖ Letters were sent from IUCN Director General to government agencies to initiate the project and invite support.
- ❖ Initiate work on country priorities through mentoring the team to develop a project plan and agree on who does what
- ❖ Preparation before country visits undertaken by email, fax and phone with country participants
- ❖ Mentoring of project management and communication projects by email, fax and phone
- ❖ In-country visits used for preparation of an activity and mentoring of the activity.





## Participants

The project worked with some of the core group of people from Debe, along with people involved in phase 2 as well as with new people in regional agencies.

- ❖ In **Slovenia** the main partners in the project the Director, Albin Krapez of MOP/URSVN, Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning, State Agency for Nature Conservation. Branka Hlad from the Ministry managed the project and worked with staff from a protected area and the regional institute in Pirana.
- ❖ In the **Slovak Republic** Joseph Kamarik, Director of Nature and Landscape Conservation Department and Martin Kassa, Director of State Nature Conservation. The team was led by Ema Gojdicova and Karina Kralikova with support from Martin Sarossy and Daniel Dite.
- ❖ In the **Czech Republic** the project was supported by Dr Milos Kuzvart, Minister of the Environment. The project was managed by the Czech Environment Institute Alena Rietschmiedova and Zdenka Tancosova. Input on the sub projects was from Tomáš Kažmierski and Roman Hamer

▪  
Andras Schmidt; a representative of Birdlife Hungary and Tata  
Town Council

The names of people involved in the project and in the workshops  
undertaken are listed in the *Country Annexes* within the Mission  
Reports.

## Programme Delivery

The results achieved against the objectives of the project are described in the reports on each county project that follow and these support the general project objectives 1-3.

Near the conclusion of the project, an international workshop was held for the main managers of the projects to present their work and share their experience. This workshop was held in Bratislava Slovak Republic November 30 to December 1, 2001. This was in support of the project objective 4.

The project intended to increase institutional recognition of communication. The project interventions to encourage this recognition included letters from IUCN Director General at the inception of the project, and by regular briefings to decision-makers by the consultants. Within each country national workshops were held to present the results of the project and arguments for communication and the stakeholder approach. Efforts were made to engage most decision-makers in those events.

It was proposed that the project would undertake a high level event to promote the communication instrument, project objective 5. This was not implemented as a high level meeting for decision - makers from the 5 countries as originally conceived. The resources from the project allocated for this operation were put towards making a promotional event for the Conference of the Parties on the role of the communication instrument in mainstreaming biodiversity. The tools produced for this event are being used in the countries.

## Evaluation

Within each country project, the facilitator has undertaken an evaluation with the participants of each activity. This has been an important learning tool for the project. Emphasis has been put on learning from mistakes, as these can be more memorable than analyzing the factors for success. The facilitators would suggest ideas and approaches and question the thinking behind the proposed course of intervention, but would allow for errors to occur. So the intent was never the perfect communication plan, but learn

▪

Participants were asked to rank their responses on a scale of 1-7, where 1 is nothing and 7 is a lot. This is shown in the horizontal axis. Measures from 4-7 show a reasonably good to high level of positive response. On the vertical scale the number of responses is shown.

## **KNOWLEDGE**

### **1. "What changes have there been in your knowledge?"**

The changes in knowledge were assessed in relation to six areas of communication

*Chart 1: Knowledge about being an effective communicator and planning a communication activity*

Most participants reported very strong results in knowledge, the range 5-7, about planning a communication activity.

There was a more mixed reaction to changes in knowledge about being an effective communicator themselves. Some (4) of the participants stated that their change in knowledge was less than the mid range, whereas 10 were in a range of more positive gains from 4-7.

*Chart 2: Knowledge about how to evaluate their communication and how to influence the boss*

Participants report positive gains in knowledge about how to evaluate their communication work with most in the range of 4-7. A wider disparity in changes in knowledge is reported about how to influence the boss. Four participants stated that there was nothing or only a little learnt, though most reported gaining knowledge up to a ranking of 6.

*Chart 3: Knowledge about managing a project and undertaking a training activity*

In general the participants have gained knowledge about how to manage a communication project at a very positive level. Similarly the participants have good gains in knowledge about how to undertake a training activity.

▪

## **SKILLS**





## ATTITUDES

### 3. To what extent have your attitudes changed?

The project has had a positive impact on attitudes in the 4 areas assessed.

*Chart 1 To what extent have your attitudes changed in regard to your confidence and credibility and in evaluating and learning from your work*

Most report a change of attitude in both areas, with results most strongly in the range of 4-6 expressing a growth in confidence and credibility. Two reported a score of 7 in regard to change in attitude on evaluating and learning from their work.

*Chart 2: To what extent have your attitudes changed in regard to arguing for communication in the work place and managing communication projects*

All have changed attitudes in regard to arguing for communication in the work place, with highest scores in the range of 5 –7.

With regard to attitudes to managing communication projects, most responses are in the range 5-6.

The changes in attitude augur positively for a good measure of success in building institutional support for communication as aimed for by objectives 1-3 of the project.

## INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE

### **3. What changes have occurred in your work place as a result of your involvement in this project?**

This question assessed the changes in the organization as a result of the project. The results here might be expected to be mixed as the participants came from many different organizations. The focus of the external consultants was usually on the principal or government institution, and to a lesser extent on regional institutes or park agencies.

*Chart 1: What changes have occurred in your work place in regard to cultural change in the organization, increase in projects submitted for funding, and resources available for communication*

There is a broad range of impacts reported from the project on the culture of the organization, ranging from none to 6. A similar broad range of responses occurs for the increase in projects submitted for funding, and in the resources available. However for these 2 areas, a higher number 6-9 report that there has been a good impact to very good impact on the financial resources available for communication and in the projects submitted for funding.

*Chart 2: What changes have occurred in your work place in regard to more attention for internal communication, and recognition of your work by colleagues*

All participants report an impact on the work place in regard to more attention to internal communication and recognition of the work by colleagues. Most responses lie in the range from 3- 6.



## PERFORMANCE

5 As a result of what you have learnt what concrete steps have you taken in your work, or on how you perform in your work?

These questions were trying to find out whether the participants had indeed taken their own learning in knowledge skills and attitude into action in the work place, i.e. what was the level of application or performance.

*Chart 1: The concrete steps taken at work to use existing institutions for communication capacity building and increasing critical mass of communicators*

Most respondents affirm that existing institutions are being used to build capacity in communication in the country, with a high peak of 9 respondents at the high level of 5. This reflects the use of regional institutes being involved in the project. These institutes have also gained experience in managing projects. It does not necessarily imply that the project has been successful in integrating communication training in

▪

▪

*Chart 5 The concrete steps taken at work to accept the better analyze and prioritize communication and manage a project.*

The results in both these areas are very positive. Most responses are ranked between 5-7. The project has contributed to applying project management principles and skills and analyzing and prioritizing communication in their work.

*Chart 6 The concrete steps taken at work in working with stakeholders and to prepare a project.*

Again very positive results are evident with most participants stating that they are using at a high level their know how to prepare projects. To a lesser degree the participants credit the project with enabling them to apply their work to working with stakeholders.

Chart 7 *The concrete steps taken at work to prepare presentations and negotiate with others.*

In preparing presentations participants report a very high level of application of the learning from the project. All report learning in the range of 4-7.

Participants state that the learning from the project is being applied in negotiating with others at a good to high level. All but 2 ranked above 4 their application of negotiating with others.

Chart 8- *The concrete steps taken at work to apply planning to all projects and apply effective training methods*

While 10 state that they apply planning to all projects to a high degree – at a ranking of 5-7, four state that they apply their learning to their performance in the range of 1-3. While nine participants apply effective training methods In their work, five state more weak application of training methods.

This result affirms the project's relative success in institutionalizing capacity building for communication.

▪

*Chart 9 The concrete steps taken at work to contribute to communication planning in the organization and apply planning approach to communication*

Nine participants report a range of 5-6 level, applying a planning approach to communication. Nine participants report contributing at a strong level of 5-6 to the communication planning in their organization.



General comments

*Chart 1: Opportunities to reflect on your work from other countries and inter cultural exchange*

Most participants valued the opportunities to reflect on their work with that from other countries and benefited from the inter cultural exchange.

*Chart 2 Effectiveness of advice from the help desk and effectiveness of advice in face to face with the facilitator*

Participants report that the face to face exchange with the facilitator of the project is very effective. All participants gave this a ranking of 6-7.

In contrast the help desk had more of a range of ranking for effectiveness with two participants stating that it was not effective at all. This result may have been influenced by the fact that not all workshop attendees were key organizers of the project and in regular contact with the external consultant.

## Overall Evaluation of the Project

### Concept of the project & feasibility of the activities

Due to a long delay between Phase II, which ended in December 1999 and the start up of phase-3 in September 2000, an extra round of in-country consultation was undertaken in all countries to adapt the project to the changed circumstances. These 5 inception missions assisted the country team to determine priorities, expand the base of core-team members and to prepare project documents as a basis of activities for all countries. This served to respond to the request from the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries to provide "more specific information about the stakeholder groups finally targeted through the sub projects and about the national organisations that are involved in implementation".

All countries supported the project at a high level in the government. At the outset a letter was sent from the IUCN Director General to the Minister, Deputy Minister or Agency Head. The project consultants also briefed key decision-makers on the project and regularly reported to them on the project's progress.

Countries were prepared to identify biodiversity projects where communication support could add value to the work proposed. This flexible and country driven process meant that the activities were specific to the countries' current agenda like contributing to preparing for *Natura 2000*, a Ramsar – wetlands Convention - communication strategy, or improving relations with people in protected areas. For success it was important that these activities were not additional activities given the already taxed capacity in the government agencies.

The inception report presented the project documents for the five sub projects and described the common elements in the approach in each country and any major deviations to the project proposal as well as a justification for them. In addition to supporting communication, the project was asked to provide capacity building in project management.

In *Hungary* the project activities were oriented to wetland conservation, rather than to the Biodiversity Conservation Strategy in general. The project supported the national Ramsar Strategy, and specifically the execution of the Ramsar Convention requirement that every Ramsar member will have a communication strategy and the capacity to manage its

implementation. One Ramsar site was used for practical learning by doing experience in communication.

In **Slovenia** the activities provided training and coaching for the Ministry and regional institutes of the Nature Conservation Agency on project and communication management and in stakeholder management. Two pilot communication projects were developed one on pond conservation and the other for a landscape park.

In **Slovakia** the activities included informing on the nature conservation impacts of accession. Project management and communication skills were developed for two projects, one on an endangered orchid and the other and endangered bird, the Corn Crex. The national team was supported to implement the projects using stakeholder negotiations, public awareness activities and the production of materials. An evaluation workshop to share the lessons learned was held for government agency staff.

In **Poland** the activities focused on developing and implementing a communication plan for an area, the Narev River, where an invasion of willow scrub threatens the grassland landscape and habitat for rare birds (White Stork, Corn Crake, Aquatic Warbler) and amphibian species (Tree Frog). A workshop was held to develop the communication plan and to up grade the skills of the facilitators and another workshop to evaluate the results. A workshop was held for the staff in the Ministry of Environment on the strategic importance of communication and planning.

In the **Czech Republic** the project planning meeting was also used to train facilitators to manage communication planning. Then 2 workshops were held to develop a communication plan for two sub project issues relating to *Natura 2000* and Biodiversity. One of the issues chosen was the public perception of forest management within a new National Park of Ceske Svycarsko, likely to be included on the *Natura 2000* list. To conform to the Habitats Directive, aggressive introduced tree species will have to be removed from the site. As this removal was unpopular, the project worked on the communication to deal with those perceptions. The second issue concerned problems of local opposition to the establishment of a Strict Reserve Zone of Sumava National Park and the restoration of a mined peat bog.

The provision of a budget line to provide small funds to each country meant that the national projects defined in the planning workshops had some means of financial support to assist in their delivery. For most

countries this proved very important. In Poland the amount was not so appealing to the government, as this project could provide far less than is available from other projects currently being implemented.

The sub projects undertaken in the countries were usually undertaken out of the "centre", so bringing the experience and influence of them back to the centre was worked at by holding national workshops at the centre for decision makers. In two countries the sub projects were undertaken at the central government office. In addition regular contact was undertaken with decision-makers in the government to raise interest and build support for the activities with bosses and colleagues.

Participation in the project aimed to improve efficiency and effectiveness though it did make some extra demands to undertake these actions in a more planned and evaluated manner. Participants gave time to attend a project planning workshop, and the international workshop. At the country level there was good commitment & team spirit with many giving additional hours of personal time to make the activities work.

The country co-ordinators for the project had additional tasks imposed on them, which in some cases created pressure and the need to give personal time. A co-ordinator for the project was willing to take on the task in each country, though sometimes funding to support that function was required. In four countries the project co-ordinator has been consistent with the previous phase of the project. The task was managed well, especially as the project plans for each country made clear the tasks, responsibilities and timetable.

Continuous encouragement and checking by way of the help desk served to keep the projects at national level on schedule, and reinforce the planning and management steps required. The visits by the consultants kept the pressure on the process.

The use of local consultants increased professional input and guidance in the period between visits of the external consultants. Fundamental to smooth implementation was having the external and internal consultants agree on the approach to communication.

The professional input from the SPAN / IUCN consultants was highly regarded and the face to face consultations highly rated by the country participants.

▪

The project attracted new partners into the national sub project activities, including members from the community, local councils, NGOs and diversified the interactions of the teams. Integration of these stakeholders in planning the sub projects gave practical experience of how to work with people with different perceptions and approaches. It also resulted in a lot of lessons pertaining to what is realistic and feasible in the sub projects in view of the funding and time available. There was a tendency for the sub projects to be too ambitious.

Country project management by the consultants meant that the project stayed within time, quality and money budgets. SPAN undertook overall management of the financial allocations for the country projects.

The evaluation process through out the project – after each activity - and enumeration of lessons learned by the national teams built a good learning process into the project

The facilitators served as a conduit of information about what was happening in other countries and maintained a competitive spirit amongst the country counterparts. However the exchange and interaction between the project participants could be increased throughout the project by email news and web site postings.

The idea to build the communication training into existing institutions – particularly government training institutions - in some countries was not feasible, as countries like the Czech Republic do not have such training programmes. However, the project built capacity of government institutes that provide services to government agencies and to regional institutes and agencies of the government. The Polish REC, a beneficiary of the project, is now undertaking training programmes in communication.

The international workshop that brings together key people from each country provided a valuable opportunity to exchange practical experiences and for opportunities to explore issues amongst the group.

The high level meeting for state secretary or deputy Minister for the five countries did not prove to be feasible as a means to advocate for communication. Instead the project developed some advocacy tools for decision-makers. These tools have the advantage of having a broader application than to just the 5 countries. The tools were used to support advocacy for communication at the Conference of the Parties for the Convention on Biological Diversity.

▪

Continuity with the next phase of the project has been superior than in the past when long delays were experienced between phases leading to a loss of momentum.

### **Evaluation of the content of the project's input**

in a protected area, people engaged in action to restore a peat bog or maintain the cultural and biological diversity of a landscape in Poland.

#### *Content of the project at the individual skills level*

The project aimed to increase the confidence and credibility of those participating in communication and project management. Those who have been associated with all phases of the project have benefited most.

As shown in the charts, the participants report good to strong learning in knowledge, skills and attitudes in project management, communication planning and working with stakeholders. They are able to better analyse the communication problem in an issue, prioritise activities and plan their work. Participants have improved skills to facilitate interactive workshops and to make effective presentations. As yet skills to implement communication are still weaker than the ability to plan communication, talk about it and to train others. Bosses and colleagues have been supportive and the acknowledgement of communication and the skills of the participants is acknowledged and used. In Slovenia, there is an increase in the critical mass of people involved in interactive policy making in the government agency.

Project activities were developed based on suggestions made by teams in the countries involved. The process of planning and implementing these projects strengthened understanding of project management. One factor that had to be worked against with the teams was to lower ambition and to be realistic with time, money and quality.

#### *Content of the project at the organizational level*

The project aimed to build a basically positive attitude towards communication as an instrument in the 5 governments in the project. This appreciation aimed to provide building bricks for cultural change in the organization. The project also aimed to draw more attention to internal communication and increase the financial and moral support of bosses for activities.

The project inputs included workshops for target groups crucial in the national biodiversity conservation system. National & regional training was provided for different groups in the planning and use of communication

communication strategy that was developed with stakeholders in Hungary. Practice and experience in using appropriate tools for communication were included such as using surveys and focus groups.

Throughout the project good contact was made with decision-makers in the government centrally and regionally.

However the real uptake and integration of the project in the work of the central government of Poland and Czech Republics was more difficult than in other countries. Government staff from these two countries participated in a workshop on communication and even the Czech Minister of Environment attended. However the use of the government institute in the Czech Republic and the REC in Poland as managers of the project tended to push the issue outside of the daily business of the government, even though the projects focused on Natura 2000 proposals that the government was working on.

In contrast the central government agency in Slovenia recognised the added value of communication and the project assisted stakeholder management and communication to be well integrated into the National Biodiversity Strategy preparation. The learning by doing projects were based in regional institutes. Altogether there was a strengthening of skills at both levels, regional and central.

Similarly in Hungary the management of the project was taken on by the central government agency and added value to the ongoing work to create



▪

This issue led the project team to consider using the skills of the team in different ways in future. The conservation expert in the team could be used in all five countries in future to comment on the substantive conservation aspects, while the other members of the team undertook the communication planning component.



▪

The ten-minute video produced was shown to the plenary of the COP, with over one thousand viewers. The video presents the importance of communication to implementing the Convention and emphasises that the issues for biodiversity are 80% communication and not just technical issues. Spokespersons in the video are the President of the COP (Mme

assessed the presentations. An incentive was provided. An offer of taking the best presentation to the Global Biodiversity Forum workshop in the Hague April 2002. One of the projects was presented in the Hague, providing that participant with international exposure.

In each country the workshops were mostly undertaken in the country language. This was important and very effective and proved not to be a major problem to the external facilitator, who was regularly briefed on the progress.

### ***Contributions from the international level***

IUCN is viewed as a credible organization for biodiversity related projects in the region and a provider of competent technical support. The letters from the IUCN Director General at the inception of the project contributed to setting the stage for the importance of communication and creating the organisational relations in the project.

The international workshop provided an opportunity to exchange experience and to have a mirror held up to their work. The workshop allowed for the exchange of materials and presentations by the participants and a comparison of ways of working, questioning the approaches and recognition of common strengths and weaknesses.

IUCN has spread examples of the work in articles and presentations internationally. For example the work in Slovenia protected areas was presented as case material in an international IUCN protected areas meeting in Italy in 2001. The Hungarian case was reported in the brochure "*Mainstreaming Biodiversity*". The Slovenian ponds story was presented at the Global Biodiversity Forum 2002 and will be reported in the report of that workshop. The last case was also featured on the IUCN web site.

The work to promote communication at the international level in lieu of a summit in the 5 countries is reported on earlier.

▪

### *Logistics and organization of the project*

Despite changes of personnel involved in the project in Poland, there were

## Conclusions and Recommendations

The quality of input from the SPAN external consultants was high. All are very experienced in the field of communication and their standing and professionalism enabled them to be credible ambassadors for communication with decision-makers. A high return was received on the investment in terms of products and learning.

Efforts by the external consultants and IUCN to contact decision-makers through out this project were important for support for the project and also to bringing decision-makers along on the importance of

very es aivities,m Slviion afacilities,msie timg on icaff5 TD -9i-n4h ded 8 rCsiom.5 752j 4

▪

The project is adding value to the quality of work undertaken by those involved and to some extent their institutions. There is no doubt it is important to continue this project to build on what has begun. The participants have become good at talking about communication, training others, and more effective as project developers and managers. There is still more to be achieved to institutionalize communication as a tool of management and policy. However full-fledged institutionalisation of the communication function in government institutions is a major long-term undertaki

▪

the governments in their work on biodiversity action plan implementation and to further encourage government agencies to incorporate communication in their work.



## 10. Financial Report

The financial report shows an expenditure of DFL 599,278.88 from the budget of DFL 614,420. Deloitte and Touche, who checked that expenditures claimed matched products, audited the financial reports.

The following statements provide:

1. Auditor's report
2. IUCN Financial Report

Separate files of all expenditures for SPAN Consultants including, country operational costs are included as part of the financial reporting.

In the financial report there are two budget lines that require an explanation.

### *Operational and local consultants*

In the final financial reports from SPAN the costs associated with the operational budget line 500 for local project support and the budget line

▪

*High level summit*

The funds from the operational budget line (500) DFL 10,000 to hold this summit was used to provide for staff costs associated with developing the messages to communicate the value of communication to decision makers. The products that resulted are the text for the brochure "*Mainstreaming Biodiversity*" ( see Annex) made available at the Conference of the Parties in the Hague and the script for the video with a similar message.