

**Convention on
Biological Diversity**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/COP/11/INF/57
6 October 2012

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE
CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Eleventh meeting

Hyderabad, India, 8-19 October 2012

Item 5.4 of the provisional agenda*

**ENGAGEMENT OF STAKEHOLDERS AND MAJOR GROUPS:
RESULTS REPORT ON WORLD WIDE VIEWS ON BIODIVERSITY**

Note by the Executive Secretary

INTRODUCTION

1. The Executive Secretary is circulating herewith, for the information of participants in the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Results Report of World Wide Views on Biodiversity submitted by the Nature Agency of the Danish Ministry of the Environment on behalf of the Danish Board of Technology and the partner organisations that participated in the initiative.
2. The document is being circulated in the form and language in which it was provided to the Secretariat.

* UNEP/CBD/COP/11/1.



Danish Ministry
of the Environment
Nature Agency

Biodiversitet og arter

J.nr.

Ref.

October 4 2012

Dear Mr. Dias,

I am pleased to transmit to you on behalf of the Danish Board of Technology and the many partner organisations that participated in World Wide Views on Biodiversity, the Results Report of the project that has just been published following the citizens consultations held on 15 September 2011.

As you know this has been a unique initiative to which the Danish Ministry of Environment, the Government of Japan through the Japan Biodiversity Fund and the Secretariat of the CBD, have provided support and I am sure will be of interest to the Parties of the CBD submitted as an information document to COP 11.

Mr. Søren Mark Jensen

Head of Unit
Division for Biodiversity and Species
The Danish Nature Agency
Danish Ministry of the Environment

Email: soemj@nst.dk
Phone +4572544817



Results Report

World Wide Views on Biodiversity

FROM THE WORLD'S CITIZENS TO THE BIODIVERSITY POLICYMAKERS



TEKNOLOGI-RÅDET
THE DANISH BOARD OF TECHNOLOGY

3	Preface
5	Executive summary
6	About World Wide Views on Biodiversity
13	Results
28	World results graphics
31	List of national and regional partners

This Results Report is published by the Danish Board of Technology, the coordinator of World Wide Views on Biodiversity (WWViews on Biodiversity). It has been prepared based on input from WWViews partners and with special help and cooperation from Mr. Richard Worthington, Professor of Politics at Pomona College in Claremont, California, USA.

WWViews on Biodiversity has succeeded thanks to the exemplary efforts of the National and Regional partners in the WWViews Alliance and the support of their sponsors. We are especially grateful to the Danish Ministry of the Environment, the Government of Japan through the Japan Biodiversity Fund and the VILLUM FOUNDATION, whose donations made the global coverage and scope of WWViews on Biodiversity possible. We are especially indebted to the UN Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) which has taken an active part in initiating and implementing this global citizen consultation. Finally, we would like to express our sincere gratitude to the 3,000 citizens around the world who participated in WWViews on Biodiversity.

World Wide Views on Biodiversity

From the world's citizens to the biodiversity policymakers

Results Report

Published by The Danish Board of Technology Foundation, October 2012

Editor: Bjørn BEDSTED, The Danish Board of Technology Foundation

ISBN 978-87-91614-63-7

Photos: WWViews partners (front page: Poul Rasmussen, p 10, Ida Auken: Claus Bjørn Larsen)

Map: Vibek Raj Maurya

Illustration: niels@bobojesen.com

Design: Søren Maarbjerg

This Results Report is available for download at

biodiversity.wwviews.org

WWViews

c/o The Danish Board of Technology Foundation

Toldbodgade 12

DK-1106 Copenhagen K

Phone: +45 33320503

E-mail: tekno@tekno.dk



– People gathered in Tokyo from all different kinds of areas: cities, suburbs, villages, mountain areas and sea sides.

Yasushi Ikebe, Ph. D., Science Communicator



– Citizens living in very different contexts were put together to express their opinions: indigenous people, big and small farmers, fishermen, teachers, engineers and musicians are just a few examples.

Marina Ramalho e Silva, Project Manager



– All types of localities were selected from each governorate: urban, rural, and camps. We invited 12 persons from each governorate: 6 females and 6 males, of the females 1 from 16-24 years old, 1 from 25-30 years old, 1 from 31-40 years old, 1 from 41-50, and 1 from 60 years and above. The same criteria were set for males.

Roubina Ghattas, Project Manager



PREFACE

World Wide Views on Biodiversity (WWViews on Biodiversity) is a globe-encompassing democratic deliberation on biodiversity. It gathered citizen views on international biodiversity policy issues and disseminated them to policymakers involved in the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). It is the second of its kind (the first was on global warming in 2009) and part of the ambition and effort to close a widening democratic gap between citizens and policymakers as policymaking grows increasingly global in scale.

The WWViews on Biodiversity citizen consultation is part of the UN Decade on Biodiversity and a contribution to reaching Aichi Biodiversity Target 1 of the Convention on Biological Diversity's Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, which includes making people aware of the values of biodiversity.

WWViews on Biodiversity contributes to this by giving citizens worldwide a platform for stating their views on how to deal politically with the decline in biodiversity. While scientists and powerful interest groups have already found their way into the international discussions of which policies to implement, no attempts have been made so far to include citizens in these discussions in a structured manner. By introducing the views of citizens into these discussions, policymakers will have a better basis for making decisions in tune with informed public opinion. Furthermore, by including citizens in an informed and structured exchange of views, citizens are more likely to take an interest in biodiversity, to feel more ownership of decisions, and consequently more inclined to support the implementation of those decisions.

WWViews establishes a model for the future inclusion of the world's citizens in global policymaking. In principle, the project design can enable all nations on Earth to take part in producing comparable results that can be clearly communicated to policymakers.

WWViews on Biodiversity involved 3,000 citizens in 25 countries spanning five continents. The citizens gathered in their respective countries to deliberate about some of the core issues at stake in the ongoing, international discussions and negotiations about how to stop the decline in biodiversity and fulfil the Global Strategic Plan for doing so. They received balanced information about biodiversity, discussed the issues with fellow citizens and voted individually on the questions presented to them. They did so at daylong meetings on September 15, 2012.

This report summarizes their answers and presents some of the most significant results, which can be studied in greater detail at biodiversity.wviews.org. The report is aimed at policymakers with prior knowledge about biodiversity issues, and written by the WWViews coordinators in cooperation with the 42 National and Regional WWViews partners.

We hope that political decision makers will make use of the unique insights presented by WWViews on Biodiversity and carefully consider the views of the citizens when formulating the biodiversity policy for the future.

October 2012
Bjørn Bedsted, WWViews Coordinator



SOUTH AFRICA

– More than 100 people from KwaZulu Natal took part in World Wide Views on Biodiversity, delegates included grade 11 learners, university students, royal haskonian, traditional healers, sangomas, fishermen, farmers and concerned citizens.
Dr. Busisiwe P.Msimango, Project Manager



INDONESIA

– Citizens from many parts of Indonesia were discussing biodiversity at the meeting: a Javanese, a Papuanese, and a Sumatranese and many backgrounds were represented: such as an organic farmer, a psychologist, and a student took part in the meeting.
Ruzka Radwamina, Project Manager



BOLIVIA

– Some of the citizens went by bus and by airplane to take part in the consultation; others travelled by two or three buses, and some others again both boat as well as bus and airplane. Some citizens travelled for over three days to reach the meeting in Cochabamba on time.
Ximena Velez-Liendo, Project Manager, Bolivia



On September 15, 2012 the first WWViews meeting started at 9 am in Japan. The last one finished 25 hours later in USA, Arizona. Meetings were held in twenty-five countries.

- BOLIVIA
- BRAZIL
- CAMEROON
- CANADA
- CHINA
- DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
- DENMARK
- DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
- FRANCE
- GERMANY
- INDIA
- INDONESIA
- JAPAN
- MALDIVES
- NEPAL
- NIGERIA
- PALESTINIAN TERRITORY
- PHILIPPINES
- SAINT LUCIA
- SOUTH AFRICA
- ST. VINCENT & THE GRENADINES
- UGANDA
- USA
- VIETNAM
- ZAMBIA



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The results from the global citizens' consultation on biodiversity are clear: there is strong public support for taking further political action in order to stop the decline in biodiversity.

The WWViews results are based on well-established principles for citizen participation and offer unique and detailed insights into ordinary people's views on biodiversity and the question of how to design global policies to deal with its decline. The 3,000 participating citizens from 25 countries were selected to reflect the demographic diversity in their respective countries and regions. They were provided with unbiased information about biodiversity and the international discussions about policy measures to stop its decline, and they were given time to deliberate with fellow citizens.

Although results differ from country to country, there are no significant differences between continents. And although some differences exist between developed and developing countries, the similarities tend to be more significant. Interestingly, young and adult participants vote quite similarly. There were 839 participants between 16 and 24 years of age and 2,165 participants aged 25 or older. The participating citizens voted on alternative answers to 18 predefined questions. Having analyzed the results, we would like to highlight the following:

- Most citizens worldwide do have some knowledge of biodiversity
- Citizens think most people in the world are seriously affected by biodiversity loss and more participants from developing countries than developed think that their country is so
- Citizens worldwide are very concerned about the loss of biodiversity
- The establishment of new protected areas should be given higher priority than economic aims
- Efforts should be made to protect nature areas
- Eat less meat and intensify agricultural production
- Incentives and subsidies leading to overfishing should be phased out
- Protection of coral reefs is a shared responsibility
- More protected areas should be established in the High Seas
- All countries should pay for protecting biodiversity in developing countries
- Benefit sharing should apply to genetic resources already collected
- Use of genetic resources from the High Seas should benefit biodiversity

– WWViews results can be studied in detail at biodiversity.wwviews.org

The timeline

- Late 2010 ● The idea
- Early 2011 and onwards ● The WWViews design
- 2011 – June 2012 ● Selecting the partners
- Mid 2011 and onwards ● Questions and information material for the citizens
- Late 2011 and onwards ● The web tool
- May – August 2012 ● Selecting the participating citizens
- September 15, 2015 ● WWViews Day
- September 15 and onwards ● Making the citizens' views heard



ABOUT WORLD WIDE VIEWS ON BIODIVERSITY

The idea

World Wide Views on Biodiversity was initiated jointly by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Danish Ministry for the Environment and the Danish Board of Technology. Through this partnership, the project aims to contribute to the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity during which the Parties to the CBD will implement a Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 that includes 20 “Aichi Biodiversity Targets”.

These targets were named for the Japanese prefecture where they were created during the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP 10) to the CBD in 2010. The first Aichi Biodiversity Target calls for making people aware of the values of biodiversity.

The WWViews method is a unique and innovative way of engaging citizens in biodiversity policy discussions, thereby raising awareness through other means than campaigns and other traditional educational initiatives.

The Danish Board of Technology has developed the WWViews method in response to the emerging democratic gap between global policymakers and citizens, as more issues (such as global warming and biodiversity), and thus decisions, become global in scale. The method was first developed for the UN climate summit (COP15 of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change) in 2009 in order to involve citizens in a debate otherwise heavily

dominated by scientists, politicians and powerful interest groups. The international discussions on biodiversity are similar in that respect, as is global environmental governance in general.

The Danish Board of Technology has a long tradition of involving ordinary citizens in political decision-making processes nationally and on a European scale and is internationally recognized as a centre for the development of best practices for collaborative democracy.

Inasmuch as citizens will have to live with the decisions that aim to address the decline in biodiversity, it would only be fair to consult them during the preparations. Furthermore, the approval and cooperation of citizens worldwide is critical for decisions to be implemented successfully. In democratic and functional terms, biodiversity policies will not work effectively if they do not enjoy public support.

The project design included the presentation of the WWViews results at the CBD's eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP11) in India in October 2012 and, having completed this project at the beginning of the UN Decade on Biodiversity, the CBD Secretariat has expressed its wish to collaborate on a similar project at the end of the decade in order to learn if and how citizens' views have changed. Participants were overwhelmingly positive when asked about the desirability of future deliberations (see World Results on p 30).

The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity, 2011-2012

Although CBD was opened for signature in 1992 and 168 countries had ratified the agreement by mid-1993, it has not resulted in a halt of the decline of biodiversity. As stated in the Strategic Plan, “It is against this backdrop that the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity... adopted the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2012 with the purpose of inspiring broad-based action in support of biodiversity over the next decade by all countries and stakeholders.”

The mission of the CBD’s Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets is to: “Take effective and urgent action to halt the loss of biodiversity in order to ensure that by 2020 ecosystems are resilient and continue to provide essential services, thereby securing the planet’s variety of life, and contributing to human well-being, and poverty eradication.”

Aichi Biodiversity Target #1 states that:

By 2020, at the latest, people are aware of the values of biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably.

The WWViews design

The WWViews design was developed in response to the practical challenges of making global citizen participation possible. The following criteria were considered essential:

- Cheap and easy: The method had to make it feasible for potentially all countries in the world to participate, regardless of financial income and general education level.
- Clear link to policymaking: It had to address issues of immediate relevance to policymakers.
- Both global and national: It had to pertain to both national and global decision-making.
- Clear and comparable results: Results had to be comparable across countries and regions and they had to be easy to communicate to policymakers.
- Informed citizens: Citizens had to be provided with the balanced information required to understand the issues debated among policymakers.
- Deliberation: Citizens should be given the opportunity to discuss their views with each other before reaching their own conclusions.

On this basis, it was decided to have large groups of citizens (roughly 100) meet in their respective countries or regions to deliberate on an identical set of questions, using identical meeting designs and information material and then link these meetings and their results through web technology.

The WWViews method differs in important ways from conventional opinion polls. Although the sample size of 100 per country or region limits the national statistical validity of the results somewhat, it is nonetheless large and diverse enough to give a sense of general trends in national and international opinions. Unlike opinion polls, the WWViews method provides respondents with balanced and scientifically based information as well as an opportunity to deliberate for a full day with other citizens prior to rendering their judgements. Thus, it encourages the exploration of more substantive questions and well-considered responses, allowing policymakers to assess which policies will be well received if people are properly informed about the rationale behind them.

The method used for WWViews on Biodiversity has been adjusted in various ways, based on evaluations from partners participating in WWViews on Global Warming in 2009 and scientific observations published in the following years.



Project managers from around the world.

Selecting the partners

The WWViews National and Regional partners have been responsible for organizing WWViews meetings in their respective countries or regions. To become partners they should preferably

- have some experience with citizen participation methods
- be unbiased with regards to biodiversity
- be able to follow the common guidelines
- self- or co-finance their participation in WWViews

First, partners already part of the World Wide Views Alliance were invited to join. This global network of partners typically includes public councils, parliamentary technology assessment institutions, non-governmental civil society organizations and universities. It is a network of partners sharing the ambition of making public participation an integral part of global governance. The network was established for the global warming project and has now been supplemented with a number of new partners worldwide.

– It is of utmost importance that we as politicians listen to the citizens and their ideas on how we can put an end to the decline of natural resources, plants and animals on our planet. (Welcoming project managers in the Ministry in March 2012, where WWViews was officially launched.)



Mrs. Ida Auken,
Danish Minister for
the Environment

42 partners from the World Wide Views Alliance collaborated in WWViews on Biodiversity on arranging 34 deliberations in 25 countries spanning five continents. Some partners were self-financed but several partners, especially from developing countries, received support from the Japan Biodiversity Fund. Despite high motivation, several potential partners were not able to join due to lack of financing. Had additional funding been available, the global coverage of WWViews could have been significantly expanded.

Questions and information material for the citizens

The questions put to the citizens worldwide were selected so as to be of direct relevance to the ongoing international discussion about how to stop the decline of biodiversity and with a view to provide decision makers with information about public opinion on different policy measures to do so. They had to be identical in all countries in order to allow for cross-national comparisons. To ensure clear communication to policymakers the questions were predefined with alternative answer options. 13 of the 18 questions chosen were clustered in 4 themes:

- Introduction to Biodiversity
- Biodiversity on Land
- Biodiversity in the Sea
- Burden and Benefit Sharing

The remaining 5 questions focused on evaluating the event.

An information booklet of 20 pages was produced with background information about biodiversity and some of the main issues discussed internationally.

Information videos (each 4-10 minutes long) were made for each of the four themes, repeating the most essential information available in the booklet and ensuring that all citizens would participate in the meetings with the necessary information. All WWViews information material was translated into local languages.


In some countries, WWViews partners decided to gather the citizens the day before the meeting in order to give them the opportunity to familiarize themselves with the information material beforehand. Some partners added an additional session with questions and deliberations on national issues and allowed participants to formulate their own recommendations to their national policymakers.

The questions and information material were developed by BIOFACTION (a research and science communication company in Austria) in close cooperation with the coordinators at the Danish

Board of Technology and the WWViews Alliance partners. An international scientific advisory board was responsible for assuring the quality of the information material, and both questions and information material were tested by focus groups in different parts of the world. This design assured the input of experts as well as ordinary citizens in the development of the questions to be discussed and the information to be provided for purposes of informing those discussions.

The web tool

A special web tool was designed for the purpose of near-instant collection and presentation of the results from the WWViews meetings. The tool allows for statistical presentation and comparison of results between countries and various international groupings (i.e. continents, developed and developing countries). It can be found at biodiversity.wwviews.org.





VIETNAM
 – Some indigenous people from northern mountainous region as well as north central part of Vietnam joined the meeting. The invited citizens were mainly farmers, teachers, retirees, local officers and students.
 Nguyen Thanh Lam, Ph.D.



ZAMBIA
 – In Zambia we had a variety of participants, for instance an engineer, a clinical officer, a charcoal burner and an agricultural officer among others. At the consultative meeting we saw even mothers with their little ones actively taking part in the discussions on biodiversity.
 Sampa Kalungu, Team Leader



INDIA – AHMEDABAD
 – More than 110 participants from cross sections of society participated in the event and expressed their opinions on biodiversity. Participants included fishermen, farmers, pastoralists, naturopaths, housewives, auto drivers, doctors, slum dwellers and planners from institutes such as CEPT and NID.
 Times of india

Training seminar

Most of the Project Managers from the WWViews National and Regional partner institutions met in Denmark six months prior to WWViews Day for a training seminar. The purpose of the seminar was to ensure a common understanding of the project, uniformity of method implementation and procedural solutions for culturally specific challenges. Partners joining WWViews later came to Denmark for individual training sessions.

Selecting the participating citizens

Guidelines for selecting the participating citizens were made in order to ensure the reliability of the results: The citizens at each meeting should reflect the demographic distribution in their country or region with regards to age, gender, occupation, education and geographical zone of residency (i.e. city and countryside). A further criterion was that they should not be experts on biodiversity issues, neither as scientists nor as stakeholders. Where appropriate, the national

partners added further demographic criteria of relevance to their national context, such as race and religion. Finally, in countries where statistics of membership of environmental organizations were available, this was also used as selection criteria in order to avoid an overrepresentation of participants more concerned with nature preservation than the population at large.

Based on reports from the partners, the guidelines have been followed, albeit with some local variation due to economic and other practical limitations. It proved particularly difficult to recruit participants with lower levels of education, and a tendency towards underrepresentation of the less educated can therefore be seen in many countries. Furthermore, some meetings ended up with fewer than 100 citizens. Some countries or regions recruited citizens from their entire geographical area, whereas others recruited from a smaller area in order to cut expenses.

The sample of citizens consulted in WWViews is, however, large and diverse enough to give a sense of general trends in national and international public opinion.



Welcome to WWViews Day



Information videos



Deliberation in groups



Voting after each thematic session



Goodbye and thank you for participating

WWViews Day

THE WORLD

On September 15, 2012 the first WWViews meeting started at 9 am in Japan. The last one finished 25 hours later in Arizona, USA. As the day progressed, citizens voted on alternative answers to the predefined questions. These results were instantly reported at biodiversity.wviews.org so that anyone with Internet access could – and still can – compare answers to the various questions across countries, regions, political and economic groupings, etc.

Photos and videos from the various meetings were continuously uploaded to a media share server. Video interviews with citizens were made available as well. Most countries arranged link ups by way of Internet videoconferences. Others presented pictures and results from other countries to their participants.

THE MEETING

All meetings followed the same schedule: The citizens, divided into tables of 5-8 people, were led through a program, divided into four thematic sessions, by a head facilitator and a number of group facilitators.

Each thematic session was introduced by the head facilitator and an information video. The participants then engaged in moderated discussions at their tables, the purpose of which was to give all participants time to listen to other opinions and reflect prior to voting. Group facilitators were trained in advance to provide un-biased facilitation at the tables. Each thematic session concluded with citizens casting their votes anonymously on alternative answers to a total of 13 questions (three to four questions in each session). Votes were counted by the staff and immediately reported to biodiversity.wviews.org thereby enabling international, quantitative comparisons.

Most meetings were either opened or closed by ministers or high-level government officials. The citizens were apprised of the means by which policymakers would be informed of the results. A short video message from Dr. Braulio Ferreira de Sousa Dias, Executive Secretary to the Convention on Biological Diversity, was screened at the beginning of the deliberation at every site around the world. In this video, Dr. Dias told the participants that he personally looked forward to hearing their views and that they would be presented at a special event with high-level attendance at COP11 in India.

– I have great hopes for this novel way of mobilizing citizens' views in the discussions about global biodiversity policies and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity. This method could be extremely useful to the Secretariat and to governments as a means to facilitate the exchange of views between citizens and policymakers on how to build a future of life in harmony with nature.

Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias, Executive Secretary to the Convention on Biological Diversity





– In October we will bring the results to COP11 in India, where they will be part of the discussions about future action to stop the loss of biodiversity in the whole world.

Bjørn Bedsted, Project Manager



In the Dominican Republic, people travelled from isolated areas like Pedernales, in the border region on Haiti. As an expression of and respect to the diversity of the country, a couple of Haitians living in the Dominican Republic were able to attend the meeting and express their own views

Cesareo Guillermo, Project Manager



– In the Philippines, citizens from remote islands were flown in to participate in the meeting.


Florencia B. Pulhin, Project Manager

Making the citizens' views heard

The target groups for receiving the WWViews results are politicians, negotiators and interest groups engaged in the ongoing CBD negotiations as well as discussions concerned with reaching the Aichi Biodiversity Targets for the fulfilment of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. The WWViews results are especially significant for biodiversity policymakers because they represent the informed and considered views of a broad range of citizens across the world concerning the complex issues to be addressed in the UN negotiations.

In addition to the presentations made at COP11 in India 2012, all National and Regional WWViews partners have employed their own strategies for how to reach these target groups. The goal is to make those engaged in biodiversity policy aware of the results and to encourage their consideration of them.

From the early start in Japan to the late finish in Arizona the many votes and recommendations were instantly reported on biodiversity.wwviews.org and available for comparisons. They still are.





CITIZENS' VIEWS – RESULT HIGHLIGHTS

The general answer:

Do more to stop the decline in biodiversity!

Looking across the votes from all participating countries, it is safe to conclude that public support for taking further political action in order to stop the decline in biodiversity is strong.

The citizens participating in WWViews on Biodiversity became much more informed than the average citizen and they were given time and afforded facilitation for deliberation with other citizens. While there is plenty of space in an exercise like this for each reader to develop his or her own interpretations of the results, several general points seem warranted based on the analysis conducted for this report.

The WWViews citizens express great concern over the loss of biodiversity and this concern is clearly reflected in the support for protective measures at the expense of economic aims.

There is widespread willingness to share costs for biodiversity protection although it is also generally acknowledged that developed countries should contribute more than developing.

There is general support for expanding international regulation of biodiversity and thus the extent to which burdens and benefits are shared.

Although results differ from country to country, there are no significant differences between continents. And although some differences exist between developed and developing countries, the similarities tend to be more telling. Interestingly, young and adult participants vote quite similarly.

The following results are highlighted after thorough analysis by the project coordinators assisted by WWViews Alliance partners from across the world.




Most citizens worldwide do have some knowledge of biodiversity

Almost seven out of ten participants say that they were somewhat or very familiar with biodiversity issues before joining WWViews on Biodiversity.

OBSERVATIONS

- 46% of WWViews participants said they had some (as opposed to a little or no) knowledge about biodiversity issues before joining. 19% said they knew a lot.
- 30% of WWViews participants said they knew nothing or very little before joining WWViews. Only 1% said they still knew nothing after having joined. 9% said they knew very little. 42% said they now knew a lot.

To what extent did you feel familiar with biodiversity issues, before joining WWViews?



How familiar do you feel now?





ASSESSMENT

Aichi Biodiversity Target 1 aspires to a citizenry that is “aware of the values of biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably.” The categories “somewhat familiar” and “very familiar” both seem consistent with the public awareness goal in Aichi Biodiversity Target 1. Although there are differences from country to country, the general picture across developed and developing countries and young and adult participants is fairly uniform.

The proportion of participants that had some knowledge or knew a lot about biodiversity before joining WWViews is fairly high. This should be good news for policymakers relying on public awareness for the successful implementation of policy initiatives.

It is possible that participants in WWViews are more aware of biodiversity than the population at large because of a “self-selection” bias (some might join because they are already familiar with the topic), but strong efforts were made in the recruitment process to emphasize that such prior knowledge was not required.

It is also possible that some participants were unable to adequately recall their level of awareness prior to joining WWViews. Even so, the level of awareness should be relatively reassuring to policymakers.

In addition, it is fair to conclude that WWViews on Biodiversity was successful as a method for raising public awareness about biodiversity and cross national policy issues as indicated by the shift in level of awareness before and after joining WWViews.





Citizens think most people in the world are seriously affected by biodiversity loss

Fewer participants from developed than developing countries think that their country is seriously affected by the loss of biodiversity.

OBSERVATIONS

- Responding to a multiple response question, half the participants in developing countries think that their country is seriously affected by biodiversity loss today. Only a quarter of the participants from developed countries think so.
- Although 84% of participants worldwide say that most people in the world are seriously affected by the loss of biodiversity, only 24% say that their home town/village is, and only 28% say they are personally affected. For example, 5% in Denmark feel personally affected and 61% in Indonesia, but overall, there is no difference in this regard between developed and developing countries.





ASSESSMENT

The unambiguous result for this question is that a significant majority of the participants thinks everyone in the world is seriously affected. A large minority considers their own country seriously affected as well, but the number of participants who considers their locality or themselves affected is much lower.

The fact that a significantly higher proportion of participants from developing countries thinks that their country is seriously affected by biodiversity loss indicates a more acute sense of dependency on the direct use of natural resources that is a more prominent feature of developing country economies than those of the developed countries.

This sense of dependency is also reflected in the general willingness among participants from developing countries to contribute economically to the protection of biodiversity (see the section “Burden and Benefit Sharing” below).

It is tempting to interpret the low responses for the local and personal impacts of biodiversity loss as a

sign that this issue is somehow abstract and distant from citizens. While the global orientation of the participants’ responses might in part be the product of the internationally-focused information material they received, concerns that biodiversity is remote, and therefore unlikely to garner sustained attention and constructive citizen engagement, prompt two observations.

First, it is not insignificant that informed people who have deliberated on global biodiversity overwhelmingly say that all people in the world are seriously affected by its decline. It is thus advisable to continue existing efforts to communicate with citizens about the global consequences of biodiversity loss.

Second, it is advisable that national action plans for implementing the global Strategic Plan in national legislation and actions address the concern that biodiversity is remote from people’s everyday lives, for example by directing communication activities at the local and personal consequences of biodiversity loss.




Citizens worldwide are very concerned about the loss of biodiversity

The concern is essentially the same for young and adults, but significantly bigger for developing than developed countries.

OBSERVATION

- 74% of the participants worldwide say that they are very concerned about the loss of biodiversity. 22% say that they are somewhat concerned.
- The percentage of participants from developing countries saying that they are very concerned is significantly larger (78%) than that of developed countries (63%).



ASSESSMENT

The widespread concern over the loss of biodiversity is remarkable. 97% of the participants are concerned about biodiversity loss, a number that could be considerably lower and still indicate that strong action is warranted. This result indicates that if citizens receive factual information about the loss of biodiversity and have time to discuss it with fellow citizens, they will tend to react with concern.

The fact that more participants in developing countries are “very concerned” than in developed countries probably reflects their greater dependence on the direct use of natural resources and their greater vulnerability to the cultural and economic erosion that accompanies biodiversity loss in such circumstances. This is also consistent with the fact that more participants from developing countries think that their country is seriously affected by biodiversity loss.



Establishment of new protected areas should be given higher priority than economic aims

There is general support worldwide for establishing new protected areas.

OBSERVATION

- 46% of participants worldwide think that establishing new protected areas on land should have higher priority than economic aims unless these are very important.
- An additional 31% say that protected areas should have the highest priority in all circumstances.
- Results for developed and developing countries are fairly similar.

If a conflict arises between existing economic interests and the establishment of new protected areas, what do you think should come first?



ASSESSMENT

The results indicate that there would be strong public support for reaching the Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 of increasing the area of protected land to 17%.

In the midst of a financial crisis it is remarkable that economic concerns are not given higher priority compared to the establishment of new protected areas. It is even more remarkable that this trend is almost as strong in developing as in developed countries.

In the previous World Wide Views deliberation on global warming (2009), a similar phenomenon was observed in that many citizens from low-income developing countries voted in favour of reducing greenhouse gas emissions in their own countries.

One interpretation is, that citizens in developing countries are open to the idea that environmental and economic improvement goes hand in hand.



Efforts should be made to protect nature areas

Education is the most preferred measure.

OBSERVATIONS

- Responding to a multiple response question about preferred measures for protecting nature areas in their country, 36% of the participants worldwide wish to enact stricter national laws to protect nature areas. 73% vote in favour of educating school children and the public.
- While support for education is similar in developing and developed countries, 37% of participants in developed countries favour better enforcement of existing laws, compared to 50% in developing countries.
- 53% of the participants worldwide vote in favour of incorporating biodiversity issues in all other planning activities.

ASSESSMENT


Overall, there is strong support worldwide for protecting nature areas. Participants could have voted that nothing should be done, but they didn't. This sends a strong message to national policymakers and encourages them to take a closer look at their national results, outlining which measures are preferred in their country.

The fact that the strongest support goes to educational measures indicates both a widespread readiness and wish to learn about biodiversity and possibly a realization that education makes it easier for people to take biodiversity into consideration in their daily lives.

The greater emphasis on enforcing existing laws among participants from developing countries reveals a popular awareness that governance of biodiversity should be improved. In developed countries support for incentives are bigger.

The support for the integration of biodiversity in all other planning activities points to a need for education, not just of the public, but also of public administrators, on the importance of this goal and the ways to achieve it.

Which of these measures do you prefer to ensure the protection of nature areas in your country?



The percentage amount shown in the graphs for each answer reflects how many participants chose this answer. Note that the total amount of all answers can be higher than 100%, since participants could choose more than one answer option.
Total, Whole World: 3065

Which of these measures do you prefer to ensure the protection of nature areas in your country?






Eat less meat and intensify agricultural production

The future demand for food must be dealt with by intensifying agricultural production, according to participants from developing countries. Participants in developed countries prefer to eat less meat.

OBSERVATIONS

- 53% of the participants from developing countries want to intensify agricultural production on existing farmland in order to balance the future demand for food with the aim to protect biodiversity.
- Support for the expansion of farmland areas is small (20% worldwide and 23% for developing countries) in comparison.
- 61% of participants from the developed countries wish to reduce demands by eating less meat.



ASSESSMENT

Although noteworthy, it is hardly surprising that participants from developing countries are less in favour of cutting down meat consumption than participants in developed countries.

It is surprising, however, that the support for expanding existing farm land is relatively small among participants from developing countries. Although this is consistent with their support for the establishment of new protected areas, it also points to future challenges of implementing new agricultural practices and technologies that will diminish the conversion of natural areas into farmland. These results challenge policymakers to support the implementation of such practices and technologies, particularly in developing countries.

The readiness among participants in developed countries to reduce meat consumption provides a strong basis for such an approach in national action plans with regard to reaching the Aichi Biodiversity Target 4 of making plans for sustainable consumption.




Incentives and subsidies leading to overfishing should be phased out

Very few participants worldwide disagree.

OBSERVATIONS

- 93% of participants worldwide think that incentives and subsidies leading to overfishing should be phased out.
- 51% of participants from developed countries want to phase out subsidies quickly while 51% of participants from developing countries say that it should happen slowly.



ASSESSMENT

A clear majority of citizens worldwide support phasing out incentives and subsidies leading to overfishing, thus providing policymakers with a clear mandate to use this as an instrument for reaching the Aichi Biodiversity Target 6 of avoiding overfishing.

The greater economic dependency on natural resources in developing countries probably accounts for at least some of the greater support for a slow phase-out of subsidies in developing countries. The speed and need for compensation may differ from country to country, but there is support for proceeding in both developed and developing countries. The fact that none of the two most popular alternatives has a clear majority does, however, signal the need to proceed with care.



Protection of coral reefs is a shared responsibility


The will worldwide to share the responsibility is considerable.

OBSERVATIONS

- 97% of participants worldwide think that all countries should contribute to the protection of coral reefs.
- Of these, 49% think that contributions should be equally shared. Only 27% think that developed countries should pay the main part. This number is the same for the world result and for developing countries alone.

ASSESSMENT

The willingness to share costs equally is almost twice as great as the opinion that developed countries should pay the main part. While this shows that most citizens will be inclined to support reaching the Aichi Biodiversity Target 10 of minimizing the pressure on coral reefs, expectations will most likely be that developed countries pay the most.





More protected areas should be established in the High Seas

Support for doing so is very strong.

OBSERVATIONS

- 90% of participants worldwide support the creation of new marine protected areas in the High Seas. They do so informed (by the information booklet and videos) about the unique legal challenge of regulating areas where no country has sovereign rights and about the significant costs of enforcing agreements in these areas.



ASSESSMENT

The unique characteristics of international governance on the High Seas pose a significant challenge for a new international agreement. The strong support for an agreement, however, can be a considerable resource in addressing this challenge.

The results demonstrate that there is strong public support for reaching the Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 of protecting at least 10% of the coastal and marine areas.




All countries should pay for protecting biodiversity in developing countries

Developed countries should pay the most.

OBSERVATIONS

- 85% of participants from developing countries think that their country should also be obliged to pay for biodiversity protection in developing countries.
- 69% of all WWViews participants think that developed countries should pay the main part.



ASSESSMENT

Although there is widespread agreement that developed countries should pay more than developing countries, it is important to note that 85% of participants from developing countries think that their country should also be obliged to pay.

The readiness of citizens to share the cost of strong biodiversity policies should be of particular interest to policymakers in those countries. This assessment is supported by the fact that a higher proportion of participants from developing countries (14%) than from developed countries (9%) thinks that developing countries should pay the main part. For the least developed countries the number is interestingly 22%. It is also supported by the widespread support for sharing the costs of protecting coral reefs.

These results echo responses in World Wide Views on Global Warming (2009) showing that participants in the least developed countries were more inclined to reduce their own greenhouse gas emissions than those in middle and upper income countries thought should be required of them. The bottom line is that the poorest countries are willing to contribute to solutions.

On the other hand, the fact that the majority of participants vote in favour of obliging developed countries to pay the main part is an equally important input to the political negotiations about mobilizing resources for biodiversity protection in developing countries.




Benefit sharing should apply to genetic resources already collected

Support for this is big, but even bigger in developing countries.

OBSERVATIONS

According to 87% of WWViews participants from developing countries, users of existing species collections of animals, plants and microorganisms should share the benefits with the countries of origin even if the species were collected before the Nagoya Protocol that requires benefit sharing enters into force. 61% of participants from developed countries agree.



ASSESSMENT

It is hardly surprising that a high proportion of citizens in the developing world thinks that they should be compensated for resources extracted in the past by outsiders who benefitted from these transfers. It is more surprising that a majority in the developed countries actually agrees.

The support for this position, then, is strong and this should be taken into account by policymakers when implementing domestic legislation, but the different levels of support in developing and developed countries raise concerns over future implementation of the protocol.




Use of genetic resources from the High Seas should benefit biodiversity

There is widespread support for the introduction of a fee for such use.

OBSERVATIONS

86% of WWViews participants vote in favour of making users of genetic resources from the High Seas pay a fee to global diversity in exchange for being allowed to use them. The support is equally high among participants from developed and developing countries.



ASSESSMENT

There is generally considerable support for stronger international regulation of the High Seas which is also evident in the support for the establishment of more protected areas there.

As is the case for a tax on the use of genetic resources collected before the Nagoya Protocol enters into force, there is generally strong support for benefit sharing schemes.

This result sends a strong message to policymakers trying to reach a new international agreement on rules to be applied in the High Seas. It also points to a possible contribution to reaching the Aichi Biodiversity Target 20 of mobilizing financial resources, through the introduction of fees for using genetic resources, for effectively implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.



The percentages given here and on the results page at biodiversity.wviews.org are calculated in the following way: Where more than one meeting has taken place in a country, equal weight is given to the results from each meeting,

Introduction to Biodiversity


To what extent did you feel familiar with biodiversity issues, before joining WWViews?



How familiar do you feel now?




Who do you think is seriously affected by biodiversity loss today?



The percentage amount shown in the graphs for each answer reflects how many participants chose this answer. Note that the total amount of all answers can be higher than 100%, since participants could choose more than one answer option.
Total, Whole World: 2987

Loss of biodiversity is one of many issues people may be concerned about. How concerned are you about the loss of biodiversity?




Biodiversity on Land

If a conflict arises between existing economic interests and the establishment of new protected areas, what do you think should come first?



Which of these measures do you prefer to ensure the protection of nature areas in your country?



The percentage amount shown in the graphs for each answer reflects how many participants chose this answer. Note that the total amount of all answers can be higher than 100%, since participants could choose more than one answer option.
Total, Whole World: 3065

regardless of the number of participants when calculating the country percentages. The same principle applies to group categories, such as regions, developed/developing countries and the world total. The votes from each country

are given equal weight when calculating the average percentages. At the online result page, comparisons are available between different WWViews meetings, countries, regions and other groupings. The total number of votes

is listed for each answering option, and also available here, is a break out of young and adult votes. In total, there were 839 participants between 16 and 24 years of age and 2,165 participants aged 25 or older.

Which general strategy do you think is most promising in matching the future demand for food with the aim to protect biodiversity?

Expand the farmland by converting nature areas to new agricultural land, which could allow for less intensive and thus more biodiversity-friendly agriculture

20.48%

Intensify agricultural production on existing farmland and thus avoid converting nature areas to new agricultural land

45.65%

Reduce the demand for more food, for example by eating more plants and less meat

29.3%

Don't know / Do not wish to answer

4.57%

Total, Whole World: 2991

Biodiversity in the Sea

Should incentives and subsidies that lead to overfishing be abolished?

Yes, they should be phased out as quickly as possible without providing some assistance or compensation to those who lose their income

8.79%

Yes, they should be phased out as quickly as possible while providing some assistance or compensation to those who lose their income

37.02%

Yes, but they should be phased out slowly so all involved can prepare and adapt over time

47.49%

No, they should not be phased out

4.22%

Don't know / Do not wish to answer

2.47%

Total, Whole World: 2975

Who should pay for the protection of coral reefs?

Countries with coral reefs should pay the main part of the protection themselves

21.16%

All countries, both with and without coral reefs, should share costs

48.63%

Developed countries should pay the main part of the protection of coral reefs

27.11%

No payments should be made

1.01%

Don't know / Do not wish to answer

2.09%

Total, Whole World: 2977

Should a new international agreement be made to establish more Marine Protected Areas in the High Seas?

Yes

90.43%

No

4.51%

Don't know / Do not wish to answer

5.06%

Total, Whole World: 2957

Burden and Benefit Sharing

Who should supply financial resources for biodiversity protection in developing countries?

Payments from countries should be made on a voluntary basis as it is done now, which means that only industrialised countries provide money

5.3%

Both industrialised and developing countries should be obliged to pay, but industrialised countries should pay the main part

68.58%

Both industrialised and developing countries should be obliged to pay, but developing countries should pay the main part

12.51%

Commercial companies and consumers should pay rather than countries

10.62%

There is no need for financial resources

0.65%

Don't know / Do not wish to answer

2.34%

Total, Whole World: 2945

Should users of existing species collections of animals, plants and microorganisms share benefits with the countries of origin if the species were collected before the Nagoya Protocol enters into force?

Yes

80.83%

No

12.5%

Don't know / Do not wish to answer

6.68%

Total, Whole World: 2917

Should users of genetic resources from the High Seas pay a fee to global biodiversity for being allowed to use them?

Yes

85.71%

No

9.78%


Don't know / Do not wish to answer

4.51%

Total, Whole World: 2948


Evaluation questions

Were the briefing materials and videos balanced and informative?




Total, Whole World: 2888

Were different and opposing views presented and discussed at your table?




Total, Whole World: 2859

Are you generally satisfied with the organization of the WWViews process in your country?




Total, Whole World: 2892

Do you believe that the WWViews results will be used in a meaningful way for political decision making on biodiversity?



Total, Whole World: 2897

Should global dialogue processes like WWViews be arranged in the future on different and/or similar issues?



Total, Whole World: 2871



NATIONAL AND REGIONAL WWVIEWS PARTNERS

WWViews is structured as a global alliance of institutions, including public councils, parliamentary technology assessment institutions, civil society organizations and universities. 43 National and Regional Partners from the WWViews Alliance in 25 nations facilitated 34 deliberations September 15, 2012.

Bolivia

PROMETA - Protección del Medio Ambiente Tarija

Brazil

Museu da Vida/Fundação Oswaldo Cruz

Cameroon

ADEID - Action pour un Développement Équitable, Intégré et Durable

Canada, Calgary

Faculty of Communication and Culture, University of Calgary,

Canada, Montreal

Concordia Science Journalism Project, Concordia University,

Canada, Toronto

Coalition: The Halton Peel BioDiversity Network + Canadian Environment Network (RCEN)

China

State Key Laboratory of Vegetation and Environmental Change, Institute of Botany, Chinese Academy of Sciences

Democratic Republic of the Congo

OLESDK - Organisation des Laics Engagés du Sacré Coeur pour le Développement de Kimbondo

Denmark

The Danish Board of Technology

Dominican Republic

Pan American Development Foundation (PADF)

France, la Réunion

Coalition: Missions Publiques + Regional Council of Reunion Island

France, Nord-Pas de Calais

Coalition : Observatoire de la biodiversité du Nord-Pas-de-Calais

Germany

Coalition: Museum für Naturkunde – Leibniz-Institut für Evolutions- und Biodiversitätsforschung an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin + Leibniz Verbund Biodiversität (LVB), Leibniz Association

India, Bhubaneswar

Center for Environmental Education (CEE)

India, Delhi

Center for Environmental Education (CEE)

India, Ahmedabad

Center for Environmental Education (CEE)

India, Chennai

Center for Environmental Education (CEE)

Indonesia

Dana Mitra Lingkungan (DML)

Japan

National Museum of Emerging Science and Innovation (MIRAikan)

Nepal

Coalition: ForestAction Nepal + Federation of Community Forestry Users Nepal (FECOFUN)

Nigeria

National Centre for Technology Management (NACETEM)

Palestinian Territory

Applied Research Institute- Jerusalem (ARIJ)

Philippines

The World Agroforestry Center (ICRAF)

Saint Lucia

The Saint Lucia National Trust

South Africa

Coalition: KwaZulu-Natal Department of Education + KwaZulu-Natal Department of Agriculture, Environmental Affairs & Rural Development

St. Vincent and Grenadines

CYEN - The Caribbean Youth Environment Network (St.Vincent Chapter)

The Maldives

Strength of Society (S.O.S)

Uganda

Coalition: Choice Africa + Youth Social Work Association (YSA) + Uganda Land Alliance + Parliamentary Forum on Climate Change

USA, Arizona

Consortium for Science, Policy & Outcomes Arizona State University

USA, Colorado

Coalition: Colorado School of Mines + the Denver Botanic Gardens

USA, Massachusetts

Coalition: Museum of Science, Boston + The Science, Technology, and Society Initiative (STS), University of Massachusetts Amherst

USA, Washington DC

Coalition: The Consortium for Science, Policy & Outcomes (CSPO), Arizona State University (DC office) + Department of Science and Technology in Society, Virginia Tech + Koshland Museum of Science

Vietnam

The Center for Agricultural Research and Ecological Studies (CARES)

Zambia

Talent Africa



Visit biodiversity.wviews.org for:

- Contact information for partners
- Information about the coordinators
- Links to sponsors
- WWViews documentary
- Information videos for citizens
- Information booklet for citizens
- Photos and videos from WWViews meetings
- Results in full
- Additional information about WWViews



VILLUM FONDEN



TEKNOLOGI-RÅDET
THE DANISH BOARD OF TECHNOLOGY

World Wide Views on Biodiversity involved roughly 3,000 citizens in 25 countries spanning five continents.

The citizens gathered in their respective nations to deliberate about the core issues at stake in the October, 2012 UN negotiations on biodiversity.

They received balanced information about biodiversity, discussed with fellow citizens, and expressed their own views.

They did so in daylong meetings on September 15, 2012.



On WWViews Day the participants watched four information videos. The videos can be seen on biodiversity.wviews.org