



ESSENTIAL MEDIA
COMMUNICATIONS

Why Give To The Environment?

*A research project on motivations and barriers to giving for
the Australian Environmental Grantmakers Network*

Prepared by:

Paul Sheridan
Associate Director

Essential Media Communications

Level 8, Suite 10
377 Sussex Street
Sydney, NSW
T: 61 2 8282 9180
F: 61 2 9283 4948

www.essentialmedia.com.au

Essential Media Communications is a member of



Our researchers are members of



Overview

This report to the Board and members of the AEGN provides an analysis of communications research into the attitudes of members toward giving, their motivations for giving, as well as barriers to giving. The research project explored commonality of interests among members and the value they share which form the basis of the decisions they make to give to the environment.

The research project involved key informant interviews; a survey of members and the results of the analysis by EMC will be included in a two-year communication strategy for the AEGN.

The analysis provided here is based on 18 key informant interviews conducted between January 9 and February 4, 2012. Each interview took place via telephone and ranged from 30 minutes to 1 hour in length. Each interview followed a set list of questions, which also reflected the content of the member survey, however interviewers explored issues in greater depth if participants demonstrated strong views on particular issues and it was judged valuable to continue to explore these areas.

The survey of was conducted online via Survey Monkey and 46 member responses were logged.

Research Findings

1. What drives people to give to the environment?

The results of both the interviews and the online survey show that members have a genuine interest in environment issues and a strong belief that they are among the most important issues of our time.

A 'love', respect and awe for the environment

A common response in interviews reflected the following view: One member said it was 'blazingly obvious' why she gave and all had this 'well why wouldn't you give?' attitude.

Many members spoke of a love for the natural environment such as the bush, the sea, 'wild areas', and 'trees'. Many have travelled a great deal and experienced many natural environments. There is an obvious respect and awe for the environment among members - a number of people spoke of the 'wonder' of nature and the 'miracle' of 'trees, life, different species'.

References were also made to the peace people felt in nature and a spiritual connection. Some, but not all, referred to Australia specifically in the context of our 'rare creatures' or 'botanical wonderlands' and how 'lucky' we are that a lot of our nature/land is preserved or 'untouched'.

Some members expressed an interest in Indigenous land care, especially the intersection of Indigenous knowledge and western science. A few participants in the interviews represented trusts set up by rural benefactors motivated by rural and regional issues i.e. primary industry. Those with an environmental interest had interpreted this through a lens of 'land care' or conservation to ensure the land remains productive.

The environment is at risk

All those interviewed believed the environment is 'going', 'crashing', 'disappearing', 'rapidly decreasing' and 'being damaged'. Many reflected on knowing a piece of land or natural region (Murray Darling Basin and forests in Tasmania, Victoria and NSW were specifically mentioned) that they had seen 'go' or be 'threatened' due to development.

Among respondents to the online survey, almost 50% chose the following as best describing the initial spark for the interest in giving to the environment:

"I believed the damage being done to our environment threatened to undermine the health and security of our society and I wanted to help reverse that."

And almost two-thirds chose the following as best describing their motivation for giving:

"I wanted to help reverse the damage being done to our environment before long term damage to the healthy and security of our society occurs."

Humans are inherently connected to the environment (so we are at risk)

Members believe that humans are part of nature *'we all share the planet and the environment helps us...we have to work to share the limited resource'*.

One participant referred to environment issues being the 'greatest threat for our civilization' and another said 'I don't think humans have a great future on this planet'. There was a sense of 'significant need' to turnaround or stop the ruinous trajectory they saw the environment as being on.

Many spoke in scientific or ecological terms, such as finite resources, closed environments and systems, and interdependency: *'Everything has a place and a purpose'* and endangered species.

There was a sense of fragility about the environment and humans due to our interconnection: *"We need it, should protect and take care of it because it looks after us"*.

Some felt 'looking after' the Earth was only fair in some karmic way, whereas most others were more pragmatic, i.e. We need it to survive and there are more people and therefore we need more food and water.

No one spoke the language of 'saving' the world. Members are, overall, 'deeply concerned' for humanity and the planet, which are interlinked.

Many referred to environmental damage in relation to our current economic models based on consumption and waste:

'I feel like I have to stave off economic rationalism – it is persistent and relentless'.

A clear majority of members sense that they can 'see what is happening' and others can't: *'What is going to make people wake up?'*

Members talked about the environment being the 'big picture' or 'big issue' and them having a long-term perspective over short term economic concerns:

"...the whole global warming debate and carbon tax debate – very much skewed by short economic issues, that I suppose is an example that concerns me a bit – these are much bigger issues i.e. our electricity will cost more – so it should and so what?"

This 'bigger picture' and 'long term view' came up frequently and a sense that human wants are and should be secondary because without the environment we don't exist:

'I have taken the big picture view – without us having an understanding of the environment - the environment underpins everything'.

There are some differences in the way the group valued the environment, most are conservationists that wanted to see land/species protected and preserved, and gave to projects that purchased land for protection to 'stop' developers.

This perhaps related to their pragmatic and factual personality (they can 'see' something i.e. fence around land). There were many that invested in research and the advancement of scientific knowledge. But there were others that were more liberal in their environmental views and did not like 'tracts of land being bought up'.

Not enough is being done...obliged to do something

All felt not enough was being done or the issues were 'not getting enough attention' by governments and others. Many referred to wanting to 'do something' or 'help' stop the aforementioned ending of the (fragile) natural world and 'protect' or 'preserve' it.

When asked what their motivation is now for continuing to give to the environment, most respondents to the survey chose:

"I want to contribute to the solutions to the most significant issues facing our environment, such as climate change."

Followed by:

"I wanted to help reverse the damage being done to our environment before long term damage to the healthy and security of our society occurs."

And:

"We all have a responsibility to do our bit and ensure we leave the environment in at least as good a condition as we inherited it."

Many felt they are in a position to give:

'we have excess money' or 'more money than we need' or 'more than enough' or 'we are comfortable' and therefore they should give.

Many also believed others in a similar situation should do the same. One talked about a personal philosophy that they would pay for their children's education but not cars and houses and the 'money was better put somewhere else' i.e. the environment. These reflect values around personal responsibility, self-efficacy and fairness.

Due to their financial position, environmental concerns and belief that ‘not enough is being done’ many spoke of an **obligation** to give.

For some the obligation was to preserve the natural environment for their lineage i.e. children and grandchildren. (*Note: most are in the age range to have grandchildren and many reflected this gave them a long term view*).

Belief that they can ‘make a difference’

Overall, members believe ‘you can make a difference’. There is a belief in high levels of personal agency, possibly because many have been successful in careers, in life or those around them had been.

Members responded positively that through philanthropy ‘*you can get things done that wouldn’t happen or would take a long time*’. There was a sense of action happening rather than just words being spoken and of providing an example to others.

This combination of beliefs i.e. you should give, you can give, it makes a difference – makes giving to the environment a fait accompli in the minds of the participants. Why wouldn’t you? Our civilization is threatened, you have the money, and projects do make a difference.

Pragmatic idealists

Many felt what they gave was small, i.e. ‘a drop in the ocean’ or ‘an ant-like contribution’, but they talked about being part of a whole (interconnectedness value) i.e. many drops or many ants all working together (similar to the ‘together we are stronger’ message that unions and also the Australian Charities Foundation uses) and they ‘were doing their bit’.

Generally, members are **highly interested in the science and ecology, and therefore facts**.

By and large, members do not align themselves with ‘greenies’ such as The Greens party, which they view as a bit radical and small ‘g’ greens, i.e. environmental activists are political and off-putting to others.

Members want to see our diminishing land, habitat and species protected and conserved for future generations. They acknowledge that alone they can’t ‘stave off economic rationalism’ but they can support an organisation to protect and look after the environment.

However, there is a distinct **pragmatism** underlining people’s giving: ‘*it is not just a feel good activity, if we are serious it needs to be done in an organized fashion and monitored and so on*’.

Many of the scientists involved in giving are interested in the design of projects, the implementation and the outcomes. The feedback and alignment with scientific method in many projects are aligned with their belief systems, thus supporting their view that environmental philanthropy ‘makes a difference’.

'The Spark'

Many grew up in or visited natural environments when they were young. Some had parents that were scientists or had a love of the outdoors that was passed on. Many spoke of the **'love of the outdoors'**, were all physically active and enjoyed camping, hiking, beaches and all seemed to have a respect of the **'wonder' of nature**.

Most have (or had) careers involving science i.e. physicians, ecologists, geographers, biologists and thus have a genuine interest and deep understanding of the interconnectedness of the world *'we are part of an integrated whole of the planet'* and importance of the environment for our existence and are concerned. They are highly informed, have a strong interest in and respect for science.

All referred to having a **'lifelong interest'** in environmental issues. All participants were scholars in some way of the environment and referred to reading, studying, traveling or attending field trips, conferences and speaking nights to 'stay informed'. Many are or have been active and passionate members of an environmental group, philanthropy, many reflected, is useful when you can no longer 'act' when you get older. But these are not 'blank cheque' writers, they are engaged philanthropists and mostly 'geeks'!

Among respondents to the survey, when asked to choose from a list of reasons that best described the 'spark' that set people on the path to environmental philanthropy, more than half chose the following reasons above all others:

"I didn't believe government alone could or would do enough to protect our environment, so I understood the need for individuals like me to take action."

Other initial 'sparks' included:

"I was concerned about the future of Australia's natural environment and wanted to do my bit to protect it."

"I believed the damage being done to our environment threatened to undermine the health and security of our society and I wanted to help reverse that."

"I felt a responsibility to do what I could to ensure future generations had the opportunity to experience our unique environment."

Personal benefits

The general feeling about personal benefits is summed up here:

'...there is great satisfaction to do something worthwhile and you believe in and help in someway...'

Members believe in **personal-efficacy** and have this confirmed through their giving. They like 'seeing things happen as a result of your support' – i.e. organisations built, projects undertaken, land (i.e. 'botanical wonderlands') conserved, animals (i.e. rare species) studied etc.

For those giving at the lower end of the spectrum they felt **the challenge to see a difference**, one remarked he *'Scaled my funding where it can have some impact – if the grant goes into \$1m plus project, I don't get a sense that I have made a difference'*. Supporting action that aligns with their values makes them the 'feel good' – *'it feels good to give...more so than buying a huge house or a fancy car'*.

Being involved in the detail of the projects themselves is an immense motivator *'we get involved in discussing the design, how they approach problems...we have always been given feedback...they bought a bit of science into the project. It has been a wonderful experience....being involved in experimental design'*.

In addition to the overall sense of '**satisfaction**' of aligning values, scientific interest with action and effecting change, they were all very positive about the people and experiences that philanthropy gave them.

These interactions with people and experiences strengthened and validated their worldview, values, interests and actions and minimized their isolation as highly environmentally concerned individuals within a larger community more concerned about 'the size of their yachts or latest plasma purchase'.

Survey respondents chose personal satisfaction above all other benefits they received through giving to the environment.

Other personal benefits included:

- *I believe I am fulfilling a personal responsibility to give back.*
- *I am exposed to new projects and organisations.*
- *I feel like I'm creating a positive legacy.*

Members all had a sense of being **outside of the mainstream** in terms of their beliefs, values and wealth. Thus talked highly about the benefit of networking and **connecting with like-minded people**, one remarked 'I feel like I am part of a community'.

Many talked about having met 'great' and 'interesting' friends ('I really treasure them') through environmental giving *'we get to sit around trying to work out what to fund...is fun intellectually'*.

But for some it was not just about enjoying meeting others with similar interests it was meeting **those in a 'similar position'**.

One spoke at length about being very uncomfortable about inheriting a lot of money, she felt guilty and not deserving of it, she felt it made her different and that she could no longer relate to her peers. Getting into philanthropy meant she met a lot of people in a similar position ('a support network was available') who understood that wealth is in some ways a burden and a responsibility. *(There is something here about philanthropists finding 'their tribe' with similar values and position.)*

The *'opportunity to travel to these locations – personal plus, seeing parts of Australia that we would not have had the opportunity'* was seen as personal benefit to many. (Philanthrotourism?).

Many talked highly about the AEGN Arnhem Land field trip last year as an example and others had been invited on field trips as a donor on specific projects. The scientists were especially excited about participating in research. Again the chance to 'hang out' with and meet like-minded souls whilst being 'active' is also appealing about trips.

For this group of highly intelligent, opinionated, passionate, interested people that believe the power of the individual the benefit having experiences (conversations, seminars, conferences and trips) that keeps them informed, connected and engaged to their issues of concern; provides them access to be 'active' in the area and have purpose and meaning, often post exciting careers. 'Staying informed' was something they all gained and valued through giving.

Giving is almost a way of purchasing a stake in environment issues and a license to have an opinion and be engaged.

Tax and PAFs

None were motivated by the tax deduction, all said it was nice, that it was an encouragement but they would all give anyway. Some reflected it allowed them to give more. Some said they give to things where there is no tax deduction.

All were **positive about PAFs** – comments were it streamlined the process, useful, 'philanthropy now structured part of what you do'. Started conversations with the family, bought attention to the issues.

There was some division about how accountable/transparent PAFs are – many believe giving to DGR status organizations should be enough regulation and given you 'are spending your own money' no more reporting/regulation should be required. Another commented that people set up PAFs for the wrong reasons and greater accountability is needed.

One spoke about the government making easier setting up PAFs, not 'changing the rules all the time'.

2. Why philanthropists don't currently give to the environment

'It is the government's role'...

Participants reflected a lot on the role of government as being an impediment to environmental philanthropy. They believe there is a perception in Australia that it is the government's role is to 'fix things' and 'pay for things' and because we pay taxes we have 'done our bit'.

However, most of the participants felt that the government can't and won't fund everything and this will get worse with impending financial issues:

'There will be more demands on the public purse than they can cover' and 'the more people involved the better'.

Despite this belief that government can't and shouldn't necessarily fund everything, some had a concern that 'government would get out of things' or 'get off the hook' with its responsibilities to fund environmental issues because of (their) philanthropic investment.

Generally the group were highly sceptical of government and government's capacity to deliver, *'Politicians are just there for the power – many go in with altruistic intentions and they feel this is there area – but they need to grow up because there are too many things we have to do – they need to acknowledge that.'*

A number were pragmatic about the inevitable 'risk and media adverse nature' of government and saw philanthropy as having an opportunity (and responsibility) 'under the radar' to take risks and trial new things *'philanthropy can be quick, can pilot and hot house ideas'*, thus government's role is to 'scale up'.

When asking about government advocating for philanthropy, there was a mixed response. It was suggested, at a minimum, the government should not be negative about philanthropy, trusts, and charities because *'bad press does not help'*; they need to *'stop berating the sector for being inefficient'*. A few argued that the government needs to market the third sector and one mentioned the 1% campaign in the UK and how the UK government supported this.

A few were concerned that people would be weary of government campaigns because it 'would start a panic because people would think we have run out of money'. However they all reflected that ideally you 'want everyone involved'.

One person said there should be as little involvement as possible from the government because 'they tend to screw things up' – again illustrating a general scepticism of the government's capacity.

Generally it was argued that the government should:

- *lead the way in legislation that 'creates care and sustenance for the environment'*
- *expect others to be involved because it is balanced way of looking at the issue,*
- *make legislation simpler especially with PAFs,*
- *assist through match funding to environmental organisations,*
- *'get serious' about setting up community foundations i.e. provide \$200m down payment to get them going.*

The growth in PAFs is attributed to the previous government and has had a positive impact on philanthropy. All were positive about PAFs because it provided 'structure' in how they gave.

Other 'social' issues or more immediate needs

Most were unsure how you made the environment 'more attractive' than other issues. They acknowledged competition exists with other 'worthwhile' causes such as 'children' or illnesses that have affected families. The group tended to believe that if a person has an interest in the environment they would give to the environment.

'Radical greenie' factor

It was acknowledged that '**radical greenies**' are a turn off for conservative environmentalists, '*Sometimes environmental movements are not walking down the straight line of society*' and this puts people off as they don't agree with the politics, especially the anti-establishment politics! For some it was important that the 'apolitical' nature of environmental organisations (i.e. AEGN) was promoted to set them apart from the 'The Greens'.

The lack of philanthropic culture in Australia

All felt philanthropy had grown over the last 20 years or so in Australia, however many believed there are a great many wealthy people who should give and aren't. Many agreed giving was still not as big as it is in America.

Many reasons were hypothesised for this:

- *different culture to America as the result of historical factors, America was founded on freedom from religious persecution that led to a 'small government' mentality*
- *Australia took on the UK model including the welfare state and big government intervention.*
- *free education and free health creates an attitude of 'someone else pays'. 'When you go to university in America you are privileged, you often get a scholarship, you want to give back, help someone else get the same opportunity. Australians get a free education and government has a responsibility, in the US there is a old wealth mentality – you help people get along...'*
- *Australians are very self-reliant – you take care of yourself and your family, than the wider community.*
- *we have an issue around 'bludgers', we believe that you have to work hard (Aussie battler) and if you do, you deserve it (but don't flaunt it).*
- *Australians have a sense of a 'fair go', which means we are generous in times of emergencies, this is different to philanthropy however.*
- *Australia is a relatively young country that remembers not having wealth, in fact remembers drought, hard-times.*
- *'We don't have mega-wealthy families like we do in America'*
- *the tall poppy syndrome in Australia that doesn't exist to the same extent in America.*

Consumer focus of society

Many felt that others did not give because they had different values focused on self, material possessions and short-term gain. *'They give things that benefit them personally, they don't see nature or old people's home because the don't benefit directly – to me what I do effects my neighbours and the rest of the world, they think in their little space – focus on material things...buy cars, best schools. The class that is growing up has not had philanthropy as part of their modus operandus – like the church community i.e. tithing – you give back...people pay their taxes and think the government should look after that...different values – people do not thinking further than their small group'.*

Invisibility of philanthropy

This is linked to the above comment around the Australian culture of the tall poppy syndrome. Most of those interviewed said they were very quiet about their giving 'I am not going to talk about my giving...find it embarrassing..'. They will speak about it within their community of givers but not beyond. They know they are different to the mainstream. This limits the culture of philanthropy growing in Australia, they know this but still find it difficult to 'speak out'.

Vastness of the environment and lack of understanding

It was suggested that people don't give because **environment is 'too vast'** and a sense of fatalism and climate change, people may think we can't stop it so why try?

Most reflected people don't give because they don't have a connection or an understanding, *'they don't believe anything is wrong,'* and *'the scientific background is not there, the interdependence of survival of the whole – is not there...Consultation is a vital part of getting people involved – we need talk about individual impact and local communities, we get to global and lose people.'*

Also reflected that there is a general lack of giving to the environment in terms of government, existence of NFPs for the environment versus other issues.

Not knowing where or how to give

It was suggested that many people are overwhelmed by the options, one stated his 'major concern is who the hell I give the money to?'. *'The challenge for interest groups is to be aware of that situation [people not knowing what to give to and where to give to] and do something about it'.*

3. Messages that influence high net worth individuals to donate

The following message frames reflect the shared values operating among members and also incorporate the words participants used themselves to describe reasons to give.

Responsibility

'You've contributed all your life, why stop now?'

'Don't think about what you can buy, but what you can contribute.'

'Giving is an effective way to paly your part in handing on our environment to future generations in as good a condition as possible.'

'Government can, or will, only do so much to protect our environment. We all have a role to play.'

The legacy we inherit and leave behind

'Grow something that you'll be proud to leave behind.'

'Leave something behind for your family and the community to benefit from.'

'Grow something you want to step into.'

'You believe environmental change is necessary – we know it is possible, let us show you how'.

'Looking for something more satisfying?'

Be part of the solution

'Contribute to the solutions to the most significant issues facing our environment, such as species extinction and climate change.'

'Help reverse the damage being done to our environment before the impacts on the health and security of our society are irreversible.'

'Government alone cannot or will not do enough to protect our environment, so the need for people like you to take action is so important and valuable.'

Personal satisfaction

'People who give to the environment share a great sense of satisfaction that they are not just part of the solution, but are making a direct difference through giving.'

Life on Earth

'Connect and experience something bigger' (include pictures of trees - participants all loved trees – but more broadly images of the natural environment are powerful motivators).

Case studies of environmental giving in action will help to reassure potential new givers that giving can and is successful, impactful and does produce results – especially within a shorter rather than longer timeframe.

Example of a direct statement from one interviewee: *‘Find projects that address the issue of land degradation for example and look at everyway to promote it – not extreme, not treehugger, appeal to the people that have set up PAFs – this putting the money to good use, talk to us, we can give you a list of projects to give to’.*

4. Insights for a communications plan to support the AEGN’s initiatives

People in the landscape

It was suggested one reason people don’t give is because they give to children and environment is ‘in competition with children’. It is important that AEGN marketing and communications cuts through this dichotomy because it attracts conservative people *‘There are less radical people in the children societies’* (which is in reference to the radical greenies talked about above).

An opportunity here is to focus AEGN’s communications, both via written and particularly supporting visuals, on people in the environment rather than simply promoting the values of wilderness, which denote a landscape devoid of people and is a term of particular annoyance to Indigenous people.

Case studies of successful project and testimonials from current members across a broad spectrum of giving included in marketing and promotional materials via text and images will meet this challenge.

Word of mouth/Immersion experiences

Word of mouth was talked about a lot, building relationships with people (connectors) and exposing them to experiences so they can advocate on AEGN behalf was suggested a number of times; *‘Develop relationships [with those] who are more likely to say I went to this or that or the other – ecological tours...promote the winnable i.e. Antarctica, chose low hanging fruit without berating.’*

Role of the AEGN

Overwhelmingly all of the participants love the AEGN. They think Amanda is great *‘Very fond of Amanda, I like her and try to support her’.*

a) The AEGN as ‘Hub’ of a network – providing opportunities to coalesce

‘...I see you guys as a hub, to bring people together, great seminars, wonderful speakers, The network is doing a great job and is a great model – thrilled to be involved...’.

'...I see them providing a link, connector...what they provide is really good – they are really helpful, interesting people and projects'

Trusted Advisor

The notion of a 'clearing house' came up but they would quickly say AEGN does 'much more', providing quality information on projects and organisations was talked about a lot. These people are busy and love the fact someone else (who they trust) is providing a service that cuts through lots of information to 'rubber stamp' good projects - 'we can give you a list of projects to give to'.

*'...knowing I can contact them on a particular issue – I have said to others when they ask about the environment to go their first...**reliable** and **valid** information'.*

One suggested more geographic and theme based information would be good i.e. locality guide of what is going on. The AEGN should work with local councils more so they are aware of the AEGN's capacity to reach and engage people.

The 'Bridge'

In addition to providing information there is a special function of AEGN to bring people together, to be *'a bridge between philanthropists and organisations, like-minded philanthropists and issues'* etc. (Great visual idea – have a big chasm and a bridge to the 'environment'. Also images of linking lots of people together for joint projects).

'Talk about what you are doing – create groups of people interested in funding the same thing'.

'Is really nice to know that there are other people that think like you...we are the better for organisations that connect people...philosophical connection...gives you strength'

Syndicate Builder

The next step after bringing people together was the idea of collective action. This idea of 'bringing people together on particular projects' came up a lot; *'AEGN should have an active role in helping to facilitate a project getting off the ground – somebody needs to organize it, inform people of the sorts of projects around'.*

Field Trip Organiser

They raved about the field trips. This fits in with education below and bringing people together above. The trip to Arnhem Land *'was wonderful, [we want] more trips, field tours open to the public to spread the word'.*

b) Raise the profile of environmental giving and 'grow the pie'

It is recommended that AEGN generate **positive media stories** around philanthropists or groups of philanthropists and successful environmental projects. Members also want to see AEGN offer media spokespeople *'get Amanda into the news etc'.*

Members want the broader to community to hear 'why philanthropy for environmental projects is a good idea' through ensuring successful projects are given publicity *'if it is a syndicate even better – we got together as a community and we achieved this goal'*. Media can show that 'giving is easy' and this will 'grow the pie' of philanthropy.

They were all proponents of AEGN working with **schools** in some capacity *'be great if you get into schools'* to talk about 'species' and the 'disappearance of biodiversity and consequences', *"It all starts with children, when something cute is threatened, they get a response. It touches people"*. Some reflected on how urbanized Australia is and that we have lost touch with nature, so field trips are important. Some also wanted to see natural sciences, ecology, etc. mandatory curriculum in primary school. They also believed there *'needs to be more dialogue around schools around giving'*.

All believed **education** was required for adults as well and engaging and creative ways were needed *'we need to get people out of concrete blocks and immerse in nature!' to '...remind people environment is part of the fabric in which we live – not separate...'*.

They thought **speakers** going out and making people aware was a good way to promote environmental giving. They liked the idea of existing members talking to new members (**peer to peer**) or people that are not yet involved. A few suggested providing a list of speakers to local schools or mother's group.

c) Focus on those who are interested

There is a this sense that the AEGN is doing a great job, but were cautionary about the AEGN 'spreading itself too thin' and 'losing its base' or personal connection to its members. Advocating to government was seen as little bit of a waste of time, because the group inherently doesn't like government involvement generally. They also saw advocating on environmental issues as not the role of the AEGN (others do that).

They were supportive of partnerships and alliances for education, media and awareness raising. They didn't see pursuing those who were not interested as a good use of resources, instead they suggested engaging those with an interest in the environment, because they saw it as efficient and wanted to see more like-minded people become involved.

www.essentialmedia.com.au

MELBOURNE

PO Box 242
15-31 Pelham St
Carlton Vic 3053
T: 03 9929 9999

SYDNEY

Level 8, Suite 10
377 Sussex St
Sydney NSW 2000
T: 02 8280 9100

BRISBANE

Level 3
16 Peel St
Sth Brisbane Qld 4101
T: 07 3217 2000

ADELAIDE

Level 3
97 Pirie St
Adelaide SA 5000
T: 08 7129 4426

PERTH

Ground Floor
445 Hay St
Perth WA 6000
M: 0419 045 200

BRUSSELS

E Blvd du Roi Albert II 5,
B1, BE-1210 Brussels
Belgium
M: +32 (0) 489 78 86 79