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Analysis

Survey Findings on Public Awareness

Aarhus Convention and European Union Environmental Law

The Context

The Central European Initiative (CEI) Action Plan, in particular the Environment Topic under the Area of Intervention of Economic Development states that: “Although the majority of the CEI Member States have made significant progress in sustainable development and environmental protection with regard to rules and norms, there is still a need to raise awareness among the general public and decision-makers.”

Justice and Environment (J&E) has set two goals in this respect:

- to conduct a survey on the public awareness of the Aarhus Convention that is a cornerstone of the environmental access rights and a powerful international legal tool for the public to protect the environment and promote sustainable development, and of the implementation of EU environmental law as an important leverage for the proper protection of access rights and the environment;
- to raise the low level of awareness among the public and the environmental civil society on what the Aarhus Convention and the EU environmental legislation contain and what can be attributed to the foregoing legal regimes, thus fighting the growing Euro skepticism.

Below are the results of the surveys and the findings of J&E followed by a set of recommendations and a media strategy in the Annex.

The Findings

Survey on the Aarhus Convention

The survey was conducted using a free online surveying tool (www.surveymonkey.com) applying 8 questions, sending the links alongside with a request for further spreading and distribution to national environmental civil society organizations in 8 countries such as Austria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Macedonia, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia. The survey produced 134 answers out of which the results are analyzed referring to the first 100 answers, expressed in percentages of the possible answers.

Survey on EU Environmental Law

The survey was conducted using a free online surveying tool (www.surveymonkey.com) applying 8 questions, sending the links alongside with a request for further spreading and distribution to national environmental civil society organizations in 8 countries such as Austria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Macedonia, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia. The survey produced 54 answers.
Have you heard about the Aarhus Convention?

Findings

The first question only intended to clarify if there is knowledge on the existence of the Aarhus Convention whatsoever. Clearly the overwhelming majority of the respondents have already heard of the Aarhus Convention and there is only a small minority for whom the existence of this international legal instrument is a novelty. This is already a positive sign in the beginning.

Can you mark what topics the Aarhus Convention primarily regulates?

Findings

The second question wanted to go deeper and test the knowledge of the respondents by offering 10 different topics from which they had to find out what the Aarhus Convention regulates. Again, the great majority did know that it is about access to environmental information, participation in environmental decision-making and access to environmental justice. All other responses that were incorrect are only an insignificant minority which is a good sign again.
Question: Have you ever invoked the rights provided by the Aarhus Convention in formal proceedings or have you ever invoked the Aarhus Convention in campaigns?

Findings: The third question wanted to uncover if the Aarhus Convention is a live part of an environmental CSO’s everyday life. It tries to measure it by asking if the Convention has ever been in fact used by the respondents. It seems that there are more who do not use the Convention than those who apply it. This shows the first alarming sign that there is need for an awareness raising.

Question: In what kind of cases did you refer to the provisions of the Aarhus Convention in your communication with authorities or courts?

Findings: The fourth question targets those who have already used the Aarhus Convention and asks about the purpose of using the Convention. The majority of the answers show the following reasons: getting environmental information from government (78%) and participation in environmental decision-making (78%). This shows that most of the respondents use the Convention in extra-judicial processes.
Question
In case you used the Aarhus Convention in your work, what would best describe the impact of the reference to the Aarhus Convention in the above cases?

Findings
The fifth question tests the effectiveness of the application of the Aarhus Convention. The majority of the respondents think or experience that reference to the Convention had made no impact on public authorities (38%), public participation was still refused (35%) or as a maximum, access to environmental information was granted (33%) as a result of referencing the Aarhus Convention. This is really disappointing and requires action.

Question
How would you describe the awareness of the public contacting your NGO about the Aarhus Convention?

Findings
The sixth question wanted to measure public awareness through the judgment of the civil society organizations. In their evaluation, only very few people know about the Aarhus Convention and even they do not know it in detail (53%). This is a clear sign of a need for awareness raising.
Please identify your NGO according to the following options (multiple answers)!

Findings
The seventh question wanted to check the background of the CSOs that were involved into this surveying. The answers show that most of the respondents are national environmental organizations. This aligned with the original expectations of the survey organizers.

Please identify your country!

Findings
The eighth question finally asked about the nationality of the respondents. The answering system ensured anonymity, but even like this, one third of the respondents did not discover their nationality.
**EU Environmental Law**

**Question**
What describes the best the level of your knowledge of EU Environmental Law?

**Answers**

**Findings**
The first question only intended to clarify the level of knowledge of the CSO approached on EU environmental law. Unfortunately, the majority (45%) responded that they only know some pieces of EU environmental law, and even only on a superficial level. Those having an in-depth knowledge are only 28%.

**Question**
Do you follow the development of EU environmental law?

**Findings**
The second question measures the consciousness on the developments of EU environmental law. Most of the respondents follow such developments only if their CSO is affected, however, at least in this case they do follow changes. This is a positive sign.
Question: Mark the areas of environmental protection that are NOT directly regulated by EU environmental law!

Findings: The third question is a kind of checking question that measures the depth of knowledge. In this case, most of the respondents (80%) are correct, especially regarding access to environmental justice (34%). However, still a high level of responses is incorrect (33%) on e.g. noise emissions. This again calls for awareness raising efforts.

Question: In what areas of EU environmental law is there a legislative proposal being drafted/discussed in the years 2010-2013?

Findings: The fourth question is really an expert one, and no wonder that the majority of the respondents (48%) replied “don’t know”. Those who responded positively, did not always knew the right answer.
**Question**

What does the “direct effect” of EU law mean?

**Findings**

The fifth question is a very legal one, however, it seems that this has already entered into some kind of common knowledge, despite its very legalistic nature. This must be the reason why most of the respondents replied correctly (54%) over those who did not know it properly (46%).

**Question**

How would you describe the awareness of the public contacting your NGO about the EU Environmental Law (any piece of environmental legislation or more laws)?

**Findings**

The sixth question measures public awareness in the judgment of the CSOs. As with the Aarhus Convention, the result is that only a very few people know EU environmental law at all, and even they do not know it in detail. But contrary to the Aarhus Convention, at least many people heard about the EU environmental law, although they do not know what is provides.
Findings
The seventh question wanted to check the background of the CSOs that were involved into this surveying. The answers show that most of the respondents are national environmental organizations. This aligned with the original expectations of the survey organizers.

Findings
The eighth question finally asked about the nationality of the respondents. The answering system ensured anonymity, and only 4 respondents did not discover their nationality.
Conclusions

Briefly, the conclusions of the two surveys are the following, according to topics:

› **Aarhus Convention:** most of the respondents know the Aarhus Convention and know what it regulates, however, most of them do not use it and even if they do, they do it outside judicial procedures, in interactions with public authorities; the outcomes are questionable, the Convention not producing the desired effects; the general public has a lower level of knowledge, few of them having heard about the Convention but not even knowing in detail what it is about.

› **EU environmental law:** most of the respondents know some pieces of EU environmental law but not in detail, and they do not follow the legal developments; they do know what the EU law is about, and sometimes also how it develops, in addition to some basic legal concepts but the general public has a lower level of knowledge, few of them knowing in detail what EU environmental law is about, but at least having heard of it in general.

Recommendations

In order to achieve the goals of a more united Europe and to contribute to the implementation of the CEI Action Plan via raising the awareness of the public in terms of access rights and the environmental law of the EU, we suggest to do the following:

› start a **public awareness campaign** on what the practical use of the Aarhus Convention is and on the benefits of EU environmental law against Euro skepticism;

› raise the **knowledge of the CSOs** in order to be able to monitor the development of EU environmental law;

› support **public interest law organizations** that can contribute to the proper application of the Aarhus Convention by ensuring its rights even via judicial remedies, and that can give expert advice to other CSOs on EU environmental law.

A communication and outreach strategy for the above purposes is in the Annex to this document.
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ANNEX

Communication and Outreach Strategy

THE BENEFITS OF EU MEMBERSHIP IN ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

1 - What are the major obstacles to public awareness?
In a context where the number of Euro sceptics is on the rise and making the benefits of EU membership hardly credible, putting forward the environmental benefits of EU membership is all the more challenging. Most Europeans being unaware of their rights related to their everyday life (such as consumer goods, contracts, etc.) they know even less about their rights in terms of environment— a far less tangible aspect of their lives. Indeed, the environment becomes visible only when a problem arises: e.g. the construction of a new airport/dam nearby, floods, disease outbreak among a population, problems in a nuclear power station, etc. The question should be asked the other way around: what happens to a country if unprotected by EU laws? Examples of environmental misfortunes in non-MS that could have been prevented had the country been a member of the EU can be good illustrations.

2 - What is the public unaware of?
J&E has conducted a survey among European NGOs, most of them working at national level and dealing directly with environmental issues. The results show that almost 90% of respondents had heard about the existence of the Aarhus Convention but sceptical about its impacts on the ground. On the public side, the great majority of the NGOs declared that the public who contacted them were barely aware of the existence and content of the Aarhus Convention. Surprisingly, more than 30% of the surveyed NGOs think the EU law does not directly deal with noise emissions and more than 20% alike about environmental liability. It is thus necessary to enhance the visibility of the respective EU directives. Both have a direct impact on people’s lives as they aim at ensuring proper living conditions.

3 – Dealing with message opacity
As both legal and environmental matters tend to be highly specialised (i.e. cryptic), it is of paramount importance to adapt the language when communicating to non-specialised audiences. To ensure the communications person succeeds in doing this, policy experts should supply understandable background information in a timely manner. Communicating in a simple language is not enough to make the topic attractive. It also needs to catch the audience’s attention by making the information relevant to their own lives so they can identify with the issue. It is important to show, based on concrete examples, that environmental justice is more than a concept and does bring tangible benefits both to the environment and the Europeans.

Fiction example: Thanks to the EU law XYZ, the construction project for a dam was stopped in a given country. It had a positive impact on the local fauna as large proportions of fish stocks came back to populate the region’s waters. This previously endangered species has regained a fairly satisfying rate in the area.

4 – External communications
Social media
Anyone desiring to convey a message cannot ignore social media nowadays. However, we should keep in mind that social media targets a restricted fringe of the public, i.e. the persons who already have an interest in legal and environmental matters in this instance. The following paragraphs compare the two main social media tools: Facebook & Twitter:
Maintaining a Facebook account is time consuming if we want to raise the profile of the organisation and maintain its credibility. Creating a project-specific fan page would enable interested parties to find information at a later stage – i.e. when the project has ended – but would look outdated. Facebook is mostly considered by its users an entertainment tool rather than a professional platform where to find credible information. It also requires a dedicated person with sound scientific knowledge to be able to interact professionally with fans asking specific questions.

Setting up a Twitter account would be an opportunity for Justice & Environment to expand its network while advertising the project. The help of valuable partners like the EEB is to be taken into account. Having a Twitter presence could help disseminate information about a project, engage with interested parties, announce events, publications, mentions press quotes, etc. Again, it would be a way to gather people/organisations with a special interest in environmental issues, not to spark new interests. On a practical aspect, tweeting daily would be ideal (J&E resources availability to be investigated). Language must be kept simple and catchy.

Traditional press
To reach out to the greater public, it is crucial to resort to traditional media such as TV and radio. Newspapers are also a major dissemination channel. For more technical aspects, it is also valuable to get in touch with specialised press (like ENDS for instance) and bloggers. Promoting the project on platforms with wide readership would be of great added value. E.g. it is possible to have an opinion piece published on the Euractiv website for free. However, the publication date is to be chosen in accordance with EU landmarks such as EP Committee votes for instance.