

Identifying knowledge gaps of Civil Society Organisations and needs for new insights in SCP

Survey report

Action Town (CSOContribution2SCP) is kindly financed under the Seventh Framework Programme of the European Commission.



Content

Content	2
1. Introduction	3
2. Current CSO strategies	5
3. The use of policy instruments, assessment tools and indicators by CSOs	15
4. What challenges are NGOs facing? Where are the gaps?	21
5. Conclusions and Outlook	26
Acknowledgements	28
ANNEX 1: Action Town Survey Questionnaire	29

1 • Introduction

Background

Climate change, insecurity of food supply, resource scarcity, inequality and poverty are some of the global challenges we face today. Urgent and ambitious changes are needed to address these challenges. All sectors of society need to contribute and collaborate in order to develop and implement solutions that effectively address the scale of the sustainability challenge humanity is facing. It requires actions by governments, business and civil society.

While policies for more efficient resource use and carbon reductions are on the agenda of most EU governments, they are very often piecemeal actions leading to relative improvements without effectively achieving the necessary absolute reductions in resource consumption and waste production. Most of existing policies are trying to tackle the challenge through a focus on technology and efficiency improvements without achieving the intended successes. As a consequence more comprehensive systemic approaches are urgently needed. Sustainable consumption and production (SCP) is a concept that looks at systems of production and consumption as a whole and for ways how these systems can

change to ultimately achieve the absolute impact reduction required. This includes the critical review of current lifestyles and the exploration of alternative ways of consumption. At the European level the promotion of SCP is rising in importance in the policy and the research arena as an overarching approach to deal with these challenges.

In order to reach the goal of shifting towards sustainable consumption patterns without reducing 'quality of life', Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) have the unique role to challenge governments, business and society and help to channel their actions towards more transformational changes. While much good work has been done in the past by CSOs in this area, the "Action Town – Research and Action for SCP" project¹ is assuming that there is a huge potential for CSOs to become more effective in their actions towards SCP. Action Town intends to contribute to this agenda.

According to many studies, the demand areas of food, housing and mobility are responsible for 60 to 70 % of the global environmental impact. It is therefore imperative to develop effective SCP strategies for these areas.^{2,3}



¹ Action Town is a project kindly funded by the European Commission under its Seventh Research Framework Programme. Its official name is CSOContribution2SCP. See next page for more information.

² EIPRO-Study (2006): Environment Impact of Products Analysis of the life cycle environmental impacts related to the final consumption of the EU-25. Main report IPTS/ESTO project.

³ NAMEA-Study (2006): Environmental Input-Output Analyses based on NAMEA data — A comparative European study on environmental pressures arising from consumption and production patterns. Moll, S.; Vrgoc, M.; Watson, D.; Femia, A.; Gravgård, Pedersen, O.

³ Draft; European Topic Centre for Resource and Waste Management, European Environment Agency, Copenhagen.

About the Action Town Project

“Action Town – Research and Action for SCP” is coordinated by UNEP/Wuppertal Institute Collaborating Centre on Sustainable Consumption and Production (CSCP). The project partners are the Sustainable Europe Research Institute (SERI), Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI), Northern Alliance for Sustainability (ANPED) and WWF-UK. It is funded by the European Commission under its Seventh Research Framework Programme.

The project focuses on knowledge exchange between civil society organisations and researchers and the establishment of partnerships between both groups to help CSOs to develop more effective strategies and develop more effective actions towards SCP.

The Purpose of this Survey

The survey is part of the first phase of Action Town. The aim of this phase is to identify gaps in the way CSOs work towards sustainable consumption and production (SCP) in three key focus areas: policy instruments, assessment tools and indicators. In parallel, Action Town partners carried out a review of state of the art research in these areas. The survey aims to provide additional insights with respect to how these instruments have been used in the past and how effectively they are contributing to the overall SCP goals. In addition the survey aims to get an overview of effective and less effective SCP strategies used by CSOs and to identify other gaps in capacity and knowledge CSOs might have in this field.

In the “Engagement and Dialogue” phase, Action Town lays the foundations by initiating several partnerships between CSOs and research organisations in three areas (exploratory actions on policy instruments, assessment tools and indicators). In addition, the project has recently started an initiative for a road map with the aim to develop a concept to bring the collaboration between Science and Civil Society to the next level and suggest a way forward for after the end of Action

Town Project. ‘Action Town’ has a wider scope on CSO actions, whereas the work stream of “Building a roadmap” focuses on activities of environmental NGOs’. All these ongoing and subsequent work packages of Action Town have been considered in this survey and questions have been developed in the most cohesive way in order to support the wider Action Town work.

Objectives

The objectives of the survey were therefore to find out from interviewees their views on the following key questions:

- Understand what actions, strategies and tactics CSOs are currently using for their SCP goals.
- Identify strengths and weaknesses of strategies that are applied for different objectives and in different contexts.
- Are the goals NGOs / CSOs are setting actually the adequate ones for the current environmental threats and are the strategies they are applying then adequate to achieve these goals.
- Identify gaps in how CSOs are working and how they can provide new insights or research, with regard to the use of public policy instruments, assessment tools and indicators for SCP and the broader strategies these technical elements are used for (with the ultimate aim to move European societies to sustainable consumption and production).

The Methodology

The survey was conducted by means of in-depth interviews (mostly over the phone) of a selected group of representatives from CSOs and research organisations. Confidentiality of names and organisations was promised to interviewees.

22 interviews were conducted and transcriptions of the interviews realised. Of these, 18 were from NGOs / CSOs of various types and sizes from 12 different European countries. Four interviews were held with representatives from international agencies and research and support bodies all working with a strong focus on SCP issues. Research bodies were included in the survey with the aim to provide a complementary and different perspective to the views held by CSOs.

2 • Current CSO strategies and tactics used towards SCP

Any review of CSO activity needs to be done in the light of a range of relationships and also of gaps and tensions. This review needs to reflect the range of activities and how they vary in terms of the differences between

- Large and funded groups and those that are small and with very few funds
- Those focusing on strategic / policy work and those doing purely project based work
- Those well linked into other sectors (including academics, private and public sectors) and those with few external links.
- Those where national government supports NGO work and those where there is little such support.

In all this there are questions as to what are the roles of CSOs / NGOs in this particular context, what is driving them and where do they have significant influence.

Some initial points that emerge from the survey suggest that many organisations lack a good understanding of the social and economic issues that affect their environmental work, that few are actually assessing their impacts and effectiveness

An overview of the Survey

A range of seven common strategies for delivering change was provided to interviewees. All of these were used in the respondents' work to varying extents. This overview summarises their responses; more detailed assessment is in the next section.

A1.1 Consumer focussed campaigning

Fourteen out of the 18 NGOs said they did this in some way. These range from those, notably in Scandinavia, with well developed and rooted 'green consumer' activity such as Action Weeks and specific initiatives to more local work and work targeted at very specific groups.

A1.2 Lobby government

Fifteen said that they were involved in lobbying work in some way. Some of this was standard NGO policy lobbying; it also included work at European and local levels, and two, including a UK CSO working on green construction, had very clear but narrower targets relating to particular industries

A1.3 Convene multi-stakeholder processes

Only 6 of those interviewed said that they directly convened multi-stakeholder work, while two more took part often. A few others had some limited experience of such work

A1.4 Build alliances

This work was for many alongside multi-stakeholder work. Only 4 talked about using this as a common technique, while 2 others had done this on some limited issue. Others had joined alliances. The most obvious use of these was on larger issues that cut across the work on NGOs and groups in different sectors. Thus climate change seems to be a common area where there are alliances, as do food and fair trade issues.

A1.5 Engage in business partnerships

There was only limited work here. Two organisations had a very specific remit to do this and for them it was almost a prime purpose. Others saw this really as working with business sponsors and one larger NGO network stressed that they never took money from business. There appeared to be significant uncertainty about the best ways to go forward on this.

A1.6 Develop and publish challenging evidence

Ten of those 18 surveyed (and all the other 4) saw this as an important role. Some of those that did not respond much here did appear to be doing this as part of their other work but perhaps did not see this as a distinct focus. Most of the NGOs with a string campaigning focus saw this as important.

A1.7 Engage with communities

Only six of those surveyed saw this as something they do (some added that other CSOs within their networks working locally led on this). This limited number might be due partly to the fact that more locally focused CSOs might not see the value of completing a survey like this.

Other Issues:

Most of those surveyed considered that what they did fits broadly into the categories used. One interviewee suggested that much NGO work was 'reactive' and was not well covered here. A UK NGO surveyed suggested that more work is needed in this field to focus on values and identity as reasons / issues around how people make consumption decisions. Others mentioned Socially Responsible Investment, research work (on SCP), training and a focus on buildings.

The Specific Issues

1. Consumer campaigns

As per the summary this is a broad area where there is plenty of activity. This work varies from large-scale national initiatives (Austria, Scandinavia) to rather more small-scale and local projects. Issues emerging for further discussion include:

- The need for better dissemination of examples of good practice, with the idea that 'People believe what they can see', and that it is easier to change people's behaviour 'if they have a model they can follow'. One Austrian NGO saw this work as having the scope to help develop prototype sustainable lifestyles.
- The need to 'mainstream' this work: this involves work not just with policy makers but also with increasing engagement with people and communities. Two surveys suggest that it is important that people see that they are not alone "swimming against the stream". Increasing engagement also allows for more group work and peer-to-peer learning.
- The need for clarity on effectiveness. Several surveys suggest that consumer focussed campaigns are of only limited effectiveness for mainstreaming change. One larger network said that their experience was that 'Ecological Footprint' work was not useful in directly creating behaviour change. However, it was successful as an information tool to create awareness on resource use and to encourage action.
- Large consumer campaigns can be very expensive (especially in the context of projects run by smaller NGOs) and often the impact on consumers is very low.
- One survey suggested (and hinted at elsewhere) that consumer campaigns often preach to the converted but do not induce change on a significant scale.
- Even if consumer campaigns are only of limited effectiveness, they may have other indirect purposes (in support of media and political campaigns).

The bottom line, as suggested by an Austrian NGO, is the need to understand why people do not change despite seeing clear evidence that we are in a completely unsustainable situation.

2. Lobbying

Many of those involved saw the need for policy change as critical. Some stressed this – others showed it in their work.

For many the aim is to develop binding legislation, using traditional lobbying procedures. Eight groups seemed to be doing / have done these. However, it appears to be less of an issue for the more progressive organisations who are either looking for new ways to develop pressure or recognise that the core SCP issues are at a stage where direct discussion with a few key people may be more useful.

Other issues around lobbying that also affect its use seem to be:

- The skills and capacity of CSOs.
- The political structure within which they work.
- The potential to lobby other agencies including intergovernmental organisations and business as key drivers for change.

One respondent from the UK promoted 'a different approach to lobbying' suggesting a difference between 'material' policy and 'cognitive' policy – the former being about taxes, regulation etc. and the latter being about the message such direct measures send to a wider audience.

Another issue to emerge is the difference between lobbying business and government. The former is emerging more as an issue. But one respondent was concerned that this was simply about 'power lobbying' and campaigning rather than about engagement. But clearly business was perceived by some as a key audience to achieve change. Two of those surveyed (UK and Turkey NGOs) are working to lobby business.

One Austrian respondent suggested mass lobbying had had its day and that lobbying needs to be about getting direct access to government to identify the relevant people.

There are further problems and issues with the increasing role of European policy. This can be hard to influence. One European network pointed out that environmental ministers are influenced by the public debate in their home countries; so 27 national campaigns would be needed.

The shift from campaign was highlighted by a national Non-NGO agency, which suggested that lobbying should increasingly be much more directed towards defining a joint agenda and implementing it. Some NGOs might go with this but there are plenty who would still be careful about getting this close.

3. Cooperation, alliances and multi-stakeholder processes

Build alliances is seen as very important by some. At the most basic level this is about getting support. Two NGOs suggest that networking to bring in allies is essential for successful lobbying. A German agency suggested that 'the more complementary the organisations, the more sense it makes to build alliances'. But a German NGO pointed out that the main difficulty here is often the lack of consensus between NGOs (whether in specific or general strategies or on content). There is also concern elsewhere that with a broader consensus it becomes more difficult for organisations to change their views.

Beyond the more policy-focused NGOs there is rather more co-operation. This may include work with business (see below) but also work on larger events such as 'Green Weeks' where a range of partners is necessary to build engagement, get publicity and ensure success.

One respondent highlighted the issue that CSOs have to be careful not to spend too many resources on participation in multi-stakeholder processes: these are very time consuming and usually not very effective. They also pointed out that due to lack of time and resources SMEs have a limited scope for this kind of joint work; it is usually transnational companies which engage in partnerships and CSOs have therefore no control over implementation of any agreements that emerge.

One UK respondent saw this in a different way, and talked of CSO coalitions based around interventions, which all these organisations recognise as having an important impact on societal values. This idea of 'identity campaigning' offers a new approach to coalitions, which is rather different to issue focussed approaches.

4. CSOs and business

The traditional tactic in this context is to "drive" companies by naming and shaming, notably by focusing on those lagging behind on benchmarks or regulation. Even those working closely with business (such as one in the UK) recognised the role of such work, although they focus more on work with business leaders to show the benefits that can come from a more positive and pro-active approach. This approach does require some understanding of the motivations of those businesses and their readiness to engage. This is perhaps easier for newer organisations than for long-standing campaigning NGOs.

Newer instruments are emerging around CSR and socially responsible investing but there was only limited evidence from the survey of work on this.

5. Evidence-based working

A majority of those surveyed understand gathering of evidence to support their work as an important part of what they do. Within that there appear to be three areas for attention:

- The need to develop and publish challenging evidence (this will usually need cooperation with significant academic / research agencies - see 7 below).
- Work to identify good practice and successful alliances/partnerships is also needed.
- More clear evidence would be valuable of where change has happened and what has caused that change.

One international agency stressed the need for CSOs to have good access to research and evidence. They suggest that further work is needed to transform available research on high impact areas into consumer information and guidance thereby helping identify concrete actions for reducing environmental impacts.

There is also value in academic assessment of NGO and CSO working and development. As new movements and organisations arise and grow so it is valuable to have some clear assessment.

6. Engagement with communities

While only a limited number of those surveyed saw engagement with communities as important, it is clearly very important in certain circumstances, notably those where it is important to have public involvement and for that to be visible. This is certainly the case in the various 'Green Weeks' and similar events. The question as to how far CSOs and NGOs engage with communities rather than individuals is not clearly answered. In two cases it does seem that getting to communities is simply a way of getting to more consumers. Others, notably those specialising in this work, could see the value of developing string local collective action. This is not often a priority for the types of NGOs in this survey so any consideration of this work in more detail would need to look elsewhere and at other research as well.

7. Linking CSOs and academia

One area on which a number of surveys commented was the need for better links with academics. Some of the points that emerged from individual surveys:

- Research can help to build awareness and understanding of the way in which policy interventions have an impact on people's values.
- Action research could help CSOs to improve their effectiveness rather than just measure their effectiveness. This can also point out gaps in the strategies CSOs are using and suggest improvements to detecting ineffective strategies.
- There is a lack of clear academic research on the role of CSOs on sustainable consumption. This is an area where more work is needed and it requires good cooperation.
- CSOs do monitoring, evaluation and often their own research: it would be very valuable to get support from research bodies on this. This should come in at the design phase, so that CSOs can set realistic goals that can be measured afterwards. This would help in behaviour change work: CSOs would be able to measure not only how many people have received a certain message but also what impact this had.
- More research might help to identify good practice and successful alliances/partnerships is urgently needed.
- Research on the social aspects of SCP could help identify obstacles and new ways forward.
- CSOs have not usually lobbied on new research priorities.
- There is scope for cooperation with other research organisations such as trade union research institutes.

There are some underlying problems. One person suggested that there is a need for the 'translation' of academic theories, to apply them on the ground and find out "how to make it happen better." Others suggest that research organisations are sometimes working on very theoretical issues that do not link to action on the ground or help decision makers.

Some Projects

A range of projects were presented by those surveyed. Eight wrote up one or two projects in varying degrees of detail; seven more referred to projects in their general responses, while the remainder tended to focus on policy issues and their own viewpoints. The survey asked them what they had done, the techniques used, the partners, how work was evaluated and the key lessons learnt. The projects show the range of approaches as set out above. Some were clearly focused on consumer campaigns.

The 'Fin Mips Household Project'

The 'Fin Mips Household Project' run by the Finnish Association for Nature Conservation (FANC) is one good example.

The FIN-MIPS Household Project set out to calculate Finnish household resource use, to recommend ways to reduce it, to disseminate results and thus to encourage behaviour change. This started with detailed research work, which led to a launch and a seminar, and then the dissemination of results and promotion during a campaign week.

The project was very successful with high levels of public interest in the actions and the website. As the first such major initiative in Finland it exceeded expectations and was covered in the national press.

Part of the success came from the tradition of running a sustainable consumption campaign week, humorously called as the 'Stinginess Week', for about

20 years. The campaign week is run with the support of other major NGOs and has led to further partnership working.

Further, FIN-MIPS Household Project has also led to a 'Climate on the Plate' project on food and climate. The Climate on the Plate tackled issues such as the climate benefits of eating more vegetables instead of meat and dairy products, organic food, and food waste and the message was promoted through an attachment to the monthly magazine 'Voima' (50,000 copies) and to the bi-monthly magazine of FANC (more than 30,000 copies).

Evaluation was based primarily on consumer engagement, which was recorded and measured in various ways. The major problem for taking this work forward is lack of resources. FANC's Working Group on SCP runs on a voluntary basis.

Another consumer-focused approach,

The “Consuming sustainably with clean€uro”

Another consumer-focused approach, aimed more at those already interested in sustainability came in the “Consuming sustainably with clean€uro” run by SOL – People for Solidarity, Ecology and Lifestyle, an Austrian NGO.

This project looks to promote behaviour change for less consumption and more sustainable products. It has developed a system of guidelines to make sustainable consumption easier and has worked to communicate this work to consumers. The materials have been used to focus on special target groups such as youth, trade union, religious communities, and Local Agenda 21 networks.

Much of the focus is on workshops. People taking part acquainted with the clean€uro programme and ‘should become more sensitive towards SC and alternatives to consumption in general’.

Evaluation has been done, focusing on the number of people involved, and their feedback after the workshops. 568 people have attended these workshops so far. Many of them have ‘turned into mul-

tipliers within their circles of friends’, and passed the ideas on.

Alongside this work SOL run a series of Round Table discussions aimed at encouraging ‘Behaviour change for better living that has little negative effect on people living in the South, the environment and future generations’. As part of this work they encourage community-building actions like hiking or biking together. One of the intended outcomes is “having a great time together and learning from each other”.

While there is no detailed evaluation they are clear that it is easier to change people’s behaviour if they have a model they can follow so they seek to ‘prototype’ sustainable lifestyles. Their aim is to ‘convince people to agree with our proposals how to live sustainable and try it on their own’. People who join are put in touch with others. They invite them to a ‘Heart & SO(u)L-Birthday-Party’ and seek to inspire them to set up new round tables.

Most projects combined one or more approaches.

The “Piensaenclima”

Work that linked research, links with the private sector and consumer campaigning comes together in the “Piensaenclima” project run by Fundación Ecología y Desarrollo (ECODES), Spain.

“Piensaenclima” is an ongoing project launched in 2008 to focus on climate change impacts in five consumer sectors: Food, clothing and electronics (mobile phones, personal computers and domestic appliances). It is funded by the Spanish Environment Ministry and focuses on assessing the climate change policies and actions of major companies in these sectors.

The objectives are to rank the businesses, and working with those that are making improvements following the assessment. This is then used for a consumer-focused campaign to enable consumers to choose companies with a better performance on climate change issues.

The main output is a brochure targeting consumers. This is distributed by ECODES and other organisa-

tions in Spain. Evaluation is limited – there is no collaboration with research organisations and no specific framework. In some cases they have done surveys to compare consumer attitudes before and after the project.

One of the key measures is how many companies participate in the Carbon Disclosure Project, as it indicates the level of willingness and interest from companies as well as the likelihood that better practices will be developed as a consequence of the project.

ECODES: “We struggle to measure the real improvements on the ground. We are lacking capacity to measure the real impact of our actions”. ECODES feel that this project succeeded in the work with business, in terms of building on limited engagement to date. But the lack of any evaluation mechanism meant that they could not measure the effect of the consumer campaign in any meaningful way, “but we think it was not very successful”. Further work is being done on the business engagement side.

The “Household Chemicals”

Evidence-based working was seen as central to most projects. The “Consuming Green” project run by Green Liberty in Latvia was a two-year project that ended in 2007, but the results are still used. This project aimed to combine consumer action and political lobbying. The Regional Environmental Centre funded the “Consuming Green” project. It was run in cooperation with partners from Estonia and Lithuania and the Danish Ecological Council (who offered expertise on chemical issues). A Hydro-toxicity Laboratory working with aquatic organisms conducted the tests. The information that the project has provided is used in consumer awareness activities as well as on the website and media work.

The aim was to raise general public awareness on household detergents and the banning of certain ingredients. The work included:

- Research on the household detergents available in the market.*
- Laboratory testing of ingredients of household chemicals that are dangerous for humans and the environment.*

• Running an information campaign (based on results of toxicity and ingredient tests) in order to lobby the government for a ban on certain detergents.

Work with governments towards the goal of banning certain ingredients has continued. The ban in itself was not a specific goal of the project as it was not realistically achievable in the two-years project period. However, one year after the project the government initiated a ban on phosphorus, which is partly attributable to this project.

Evaluation was done in various ways. As well as reporting on outcomes, deliverables and progress at international project team meetings, a company was contracted to run a public opinion poll that was done at beginning and end of the project to evaluate the impact of the campaign which tested consumer awareness on labels. While the opinion polls did not show significant changes in consumer awareness before and after the project, it was felt that the time was too short to expect big results. But it was successful in so far as results are still used and the media often approaches Green Liberty on this issue.

In some work, evidence comes from direct engagement with communities and local people.

The “Food behaviour project”

The “Food behaviour project” run by members of VODO in Belgium used a year-long engagement project to develop information for a campaign on food and agriculture.

The aim of this work was to test methodologies to influence behaviour change on food and thus to identify barriers and opportunities for work on Sustainable Consumption. Fifteen families joined the project. They agreed to be monitored for a year. They were given information and provided feedback and reports. Group discussions between the families were

set up to exchange practices.

It generally worked well. Results were more qualitative than quantitative but a scientific report was published. This helped identify barriers for more sustainable food consumption and these were developed into policy recommendations.

This is part of a wider Agriculture Campaign. Work here shows that the more there is consensus, the more chances there are to be successful in getting issues in the policy agenda.

The “SCP Policy Review of Western and South Caucasus EECCA countries”

This was the “Elucidating national and sub-regional progress on SCP policy development in Western (Belarus, Moldova, Russia, Ukraine) and South Caucasus (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia) countries of the EECCA” an international project led by MAMA-86 in Ukraine and implemented in cooperation with St James’s Research (UK), Eco-Accord (Russia) and the Georgian Environmental League.

This was a review on policy issues including energy, industry, transport, construction and communal services, agriculture and forestry done in the context of a general overview. The policy review shows what is happening in policy development related to SCP. At present there is no developed Sustainable Development (SD) policy or strategy in any of countries surveyed except Belarus. None of the countries of EECCA region has a distinct policy targeting SCP issues. Environmental issues are often forgotten or seen as an obstacle for it. International obligations on SD and SCP patterns are not translated into national policy. MAMA-86 state that “We are at the beginning of setting SCP policy in Ukraine.”

The work ran from 2007 to summer 2008 and was funded by the Swedish Society for Nature Conservation and co-funded by British Council in Ukraine, with contribution from ANPED. There was a clear policy background: the aim was firstly to evaluate national and sub regional progress in SCP policy development in Eastern European and Caucasus nations following the 5th Ministerial ‘Environment for Europe’ Conference in Kyiv. It also looked to provide input on the position of the EECCA countries on SCP and issues around energy, industrial pollution, and climate change and the role of NGOs in this. The long-term objectives were to contribute to work towards the 10 year Framework Programme (the Marrakech process) and to influence governments in the region to be more active in this work.

The review was based on snapshot surveys from NGO experts in Azerbaijan, Armenia, Belarus, Georgia,

Moldova, Russia and Ukraine. The project also involved the Ukraine National Academy of Sciences, where the Head of the SD department of the Institute of Productive Forces Studies was involved as scientific expert. Other NGOs used different approaches on engaging with researchers and established effective cooperation with them.

The main outcome was the “SCP policy review of Western and South Caucasus EECCA countries” publication. This includes an analytical review of the national surveys of seven countries, the summary conclusions from two international seminars held in Kiev, conclusions of the discussion bridge between Kyiv-Tbilisi-London-Amsterdam-Copenhagen-Geneva and a compilation of the national surveys as well. While Governments were the main audience, the review was also very well perceived by NGOs.

The results were mainly evaluated against the outputs, in terms of surveys, seminars etc. Long-term evaluation has not been done in a systematic way due mainly to a lack of funding and capacity.

The work contributed to longer-term development in various ways. In Ukraine it has helped MAMA-86 in their three year campaign to prioritize environment in the development agenda. As a result of the campaign the ‘National Environmental Policy Concept’ was approved in 2007. The next government took some progressive decisions on environmental policy where environment integration is a core theme.

It was also the very first NGO overview of SCP policies in countries of EECCA region. This provided a base-line and made it available to Western partners. A range of follow-up activities have emerged. It showed that there is still a lot work to do. More fundamental changes are needed. Institutional framework is lacking and SEA is not used in Ukraine. Strategic planning is generally poor. NGOs from participating countries could make valuable contribution into policy reform there towards SCP.

Not all projects work in this way. Lobbying was the central focus for

The “Campaign on Cars- EU directive on vehicle emissions and vehicle fuels”

“Campaign on Cars- EU directive on vehicle emissions and vehicle fuels” run by the European Climate Foundation and supported by the Oak Foundation. The aim of this work was to push for stringent legislation on CO₂ emission from cars (until 2015). It was aimed at decision makers at the EU level and car manufacturers.

A combination of lobbying tools was used. There was a problem at the member state level over the mobilisation of political pressure. Environmental ministers are influenced by the public debate in their home countries, so 27 national campaigns would have been needed. This is a general problem when trying

to influence the European Union. Evaluation has not been done in a very structured way.

Binding legislation in CO₂ emissions of cars has been reached, being a big achievement although the target is below what could be done technologically. Now the aim is to use lobbying for a campaign that will include voluntary commitments from big car fleet owners and car rental organisations to go beyond legislation in the cars they buy. ECF are trying to achieve changes in politics instead of directly targeting consumers. They feel that ‘we have reached the limit by moralizing consumers’ and this approach will not deliver the successes they need in the next 20 years.

Lessons from the Projects

Care must be taken in drawing too many conclusions from a limited sample, but a few things seem clear. Many smaller NGOs are still focused on single or limited-issue campaigns and there is little clarity on how wider campaigns might be developed, except in the Austrian case, which seems to be aimed at encouraging the ‘already converted’ to take their commitment further (in much the same way that the international ‘Buy Nothing Day’ appeals to those who are already radicalised to a degree).

Evaluation is a major gap and weakness. Very few of the projects had done any objective evaluation and most sounded as if they were unsure as to how they might do this. This raises a range of issues:

- There seem to be few examples of where consumer / lifestyle campaigns have been evaluated to assess not just how many people have received information but also what they have done and the impact it has had.
- The wider social impacts of most such work are very unclear.
- Projects are also likely to be evaluated in terms of their own intended outputs. An SCP perspective demands a rather wider perspective.
- Most projects do not have resources in their budgets for adequate evaluation.
- There seems to be little evidence of learning from mistakes or failures, and few ways in which evaluation lessons can be disseminated.
- Evaluating project work is a skill in itself, and one, which many NGOs may not have. Partnerships with research bodies may help in this.

3. The Use of Policy Instruments, Assessment Tools and Indicators by CSOs

Those surveyed were asked about policy instruments, assessment tools and indicators that they used and knew about. This section summarises the results of those questions.

3.1 Policy Instruments

The first part considered policy instruments. Twenty-two were offered for assessment, grouped into six main areas as below.

Policy Instruments		Never heard of it	Heard of it, but know very little about it	Familiar but not worked with it	My organisation has worked with it
B1.1.1 Regulatory instruments	Norms and standards	0	2	5	12
	Environmental liability	2	4	11	1
B1.1.2 Informational instruments	Mandatory information provision on products	0	3	5	10
	Information campaigns and websites	0	2	2	15
	Eco-benchmarking	0	4	9	5
	Labelling schemes	0	1	6	11
	Environmental quality targets	2	5	7	4
	Information Centres	1	3	6	7

The use and understanding of these instruments varies widely but is generally not very well developed, except for some of the more obvious mechanisms.

The issues where there is familiarity and use are mostly unsurprising: education and in-

formation campaigns are the most reported, along with one other issue that might have been less obvious – green procurement.

There is another element to be considered which is what ‘My organisation has worked with it’ actually means in practice. Most NGOs

Policy Instruments		Never heard of it	Heard of it, but know very little about it	Familiar but not worked with it	My organisation has worked with it
B1.1.3 Economic instruments	Green public procurement	0	0	3	15
	Environmental fees and user charges	0	1	9	6
	Environmental Taxes	0	1	7	6
	Bonus systems	0	1	12	4
	Subsidies	1	0	6	11
	Emissions Trading	0	1	6	11
	R& D investment	1	1	8	8
B1.1.4 Creative instruments	Creating a collective movement:	0	1	8	8
	Innovative Technology	1	0	9	7
	Voluntary agreements	0	1	8	10
B1.1.5 Research and educational instruments	Education and training	0	0	3	12
	Tools for monitoring individual consumption	0	0	7	9
B1.1.6 Participatory Instruments	CSO participation in Consultation Processes	0	2	3	12

will clearly have worked with information campaigns, but there must be a question about how far the 11 that talked of working on Emissions Trading have done more than lobby on this. It may be fairer to say that they have an active interest rather than being active.

The underlying trend is that NGOs do know about these issues – most had heard of most – but that their active engagement with work outside their traditional skill areas (and perhaps ‘comfort zones’) is relatively limited.

3.2 Assessment Tools

Assessment Tools		Never heard of it	Heard of it, but know very little about it	Familiar but not worked with it	My organisation has worked with it
B2.1.1 Assessment frameworks	Environmental Impact Assessment	2	1	5	8
	Strategic Environmental Assessment	3	2	7	4
	Integrated Sustainability Assessment	3	5	5	3
B2.1.2 Physical analysis tools	Life Cycle Assessment	0	2	9	5
	Environmental Input-Output Analysis	1	2	8	3
	Substance Flow Analysis	3	2	8	2
	Materials System Analysis	7	3	4	2
	Economy-wide Material Flow Analysis	4	0	11	2
B2.1.3 Economic Valuation Tools	Cost-benefit analysis (CBA)	2	2	8	5
	Cost-effectiveness analysis	2	4	7	3
B2.1.4 Scenario Analysis		8	2	4	3
B2.1.5 Risk Assessments		6	2	5	2
B2.1.6 Multicriteria analysis	Compensatory methods	7	6	3	0
	Partial-compensatory methods	8	7	2	0
	Non-compensatory methods	7	7	2	0

The lessons for assessment tools are pretty clear. Apart from work on EIA, most of the surveyed CSOs do very little systematic analysis work. Only well-established issues such as EIA, Cost Benefit Analysis and Life Cycle Analysis score even fairly highly here in terms of active engagement.

This does not seem surprising – this would normally be work done by consultancies. Even where there is ‘familiarity’ it looks from the forms as if some had simply ticked most of these without assessing their level of engagement.

However it is also the case that these are important issues in terms of developing work around eco-efficiency. Even if an NGO is not active it would be useful if they have enough knowledge to be able to be an informed critic. It might therefore be the case that any subsequent programme should offer some ‘plain language’ guidance on the nature of these tools and the ways in which they can and should be used.

3.3 Indicators

Indicators		Never heard of it	Heard of it, but know very little about it	Familiar but not worked with it	My organisation has worked with it	
B3.1.1 Singles	Material	> TMR/TMC (Total material requirement/consumption)	3	4	7	3
		> MIPS (Material Input per Service Unit)	1	3	8	4
		> EMC (Environmentally Weighted Material Consumption)	5	7	5	1
	Area/land	> HANPP (Human Appropriation of Net Primary Production)	5	6	5	0
		> LEAC (Land and ecosystem account)	6	5	5	0
	Other	> CO ₂ Carbon Footprint	0	1	9	7
		> Water (Water Footprint, WF; virtual water)	1	3	9	4
			0	0	8	10
	B3.1.2 Combined approaches	Ecological Footprint	2	0	12	3
		Happy Planet Index (HPI)	2	3	9	2
Environmental space		4	6	7	0	
Sustainable Process Index (SPI)		5	5	7	1	
Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI)		0	4	10	1	
Human Development Index (HDI)		10	7	1	0	
Workability Index (WAI)		0	0	10	6	
FAIR TRADE Labelling		3	4	9	0	
Social Accountability 8000 Standard		6	2	9	1	
B3.1.3 Indicator sets	Sustainability Performance Indicators (SPI)	5	2	5	4	

The only indicators that seem to be widely used (or 'worked with') are those generally in the public domain - Ecological Footprint, Happy Planet Index, and Fair Trade Labeling. The Human Development Index and the idea of Environmental Space are also fairly well known, if not engaged with to any great extent.

As with the assessment tools there was a concern that some may have ticked 'familiarity' on several systems but would be hard pressed to explain e.g. the Sustainable Process Index (SPI).

It is clearly the case that those that are understood and used are the environmental ones. Issues such as Workability and social accountability are largely unknown, and this may have implications for further work to address the wider aspects of SCP.

Again, it would seem that there is a strong case for some central information resource that might summarise these measures and their use and provide direct links to the core websites for each.

4 • What Challenges are NGOs facing? Where are the Gaps?

Any analysis of this report needs to be mindful of the context. This report is based on a limited survey of NGOs and it is clear from the survey that the respondents are NGO representatives that are both, close enough to the Action Town project to have been contacted and also felt

confident that they had enough to talk about. These interviewees are therefore close to the centre of work on SCP and any assessment of wider NGO capacity should be careful not to assume that these are general lessons that apply to any or most NGOs.

The Global Challenge

According to this survey, the immediate challenges facing NGOs can be summarised into some overlapping themes:

- Many smaller NGOs find it hard to work on wider cross-cutting issues.
- There is little positive leadership.
- There are many other priorities for NGO activity.
- The way in which some NGOs are 'locked in' to certain roles.
- SCP is not seen by many as an 'issue' in its own right.

SCP and work on single issues

Most of the national NGOs interviewed appear to use the phrase SCP only sparingly if at all. Most are working on specific issues to build engagement and action. Food is a key driver mentioned by groups in Belgium, Netherlands, Spain and the UK. Other issues raised include transport and cars and green buildings.

Where there are approaches to consumption itself, these tend to be focused directly at changing consumer behaviour (as notably in Sweden, Finland and the UK). This is mostly aimed at what can best be seen as improvements in eco-efficiency (or 'weak SCP') and again there seem to be little mention of 'SCP' as an issue. This is perhaps unsurprising. NGOs are usually looking to build awareness and engagement and the received wisdom (based on years of practice) is that messages should be simple, focused and about short-term action. Sustainable development has never been an easy idea to get across (being long-term, multi-issue and global) and SCP as a subset of that is perhaps even harder. The counter-approach of focusing on ideas such as values, happiness and well-being (as reported by a large international NGO network) only comes up twice from NGOs in the survey and one of this is in the context of a 'think-piece' from the UK. One positive way to get people thinking about

the bigger picture came from Austria was the 'Global Overshoot Day' organised each year in October that seeks to remind people of how far their country has gone beyond its environmental limits.

A lack of leadership?

NGOs looking to work on issues such as biodiversity or waste will find no shortage of larger networks, both internationally and nationally to provide information, support and perhaps validation of such an approach.

However, this is not the case with SCP. The great majority of materials on this come from government agencies, academics, the EU and others with little obvious NGO presence. The only direct NGO focus on this specific issue happened in Ukraine where there was a note of work to build a 'National Coalition on SCP'. This is being done by an NGO that has worked closely with ANPED for some years. The ANPED network has focused on this issue but is small and less likely to be visible. The EEB work on this may also promote these ideas, but this is more likely to get to larger organisations with an international focus. Friends of the Earth (FoE) International run their 'Live More' programme but it is not immediately clear how any NGO outside of FoE could use this

as the basis for targeted work. There are also consumer-focused organisations such as Consumer International but their direct focus on consumer rights, marketing abuses etc. means that they do not often focus on these bigger issues.

So just what is SCP?

The combined surveys show a huge variation in how civil society is tackling the issue of SCP. It is almost inherent in the nature of 'SCP' that it is difficult to define what 'it' is, or even find any common principles, which could be used as a basis for joint working. Some see this as their 'single issue' but they are a very small group within the wider environmental / sustainability movement. As above, most of those surveyed appear to be approaching this through their key single issues (food, energy etc.). The situation is made no clearer by the linking of consumption and production at some levels. Clearly the two are completely linked but there are a growing number of a) consumer-focused initiatives around lifestyles etc. and b) emerging civil society specialist organisations (two responded to the survey) focusing on aspects of production, which have little interaction with one another.

Too big an issue?

Several NGOs are really only approaching SCP through local projects. Six of those surveyed seemed to be more focused on project delivery than policy work. This would again be unsurprising since NGOs need to survive and those (especially in Eastern Europe) who tend to rely on grant funding have to deliver work that has clear outputs. The Scandinavian (and UK) approach is to tie these aspects together through a focus on consumer and domestic behaviour change. While this clearly opens the debate there is perhaps a risk that it takes people's attention away from the political agenda.

Climate change and other priorities

The other issue that got mentioned in some way by a majority of those surveyed was Climate Change. For many of the larger NGOs this is now the dominant issue. Achieving cuts of 80% in current emissions will need radical transformation of consumption and produc-

tion patterns, but however there seems to be little focus on this specific issue within the wider climate movement. This is perhaps an area where the 'SCP movement' needs to focus its' attention. Thousands of CSOs work on climate and many are making large-scale statements about how much such society must transform with no clear idea as to how such transformation can happen.

Locked – in?

It is suggested by several interviewees that most CSOs have short-term plans, due in part to limitation of resources and reliance on individual projects. As a result CSOs are reacting rather than acting. Many have a quite limited agenda that may result from following funding calls. CSOs also have to demonstrate that their activities are having an effect, usually in terms of outputs. This means that projects and programmes may be designed from the very beginning to be easily monitored and evaluated, which limits their engagement with 'bigger' issues. It is also still the case that many if not most projects are not evaluated at all. Several of those surveyed about projects ignored this question. And where evaluations are done they tend to be about environmental outputs rather than outcomes and impacts. One survey stresses the need for NGO to move way from moralizing ('preaching sacrifice') and suggest that this has not been successful, especially around driving cars. However other still see the need for a campaigning focus. There are also significant governance issues mentioned. Governments now respond to CSO claims and demands in a much wider range of ways and have different forms of engagement. It is harder for NGOs to simply criticise: there is a need for more creative engagement.

NGO capacity

SCP is a major issue within the wider SD agenda and critical for work on Climate Change. But it is clear that even within this sample of CSOs linked to the agenda there is a lack of capacity and of the skills needed to address, engage with and influence work on these issues. Several of those surveyed acknowledge this to some extent and it is also apparent in their answers around the policy measures.

Towards New Strategies

Beyond these problems and challenges is a bigger issue. In approaching SCP as being something more than eco-efficiency, we are looking beyond single-issue problems at how to change our whole value system and at how the core functioning of society moves away from a growth oriented society.

Radical change or Eco-efficiency

This tension between these two approaches is raised in various ways in a number of the surveys, notably from those with extensive policy experience. There is a definite focus from these respondents on the need for radical and transformative change. At the core of this is challenging the idea of economic growth (as three surveys saw it) or changing the whole value system of society (as one researcher said), 'changing the system while being part of it' as another had it, and tackling and reforming the current market-drive / consumerist paradigm (from one international CSO body).

Other similar points suggested that 'we are talking about the third revolution after the agricultural and industrial revolutions', 'we are likely to underestimate the problems if we do not see the picture as a whole' and that 'there is not enough awareness of the importance of contextual factors.' Another pointed out that 'the first major challenge is to convince people (citizens, policy, CSO internal) of the scale of the challenges we face'.

There are also some fundamental differences in approaches that link to values. While an NGO in Latvia runs a project that runs chemical analyses on household cleaners, an Austrian one runs round tables so that 'we have a great time and learn from each other'.

Several respondents questioned whether politicians are really ready to change the system. One said that the big challenge for CSOs is to convince them on this, while another was clear that 'it is very difficult to make politicians think differently'.

On the basis of this survey there is certainly a body of interest among CSOs in Europe that wants to take forward this radical approach. But before considering that it is important to consider the existing priorities.

Eco-Efficiency - business as usual?

The need for transformation does not mean that ongoing work should be neglected. On the basis of this survey there is a huge amount to be done. There is now a wide range of regulatory measures and policy and economic instruments in use as set out in the survey. There is a lot of work to be done building the skills and capacities of CSOs and NGOs to be able to effectively influence governments and the private sector to implement and make use of these instruments and tools.

Alongside these tools is new legislation, especially around climate change. The debate is shifting from 'what should we do?' to 'how do we do it?'. It appears from the surveys that some NGOs will be lobbying for uptake and doing critiques of what is / is not happening, while others, more generally CSOs perhaps, will be getting actively involved in making the changes.

There is certainly work to be done in improving skills in work on using these tools and instruments. Workshops to introduce these, to highlight emerging good practice, and to help joint working would all be valuable.

There are gaps here. There is the implementation gap, between what governments say they will do and what actually happens, and that has been with us throughout the last two decades. There is also the gap between the issues addressed by policies and the matters that need to be tackled. As one international agency responded, 'environmental policies do not directly tackle consumption limitation; rather they focus on reducing environmental impact'.

Action within the current frameworks

Concerted action within existing frameworks is needed in the following areas:

- *Policy*

There are very few mentions in this survey of any work related to the Marrakech process, the 10-year action plans and national SCP action plans. Yet the need for radical policy change comes through repeatedly. This ranges from EU policies, their implementation and the need for regulatory tools through national work (including work on standard setting, criteria for green purchasing etc.) down to local government programmes. Yet even though most groups said they were involved in lobbying in some way there is little sense of any cohesive approach within those surveyed.

- *Infrastructure and services*

Some of those surveyed are directly focused on improvements to infrastructure, often through regulation and policy, on issues such as cars and buildings. But most do not see this as their role. Low carbon infrastructure, to enable people to live low carbon lives, is needed now if nations are to meet their agreed commitments. CSOs can push for this; they may also, as social enterprises, be involved in delivering this. The technical innovations exist; it is the social innovation that is needed to take this forward and CSOs can help make that innovation happen.

- *Awareness and engagement*

Some of those interviewees working on policy tend to be somewhat dismissive of the focus on behaviour change. One remark from the survey was that if simply 'giving consumers the right information was the solution we would have saved the world already'. But many also see the needs for much more work on awareness-raising.

- *Green Procurement*

From 19 surveys that responded on the instruments section, 15 said they were working on procurement and three were interested. Given the huge spend of governments, local government, health agencies etc. there is a great deal that can be done in the short / medium term to reduce emissions and overall footprints. But the work being done looks very bitty, even isolated and this is something where some well-targeted support and information on emerging good practice would be very useful. Four people mentioned broadly that a focus on "eco-efficiency improvements" within the current economic growth system is likely to fall short of what is needed. However, the surveys suggest that there is much short-term work to be done and the survey evidence hint that this work provides a very valuable learning framework for NGOs and CSOs. Many of those advocating radical change have started out on less progressive work; it is also the case that other partners such as local government (and smaller CSOs) will support work on eco-efficiency but are very unlikely in the immediate future to take more radical steps.

With all this work to be done there is certainly room for a project / network / agency to offer well-planned skills building, to exchange good practice on policy, infrastructure, procurement and engagement, and generally ramp up the active engagement of CSOs.

The Transformation Agenda

The second key question is how do CSOs take forward the emerging agenda around radical approaches to change, whether this is 'strong sustainable consumption', 'de-growth', 'prosperity without growth' or some other theme. Three respondents talked about the need for much improved CSO cooperation. It was added that CSOs have a catalyst role and do not have massive resources for implementing work, but what they can do is bring people together and inspire them. The more complicated the issue, the more relevant it is to follow this approach. There is also a need for media and CSOs to understand each other better: if these radical ideas are to ever get to a wider audience there will be a need to find ways to portray them in the mass media in a positive way. From the surveys there seem to be a range of possible new initiatives that may sit side-by-side:

- There are 'quantitative initiatives' looking to measure and then reduce the absolute amount of consumption ('footprint' and 'rucksack' methodologies). But some of those surveyed highlight how hard this is to communicate to people.
- One suggestion is that 'choice editing' should be mainstreamed. If that happens then many of these issues would also move into the mainstream and there are some examples (incandescent bulbs) where this is happening. The surveys do suggest that many CSOs are not on this "reduced choice" agenda yet. One survey notes that the WBCSD has released a report on SCP where they advocate choice editing.
- Shift in societal values is inevitable, so how does civil society work to shift values in a positive direction? Political programmes have demonstrated in the past that they are able to have a profound effect on social values. Generally NGOs do not think in those terms and do not understand the ways in which these shifts happen. A focus on identity and values offers the opportunity to set up coalitions across wide sets of CSOs.
- There is scope for a new initiative to try and bring together all the aspects of the new agenda in a 'big leap forward'.

5 • Conclusions and Outlook

What We Learned about Current Strategies

The survey conducted by the Action Town project showed that the concept of sustainable consumption and production in its complexity and systemic nature has not yet been embedded in the work of most environmental NGOs.

Most of the national NGOs interviewed appear to use the phrase sustainable consumption and production (SCP) only sparingly if at all. The responses to the interviews show a huge variation in how civil society is tackling this challenge. It is almost inherent in the nature of 'SCP' that it is difficult to define what 'it' is, or even find any common principles, which could be used as a basis for joint working. Some see this as their 'single issue' but they are a very small group within the wider environmental / sustainability movement. Most appear to be approaching this challenge through their own key activity areas (food, energy etc.).

Where there are approaches to consumption itself, these tend to be focused directly at changing consumer behaviour. This is mostly aimed at what can best be seen as improvements in eco-efficiency (or 'weak SCP').

The survey confirmed a number of generic strategies that cover most activities undertaken by NGOs. These span from publishing challenging evidence, undertaking consumer focused campaigning, government lobbying to community engagement and creation of coalitions. It became also clear that in real life projects undertaken by environmental NGOs usually combine different generic strategies.

It was indicated by several interviewees that most NGOs have short-term plans, due in part to limitation of resources and reliance on individual projects. As a result NGOs are reacting rather than acting. Many have a quite limited agenda that may result from following funding calls. NGOs also have to demonstrate that their activities are having an effect, usually in terms of outputs. This means that projects and programmes may be designed from the very beginning to be easily monitored and evaluated, which limits their engagement with 'bigger' issues.

The responses with regard to the use of policy instruments, assessment tools and indicators showed that while some of the tools and instruments enjoy a high degree of awareness, others are still widely unknown. More importantly it became evident that important gaps exist with regard to how these tools can be used strategically in order to achieve tangible results towards the objectives of SCP. We can conclude that the Action Town guidelines for these tools and instruments will be a useful contribution for the NGO community (see www.action-town.eu for the downloadable versions of the guides). More specific information on the specific instruments and tools can be drawn from the tables in chapter 3 of this report. These results will be useful for the Action Town phase of exploratory actions, showcasing how CSO / research partnerships can be fruitful in this field.

What We Learned about Strategy Gaps and Opportunities

Although the survey showed differences in strategies and thinking from CSOs in different parts of Europe, clear common patterns and gaps emerged that offer new opportunities for collaboration between academia/ research and CSOs.

The survey highlights a need for the environmental movement to go beyond current piecemeal actions and single-issue focus (like especially the case with climate change). It seems therefore that there are opportunities for capacity building with regard to the connections between climate change and the deeper root causes of unsustainable consumption and production.

It became clear that there is a need for a structured approach to getting a wider range of CSOs at every level to understand the need for systemic changes to consumption and production patterns, and the role that they can play in delivering that change. This shows that there is a need for capacity building.

In addition, the necessity of proper monitoring and evaluation of the change achieved was a clear pattern emerging from nearly all surveys. Where NGOs do evaluations, they tend to be about environmental outputs rather than

outcomes and impacts. As a consequence it must be assumed that there is little knowledge about the effectiveness of large part of the projects and actions undertaken by much if not most of the environmental movement.

It was emerging from several interviews to seem to me to create some clear (new) space for work on the 'Prosperity without growth' agenda. This might usefully establish much stronger links between the academics / researchers and some big and smaller NGOs.

Another collaboration opportunity between research organisations and CSOs that crystallised through the interviews can be seen in the fact that environmental NGOs, while often very good at ecological impact assessment, lack knowledge in social sciences (psychology, behavioural economics etc.) and capacity to integrate them into their practical work (essential to achieving systemic change).

To conclude, the survey confirmed Action Town's assumptions that many new opportunities for collaboration between academia and NGOs are emerging on a strategic level in order to equip civil society with the capacity and skills to effectively influence human, social and political systems towards sustainable consumption and production.

Acknowledgements

Writers report: Chris Church, ANPED
Michael Narberhaus, WWF-UK

Survey and interviews: Clara Gonzalez, WWF-UK

Contributions: Sylvia Lorek, ANPED, Jan Rademaker, ANPED

A special thank to all interviewees for taking their time for the interviews and providing valuable insights into their work on SCP and to all Action Town project partners who provided input and comments throughout this work package.

ANNEX:

Action Town Survey Questionnaire

A. Generic strategies and tactics for SCP

A1. Which of the following NGO strategies are used in your organisation? Please briefly describe below details about the way you have applied the strategy in the past, including a description of specific tactics you have used (if applicable).

GENERIC STRATEGIES FOR SCP	Brief description of project examples
<p>A1.1 Do consumer focussed campaigning</p> <p><i>Making a campaign on certain SCP related issue, e.g. Friends of the Earth campaign “Consume less, live more”. (http://www.foei.org/en/get-involved/livemore/)</i></p>	
<p>A1.2 Lobby government</p> <p><i>Playing an active role in political and research arena discussions, ideally to re-define or challenge the agenda (e.g lobbying SCP National Action Plans, lobbying for new legislation, etc.).</i></p>	
<p>A1.3 Convene multi-stakeholder processes</p> <p><i>Convene processes of diverse groups of stakeholders to create the space to develop, test and implement sustainable innovations.</i></p>	
<p>A1.4 Build alliances</p> <p><i>Build political alliances with partners who share the same purpose and have aligned objectives in order to influence political or societal decision making processes for SCP</i></p>	
<p>A1.5 Engage in business partnerships</p> <p><i>CSO – business partnerships to create examples of best in class sustainability practices by business.</i></p>	
<p>A1.6 Develop and publish challenging evidence</p> <p><i>Identify and understand the impacts of unsustainable consumption and production ideally utilizing scientific tools such as. the Ecological Budget Project by WWF and SEI and the Finnish Association for Nature Conservation, FIN-MIPS Household project that gathers MIPS data on household consumption. (http://www.environment.fi/default.asp?contentid=194683&lan=en)</i></p>	

<p>A1.7 Engage with communities</p> <p><i>Grass root engagement with community groups to achieve behaviour change and political bottom up pressure</i></p>	
<p>A1.8 Other (Please specify)</p>	
<p>A1.9 Other (Please specify)</p>	

A2. Do you agree with the way in which the strategies are categorised above? If there are other strategies that you have adopted to achieve your goals please describe how you have applied them below:

A.3 How do you evaluate the effectiveness of the strategies applied in your area of work or projects?

A.4 For the projects example of mentioned in the table above please fill in the following information:
Project Title: “.....”

A4.1 What are the objectives/goals?

A4.2 Are you addressing any high impact demand areas (food, mobility, housing)? If yes, which? If not, does the project have a sectoral focus?

A4.3 Please describe briefly the main activities you carry out in this project?

A4.4 Are you targeting (a) specific audience (s)? If yes, who are the audiences?

A4.5 What are the outcomes you aim to achieve?

A4.6 How do you evaluate progress against set objectives in this area of work or project?

A4.7 How well did the strategy applied work against the set objectives?

A4.8 *If you have achieved your objectives, do you think the strategy applied was efficient (as for the investment made)?*

A5 *Do you have evidence about the effectiveness of different strategies and tactics for different contexts? In other words, could you say which strategy to apply for particular situations you are operating?*

A6 *Are you aware of any other useful strategies different than the ones listed in A.1 which are NOT used by your organisation? If so, why is that the case?*

A7 *What challenges/gaps have you identified in your work that have hindered progress towards more effective outcomes/results?*

A8 *What kind of support would you need to address these challenges or gaps? What kind of support would you like to receive from research?*

B. Your work on policy instruments, assessment tools and indicators for SCP

B1.1 Please indicate (with an “X”) the types of policy instruments you will find in the table below that your organisation has worked with. Where possible please make a reference to the projects you have described in A8 using the same numbering.

Note: “Working with a policy instrument ” refers any action targeting policy makers to influence them towards the use of a certain policy instrument.

Policy Instruments		Examples	I have never heard of it	I have heard of it, but know very little about it.	I am familiar with it, but have never worked with it.	My organisation has worked with it (please make reference to project numbering)
B1.1.1 Regulatory instruments	<i>Norms and standards</i>	<i>Building standards; Health and food standards</i>				
	<i>Environmental liability</i>	<i>Environmental Liability Directive</i>				

B1.1.2 Informational instruments	Mandatory information provision on products	EU Energy efficiency labelling in selected big electric household appliances.				
	Information campaigns and websites	Austrian "Sustainable Weeks", joint national initiative of several Austrian ministries and provinces and business to raise consumer awareness among general public.				
	Eco-benchmarking	"The climate star" awarded by the German Climate alliance to a municipality with best climate change abatement measures.				
	Labelling schemes	EU's Green flower, Fair trade labels				
	Environmental quality targets	The US Council on Environmental Quality: http://www.whitehouse.gov/administration/eop/ceq/				
	Information Centres	Centres can be led by different stakeholders. E.g. Envirowise in UK is Government-led (http://www.envirowise.gov.uk/). Global Network of Environment and Technology (http://www.gnet.org/) CSO-led.				
	B1.1.3 Economic instruments	Green public procurement	e.g purchasing energy-efficient technology, buying green energy in public buildings, sustainable food (organic, fair trade) in schools, etc.			
Environmental fees and user charges		E.g. Congestion Charging in London: http://www.tfl.gov.uk/roadusers/congestion-charging/				
Environmental Taxes		CO2 taxes implemented in several European countries.				

B1.1.3 Economic instruments	Bonus systems	Systems to encourage consumers to consume less or consume “greener” products. For example, a green bonus-card which gives bonus on sustainable products.				
	Subsidies	Governments can provide financial support e.g. to households to promote energy- and resource efficient production. They can be direct or indirect.				
	Emissions Trading	E.g. European Union Emission Trading Scheme				
	R&D investment	E.g. governmental incentives to promote research and development in the public and private sectors.				

Policy instruments	Examples	I have never heard of it	I have heard of it, but know very little about it.	I am familiar with it, but have never worked with it	My organisation has worked with it (please make reference to project numbering)
B1.1.4 Creative instruments	Creating a collective movement: movement	Carrotmob in the U.S. uses facebook, myspace, blogs etc. to mobilize individuals to demand energy efficiency.			
	Innovative Technology	E.g. Technology transfer, Tecno-Point offers ideas and technologies for enterprises: www.tecno-point.com/en			
	Voluntary agreements	Aim is to encourage business and public authorities to improve e.g. resource-efficiency beyond existing legislation.			

B1.1.5 Research and educational instruments	<i>Education and training</i>	<i>All sustainability education from primary school to life-long education</i>				
	<i>Tools for monitoring individual consumption</i>	<i>Environmental targets, Promotion of the use of indicators and assessment tools (see next page)</i>				
B1.1.6 Participatory Instruments	<i>CSO participation in Consultation Processes</i>	<i>WWF-UK participating in the public consultation for Strategic Environmental Assessment of offshore energy licensing (http://www.offshore-sea.org.uk/site/index.php)</i>				

B1.2. *If your organisation has worked with one or more of the policy instruments listed above, please describe how.*

B1.3 *Are there any policy instruments not listed above that you have targeted in your work or that you think would be valuable for other CSOs?*

B1.4 *Please explain how you evaluate success when working with a policy instrument.*

B1.5 *For the policy instruments described in B1.2, please describe situations when working with specific policy instruments has been successful. Can you also describe other situations where it has not been successful?*

B.2 Assessment tools

B2.1 Please indicate (with an “X”) the types of assessment tools you will find in the table below that your organisation has worked with. Where possible please make a reference to the projects listed in A8 using the same numbering.

Note: “Working with an assessment tool” refers for instance to the use of an assessment tool in order to lobby or challenge a government, or to raise awareness on a certain issue.

Assessment tools		I have never heard of it	I have heard of it, but know very little about it.	I am familiar with it, but have never worked with it	My organisation has worked with it (please make reference to project number)
B2.1.1 Assessment frameworks	<i>Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)</i>				
	<i>Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)</i>				
	<i>Integrated Sustainability Assessment (ISA)</i>				
B2.1.2 Physical analysis tools	<i>Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) (EIOA)</i>				
	<i>Environmental Input-Output Analysis</i>				
	<i>Substance Flow Analysis</i>				
	<i>Materials System Analysis</i>				
	<i>Economy-wide Material Flow Analysis (EMFA)</i>				
B2.1.3 Economic Valuation Tools	<i>Cost-benefit analysis (CBA)</i>				
	<i>Cost-effectiveness analysis</i>				
B2.1.4 Scenario Analysis					
B2.1.5 Risk Assessments					
B2.1.6 Multi-criteria analysis	<i>Compensatory methods</i>				
	<i>Partial-compensatory methods</i>				
	<i>Non-compensatory methods</i>				

B2.2 *If your organisation has worked with one or more of the assessment tools listed above, please describe how.*

B2.3 Are there any assessment tools not listed above that you have targeted in your work or that you think would be valuable for other CSOs?

B2.4 Please explain how you evaluate success when working with an assessment tool.

B2.5 For the assessment tools listed in B2.1, please describe situations when working with specific assessment tools has been successful. Can you also describe other situations where it has not been successful?

B.3 Indicators

B3.1 Please indicate (with an “X”) the types of indicators you will find in the table below that your organisation has worked with. Where possible please make a reference to the projects listed in A8 using the same numbering

Indicators			I have never heard of it	I have heard of it, but know very little about it.	I am familiar with it, but have never worked with it	My organisation has worked with it (please make reference to project number)
B3.1.1 Singles	Material	TMR/TMC (Total material requirement/consumption)				
		MIPS (Material Input per Service Unit)				
		EMC (Environmentally Weighted Material Consumption)				
	Area/land	HANPP (Human Appropriation of Net Primary Production)				
		LEAC (Land and ecosystem account)				

B3.1.1 Singles	<i>Other</i>	<i>CO2 Carbon Footprint</i>				
		<i>Water (Water Footprint, WF; virtual water)</i>				
B3.1.2 Combined approaches		<i>Ecological Footprint</i>				
		<i>Happy Planet Index (HPI)</i>				
		<i>Environmental space</i>				
		<i>Sustainable Process Index (SPI)</i>				
		<i>Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI)</i>				
		<i>Human Development Index (HDI)</i>				
		<i>Workability Index (WAI)</i>				
		<i>FAIR TRADE Labelling</i>				
		<i>Social Accountability 8000 Standard (SA 8000)</i>				
B3.1.3 Indicator sets		<i>Sustainability Performance Indicators (SPI) including (environmental, economic and social indicators)</i>				

B3.2 *If your organisation has worked with one or more of the indicators listed above, please describe how.*

B3.3 *Are there any indicators not listed above that you have targeted in your work or that you think would be valuable for other CSOs?*

B3.4 *Please explain how you evaluate success when working with an indicator.*

B3.5 *For the indicators described in B3.2, please you describe situations when working with a specific indicator has been successful. Can you also describe other situations where it has not been successful?*

Can you recommend other CSO practitioners or experts who should be interviewed because of their experience or knowledge in CSO strategies for SCP?