

APPENDIX 1:

KEY COMMITMENTS AND OUTCOMES OF 10 YEARS OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

KEY COMMITMENTS AND OUTCOMES OF 10 YEARS OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

(source: Lee, The Ecologist, 2002)

OFFICIAL AGREEMENT AT RIO SUMMIT	OUTCOME
Industrialised nations agreed to return to 1990 levels of CO ₂ emissions by the year 2000.	By 2000, CO ₂ emissions had risen by 18% above 1990 levels in the USA, 11% in Japan, 13% in Canada and 29% in Australia. Climate change is now having dramatic consequences with an increasing death toll and financial cost.
All nations should promote measures for the management, conservation and sustainable development of forests.	Half the world's original forest cover now depleted, with 160,000km ² being lost every year. Current rates will result in 50-90% of species that live in forest becoming extinct by the middle of the 21 st century.
Adequate supplies of good quality water should be maintained for the entire population of the planet.	1.2 billion people drink polluted water, resulting in hundreds of millions of cases of illness and in 2002 water shortages caused 7 million deaths.
Governments should formulate, introduce and monitor policies, laws, incentives and regulations for sustainable agriculture. Land degradation to be arrested, with the introduction of conservation and rehabilitation programmes.	Every year, 26 billion tonnes of soil are lost through erosion; human induced desertification encroaches on 6 million ha of productive land and 2.5 million ha of prime agricultural land are lost through salinisation from large scale irrigation.
The UN Convention on Biological Diversity (Rio, 1992) had the objective of conserving biological diversity and promoting sustainable use of its components.	50-100 species are vanishing every day, which is 10,000 times faster than natural extinction rates and faster than any time in the last 65 million years
Nations committed themselves to the conservation and sustainable use of marine living resources under national jurisdiction and on the high seas.	World commercial fishing capacity is 150% above sustainable levels; government subsidies to fishing amount to \$15 billion pa and fish stocks such as Atlantic cod, herring and haddock are near collapse.
By 2000, there should be systems for environmentally sound management of chemicals, including legislation and provisions for implementation and enforcement in every country.	In 1998 global sales of chemicals amounted to \$1.5 trillion. 25% of all preventable ill health is due to environmental factors that include exposure to hazardous chemicals; rates of cancer are rapidly increasing and this is now the second leading cause of death of children aged 1-14 in the US.
By 2000, governments should have promoted sufficient technological and financial capacities to implement waste reuse and recycling policies and action.	Two-thirds of all waste is dumped into landfill sites, with a variety of harmful environmental consequences. Many countries, including the UK and Republic of Ireland, recycle less than 12% of household waste. It is predicted that waste will increase by a further 70-100% in developed nations by 2020.
By 2000, all countries should mobilise national and international efforts against HIV and prevent resurgence of TB.	Death from HIV/AIDS increased six-fold in the last ten years, leading to 3 million deaths in 2000. There were 8.4 million new cases of TB, up 20% in African countries.
All states should cooperate in the task of eradicating poverty, decrease disparities in standards of living and better meet the needs of the majority of the world's population.	By 1998 the combined income of the richest fifth of the world's population was 78 times that of the poorest fifth. 1.3 billion people survive on less than one dollar a day, estimated to increase by another 100 million by 2015.

APPENDIX 2:

REPORT OF LA21 IN IRELAND SURVEY 2002: LOCAL AUTHORITY FINDINGS

REPORT OF LA21 IN IRELAND SURVEY 2002: LOCAL AUTHORITY FINDINGS

1. Responses

Valid responses were received from the following local authorities

- Ards Borough Council
- Ballymena Borough Council
- Belfast City Council
- Carrickfergus Borough Council
- Cork City Council
- Cork County Council
- Craigavon Borough Council
- Derry City Council
- Down District Council
- Dublin City Council
- Dungannon & South Tyrone Borough Council
- Fingal County Council
- Galway County Council
- Kerry County Council
- Kildare County Council
- Louth County Council
- Meath County Council
- Moyle District Council
- Newtownabbey Borough Council
- North Down Borough Council
- Omagh District Council
- Roscommon County Council
- South Dublin County Council
- South Tipperary County Council
- Waterford City Council
- Waterford County Council
- Westmeath County Council
- Wexford Borough Council

SECTION 1: COUNCIL STRUCTURE

Question 1.3 and 1.4: Job titles and duties of respondents

Job <u>titles</u> incorporating <i>Sustainable development</i> or <i>LA21</i>	
Northern Ireland	4 out of 11
Republic of Ireland	1 out of 16

Job <u>duties</u> incorporating <i>Sustainable development</i> or <i>LA21</i>	
Northern Ireland	8 (+ 2 closely related issues) out of 11
Republic of Ireland	2 out of 16

'Seniority' of respondents	
Northern Ireland	
Officer/Coordinator	4
Chief/Deputy Chief Officer or Manager	5
Senior Manager/Senior Officer	2
Director	1
Republic of Ireland	
Chief Officer/Town Clerk	8
Senior Officer/Engineer/Planner	3
Director of Services	5

Question 1.5: Please estimate the percentage of your time dedicated to sustainable development related activities

Approx proportion of respondents' time spent on sustainable development related activities	All authorities		Northern Ireland		Republic of Ireland	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Less than 10%	8	29%	3	25%	5	31%
10%-25%	4	14%	3	25%	1	6%
25%-50%	4	14%	1	8%	3	19%
More than half the time	6	21%	1	8%	5	31%
More or less full time	6	21%	4	33%	2	13%
Total	28	100.0%	12	100.0%	16	100.0%

Question 1.6: How many *other* people work full or part time on sustainable development related activities within the council?

Type of Post	Average number of equivalent full time posts per local authority		
	All authorities	Northern Ireland	Republic of Ireland
Managerial	0.4	0.3	0.5
Technical	0.7	0.8	0.6
Administrative/Clerical	0.4	0.2	0.8

Question 1.7: What department has lead responsibility for sustainable development related activities/policy?

Department with lead responsibility	
Northern Ireland	
Environment or Environmental Health	4
Development	3
Chief Executive/ Corporate services	4
Republic of Ireland	
Dept of Community & Enterprise	7
Environment/Planning	9

Q1.8: What committee or other body of elected reps has lead responsibility for SD policy?

Elected body with lead responsibility	
Northern Ireland	
Environmental Services Committee	4
LA21 Committee	3
Republic of Ireland	
Strategic Policy Committee	10
County Development Boards	2
LA21 Committee	1

Question 1.9: What approach has the council taken to integrate sustainable development in its structures?

	All authorities		Northern Ireland		Republic of Ireland	
	Number	% of respondents	Number	% of respondents	Number	% of respondents
Staff training in sustainable development	15	54%	10	83%	5	31%
Sustainable development initiatives promoted by one dept.	15	54%	9	75%	6	38%
Sustainable development initiatives promoted by more than one dept.	13	46%	7	58%	6	38%
Sustainable development initiatives promoted by inter-departmental group	12	43%	8	67%	4	25%
Process to inform all departments of sustainable development initiatives	15	54%	8	67%	7	44%
Process to involve all departments in sustainable development initiatives	10	36%	7	58%	3	19%
Process to keep all elected members informed in sustainable development initiatives	12	43%	7	58%	5	31%
External stakeholder group established with council reps	12	43%	6	50%	6	37%
Sustainable development integrated with every element of the Council's work	9	32%	4	33%	5	31%
Other	5	19%	1	9%	4	25%

“Other” includes:

- Using 'Future Search' participatory method to arrive at an integrated strategy
- Emphasising sustainable development when responding to central government consultation papers
- Grant aid to sustainable development NGOs
- No specific integration, although sustainable development is inherent in all activities

SECTION 2: LOCAL AGENDA 21 ACTIVITIES

Question 2.1: Do you think the term “Local Agenda 21” is now an appropriate description of the process of developing sustainable development at a local level?

	Is Local Agenda 21 an appropriate description?					
	Yes		No		Don't know	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Northern Ireland	4	33%	7	58%	1	8%
Republic of Ireland	8	50%	6	38%	2	13%
All authorities	12	43%	13	46%	3	11%

Question 2.2: If NO, is there a term you think is preferable?

Only 11 respondents answered this question, with no exact agreement. The term “*sustainable*” had a high recurrence on both sides of the border; suggestions included:

- Sustainable Development
- Local Sustainable Development
- Promoting Sustainable Living
- Local Sustainability
- Developing Sustainable Communities

Question 2.3: Has the local authority formally established a process that it refers to as “Local Agenda 21”?

	Has the Local Authority established a process it refers to as Local Agenda 21			
	Yes		No	
	Number	%	Number	%
Northern Ireland	7	58%	5	42%
Republic of Ireland	8	50%	8	50%
All authorities	15	54%	13	46%

Question 2.4: If NO (to question 2.3), does the local authority have any plans to establish such a process?

Only 13 councils noted a response, 5 of them having no plans. 7 councils (2 from Northern Ireland and 5 from the Republic of Ireland) had planned future developments connected to sustainable development. Some of the responses included:

Northern Ireland
Intention to build sustainable development principles into the corporate strategy and all other aspects of council business
Republic of Ireland
LA21 'type' committee soon to begin work on sustainability and social inclusion
Draft LA21 document yet to be adopted - needs to be updated - late 2002
Various LA21 type activities in planning, urban renewal, waste management, housing, the Arts etc. are engaged in by the Council, with no formal umbrella of LA21
Intend to prepare and publish a LA21 plan within 15 months
Sustainable development commitments made in corporate plan, but practicalities of reformed local government structures essentially enshrine sustainable development principles

Question 2.5: If YES (to question 2.3), what has this process involved so far?

	All authorities		Northern Ireland		Republic of Ireland	
	Number	% of respondents	Number	% of respondents	Number	% of respondents
Participative process with local community	9	32%	3	25%	6	38%
Multi-sectoral conferences/working groups	5	18%	2	17%	3	19%
Vision statement	7	25%	5	42%	2	13%
Development of LA21 Action plan	8	29%	4	33%	4	25%
Implementation of LA21 action plan	4	14%	3	25%	1	6%
Monitoring reports	2	7%	2	17%	0	0
Others	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Not stated	5	8%	3	25%	2	13%

Question 2.6: Please describe briefly what you regard as the most significant dimension of LA21 activity engaged in by your local authority

	All authorities		Northern Ireland		Republic of Ireland	
	Number	% of respondents	Number	% of respondents	Number	% of respondents
Environmental Issues	6	21%	4	33%	2	13%
Waste Management	8	29%	3	25%	5	31%
Town Planning	5	18%	0	0%	5	31%
Increased involvement with community groups	8	29%	2	17%	6	38%
Housing	3	11%	0	0%	3	19%
Urban Renewal	3	11%	1	8%	2	12%
Increase public awareness	1	4%	1	8%	0	0%
Engaging socially excluded	1	4%	0	0%	1	6%
Other	8	29%	5	42%	3	18%
Not stated	6	21%	2	17%	4	25%

“Other” includes:

Northern Ireland:

- Internal Environmental Management (2 councils)
- Developing indicators/Monitoring reports (2 councils)
- Brokering mediation between different communities during marches (1 council)
- Grant aid to voluntary and community groups (1 council)

Republic of Ireland:

- Bulk of LA21 activities were part of CDB process not named but same principles (3 councils)
- Various LA21 type activities in e.g. planning, urban renewal, waste management etc., but no formal umbrella of LA21 (2 councils)

Question 2.7: To what extent do you think these activities have achieved the ideal set out for the Local Agenda 21 in the Rio Declaration?

	All authorities		Northern Ireland		Republic of Ireland	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Generally achieved	5	18%	1	8%	4	25%
Partially achieved	18	64%	11	92%	7	44%
Not achieved at all	2	7%	0	0%	2	13%
Not stated	3	11%	0	0%	3	19%
Total	28	100%	12	100%	16	100%

Question 2.7a: Please comment on the reasons for answer to 2.7

	All authorities	Northern Ireland	Republic of Ireland
Ongoing process	8	5	3
Lack of resources	2	1	1
Complex programme with success difficult to measure	6	2	4
Require further participation	4	3	1
Lack of integration within the council	3	2	1
Other	2	1	2
Not stated	8	3	5

“Other” includes:

- There was a lack of commitment from higher levels of management within the council (1 council).
- The LA21 was never implemented (1 council).

Question 2.8: How relevant do you think “Local Agenda 21” is to the current attempt to promote sustainable development?

	All authorities		Northern Ireland		Republic of Ireland	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Very relevant	13	46%	4	33%	9	56%
Relevant	5	18%	3	25%	2	13%
Not relevant	3	11%	1	8%	2	13%
Fairly relevant	1	4%	1	8%	0	0%
Not stated/don't know	3	11%	1	8%	1	12%

Some councils added commentaries to this answer:

- Three councils from Northern Ireland and one from the Republic of Ireland felt there was a lack of understanding of sustainable development and Local Agenda 21 by the general public and thus not very relevant.
- One council from Northern Ireland and one from the Republic of Ireland suggested there was no link between LA21 and sustainable development.
- Two Northern Ireland councils felt that the fact that LA21 was not a statutory responsibility was a problem.
- One Northern Ireland council and one from the Republic of Ireland suggested that the relevance of Local Agenda 21 was compromised by its vagueness.

Question 2.9: What types of initiatives would you wish to see emerge from WSSD in Johannesburg to further your local authority’s attempts to promote sustainable development?

	All authorities		Northern Ireland		Republic of Ireland	
	Number	% of respondents	Number	% of respondents	Number	% of respondents
Clearer role for local authorities	4	14%	3	25%	1	6%
Change consumption and production patterns	3	11%	1	8%	2	13%
Greater awareness raising	1	4%	0	0%	1	6%
More global focus, especially 3rd World	3	11%	3	25%	0	0%
Greater government commitment	2	7%	1	8%	1	6%
Funding for initiatives	2	7%	1	8%	1	6%
Renewed emphasis on subsidiarity	1	4%	0	0%	1	6%
More coherence on SD	5	18%	2	17%	3	19%
Legislation needed for local authority objectives	3	11%	3	25%	0	0%
Others	2	7%	1	8%	1	6%
Not stated	8	29%	1	8%	7	44%

SECTION 3: OTHER LOCAL AUTHORITY SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES

Question 3.1: Has the local authority been involved in any initiatives that you think we should know about (other than the LA21 process discussed above), that could be broadly classified as contributing to “sustainable development”?

	All authorities		Northern Ireland		Republic of Ireland	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	21	75%	10	83%	11	69%
No	1	4%	0	0%	1	6%
Don't know	6	21%	2	17%	4	25%
Total	38	100%	12	100%	16	100%

Question 3.2: If yes, please list what you believe are the five most significant initiatives?

21 councils responded to this question, many of them giving up to three examples. These are listed as follows:

Northern Ireland	
Government led initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan • Health Board Initiative 'Tassk' • 'Wake up to Waste' publicity campaign, achieved local effect
Agency led initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arena Network • Bryson House: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reducing fuel poverty through an Energy Agency - Environmental education • Groundwork NI

Local Authority led initiatives:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community-based environmental plan • Environmental education (2 councils) • Energy efficiency scheme for council properties • Best Value • Public participation on waste strategy • Composter trials • Arc 21 (3 councils) • Multi-bin recycling • Indicators report • Mediation between residents and marching groups • Social housing for Travellers • Rural water supply • Supporting community groups
Partnership led initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Need to Know' programme • Local Strategy Partnership (2 councils) • Health Action Zone • Food Futures/Foodlinks • Swamp - a waste management partnership • Representative Rules
Republic of Ireland	
Government led initiatives	Urban renewal (2 councils)
Local Authority led initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council Strategies (8 in total), including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - City/ County Development board's 10 year strategy preparation (4 Councils) - City Development plan (2 councils) - Strategic Management Initiative (SMI) - Anti-poverty strategy • Environmental education programmes (3 councils) • Regional waste management plan (2 councils) • Household waste management scheme • Environmental awareness training and waste plan for council • Inclusion of the sustainable development principle in all plans and policies • Public housing (2 councils) • Housing estate management • Litter schemes (2 councils) • Community wardens • Pollution control • Traffic study • Urban forest scheme • Eco tourism initiative
Partnership led initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recycling initiatives (2 councils) • <i>Rapid</i> - integrated approach to revitalise deprived areas

Question 3.3: Please comment on which of these you feel has been the most effective in promoting sustainable development

Only seven councils responded

Northern Ireland
Involvement with community groups (2 councils)
Joint council working on waste management (2 councils)
Republic of Ireland
Inclusion of LA21 principle in all policy and plans (2 councils)
City development plan

Question 3.4: Is it your perception that your council is better or worse than other councils in the way it has promoted sustainable development?

The Local Authority promotes sustainable development.....	All authorities		Northern Ireland		Republic of Ireland	
	Number	% of respondents	Number	% of respondents	Number	% of respondents
...better than most other councils	7	25%	4	33%	3	19%
... the same as most other councils	21	75%	8	67%	13	81%
...worse than most other councils	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	28	100%	12	100%	16	100%

SECTION 4: LOCAL SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT POLICY COMMUNITIES

Question 4.1.1: What participation methods have been used to engage the public in the LA21/sustainable development-related process?

	All authorities		Northern Ireland		Republic of Ireland	
	Number	% of respondents	Number	% of respondents	Number	% of respondents
Public meetings/community forums	21	75%	7	58%	14	88%
Posters/public exhibition	10	36%	5	42%	5	31%
Surveys and questionnaires	12	43%	5	42%	7	44%
Community workshops	9	32%	4	33%	5	31%
Multi-sector planning with participation	11	40%	4	33%	7	44%
LA21 progress reporting	7	25%	6	50%	1	6%
Working groups	13	46%	7	58%	6	38%
Focus groups/round table	8	29%	3	25%	5	31%
Interactive websites	7	25%	4	33%	3	19%
None of the above	1	4%	0	0	1	6.3%
Other	6	21%	5	42%	1	6.3%

“Other” includes:

- Website (1 council)
- Leaflets (4 councils)
- Children's Day (1 council)

Question 4.1.2: How successful do you feel these methods have been in terms of being both participative and inclusive?

	All authorities		Northern Ireland		Republic of Ireland	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Totally effective	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Generally effective	22	79%	9	75%	13	81%
Generally ineffective	4	14%	2	17%	2	13%
Totally ineffective	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Not stated	2	7%	1	8%	1	6%
Total	28	100%	12	100%	16	100%

Question 4.1.2 a: Reasons for this view:

	All authorities		Northern Ireland		Republic of Ireland	
	Number	% of respondents	Number	% of respondents	Number	% of respondents
Forums/Committees well attended	3	11%	1	8%	2	13%
Lack of public interest/understanding	2	7%	1	8%	1	63%
LA21 only now starting to have an impact	3	11%	0	0%	3	19%
Encourages participation	2	7%	0	0%	2	13%
Other	7	25%	5	42%	2	13%
Not stated	11	39%	6	50%	5	31%
Don't know	1	4%	0	0%	1	6%

“Other” includes:

Northern Ireland

- Difficult to attract non environmental, social, economic and disadvantaged, apathetic groups (2 councils)
- Hard to maintain high interest - in competition with other issues (1 council)

Republic of Ireland

- Council officials do not focus enough time on policy implementation (1 council)
- Local government staff only have 'developing' understanding of real meaning of 'public participation' and the impact it will/should have on the way they work (1 council)

Question 4.2: Please identify formal partners in the LA21 or sustainable development-related process by sector and indicate the support they are providing

<i>Partners</i>	<i>No. Formal Partners</i>	<i>No. Leading the process</i>	<i>No. Providing Paid Staff Support</i>	<i>No. Offering Financial Support</i>	<i>No. Offering Volunteer Support</i>
National government	4	3	0	0	1
Regional government	4	2	3	1	1
Other local government	4	2	3	1	5
Business/private sector	5	2	0	1	6
Community-based groups	7	1	0	0	0
NGOs	6	2	3	0	7
Educational sector	4	0	0	0	6
Professional associations	2	0	0	0	0
Research/scientific institutions	3	0	1	0	1

Ethnic minorities	1	0	0	0	2
Women's groups	1	0	0	0	3
Youth	1	0	0	0	5
International agencies	2	1	0	1	1
Other	1	0	0	0	1

The formal partners included the following (please note categorisation is as it appears on the returned questionnaires):

International agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • European Sustainable Cities UNED-UK (1 NI council) • ICLEI (2 councils, 1 N1, 1 Rol) • EC programmes (1 council, NI) • EU Commission (1 council, Rol)
National Government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Environment and Local Government (9 councils, all Rol).
Regional Government:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environment and Heritage service (1 council, NI) • Arena Network (2 councils, both NI) • Department of the Environment, NI (3 councils, all NI) • Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (1 council, NI) • Dublin Regional Authority (1 council, Rol) • South East Regional Authority (1 council, Rol) • Environmental Protection Agency (1 council, Rol)
Other Local Government	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northern Ireland Housing Executive (1 council, NI) • Other local authorities (5 councils, 1 NI, 4 Rol) • CBC (1 council, NI) • "Within this council" (1 council, Rol) • Leader Groups (1 council, Rol) • Gardai (1 council, Rol)
Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NI Electricity (1 council, NI) • "Local Companies" (1 council, NI) • County Development Boards (1 council, Rol) • Chamber of Commerce (2 councils, Rol) • "Business Pillar" (1 council, NI)
Community-based groups:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NI Tenants Action Project (1 council, NI) • Community Groups (3 councils, 2 NI, 1 Rol) • Strategic Policy Committees (1 council, Rol) • Forum Groups (1 council, Rol) • Various residents assoc. (1 council, Rol) • Community Forums (1 council, Rol) • Community partnerships (1 council, Rol)
NGOs:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forum for the Future (1 council, NI) • Tidy NI (1 council, NI) • Arena Network (1 council, NI) • Groundwork (1 council, NI) • SNIP (4 councils, NI) • Energy Agency (1 council, NI) • "Many others" (1 council, NI) • Ulster Wildlife Trust (1 council, NI) • Foyle Basin Council (1 council, NI) • Heritage Groups (1 council, Rol) • Tourism sector groups (1 council, Rol)

Educational Sector	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BELB (1 council, NI) • Education Boards (1 council, NI) • VEC (1 council, RoI) • Schools and 3rd level colleges (1 council, RoI) Institute of Technology (2 councils, RoI)
Professional associations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chartered Institute of Environmental Health (1 council, NI)
Research/scientific institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University of Ulster (1 council, NI) • An Taisce (1 council, RoI)
Women's Groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ICA (1 council, RoI)
Youth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth farming organisation (1 council, RoI) • Voluntary and Community Platform (1 council, RoI)
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture sector (1 council, RoI)

Question 4.3: Other significant initiatives in area

Northern Ireland	
Initiatives with environmental emphasis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SNIP (4 councils) • Groundwork (2 councils) • Arena Network • Bryson House • Tidy NI • Conservation Volunteers • Woodland Trust • Ulster Wildlife Trust (3 councils) • NI 2000 • University of Ulster Jordanstown • World Wildlife Trust - NI • Foyle Basin Council • Healthy Cities Project • Foyle Regional Energy Agency
Initiatives with social emphasis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police Service NI • Holywell Trust • COSTA (Community organisation of South Tyrone & Areas) • South Tyrone Empowerment Programme • Health Action Zone • Local Strategy Partnership Board • NI Housing Executive • LCVA Lurgan • CNP Portadown
Republic of Ireland	
Initiatives with environmental emphasis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cork Environmental Forum (2 councils) • An Taisce (2 Councils) • Dúchas (the Heritage Service)
Initiatives with social emphasis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cork City Community Forum • Fingal Community Forum • Fingal Business Forum • Community Forum • Kildare European Leader Teo (KELT) • North and South Roscommon Community Forums • Roscommon Partnership Co.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arigna Leader • Mid South Roscommon Rural Development • Galway City Community Forum • Community partnerships • Navan Combined Residents Association • Sonasta, Laytown, Co Meath • Wexford Chamber of Commerce • Wexford Area Partnership • Wexford Tidy Towns Committee
--	--

SECTION 5: CONSTRAINTS AND OPPORTUNITIES

Question 5.1: Please rate the following factors in determining the successful promotion of sustainable development by your local authority where 4=very important, 3=important, 2=not very important, 0=don't know/not relevant

Rate factors in determining success in promoting sustainable development	All (Mean)	All (Ranking)	NI (Mean)	NI (Ranking)	RoI (Mean)	RoI (Ranking)
Reliable and accurate information	3.3	=4	3.3	=6	3.3	=2
Skilled expertise	3.0	=7	3.3	=6	2.8	=11
Adequate financial support	3.2	5	3.6	4	2.9	=8
Community interest	3.3	=4	3.4	5	3.3	=2
Leadership of elected members	3.1	6	3.2	8	3.1	6
Leadership of senior council officers	3.7	1	3.7	=2	3.6	1
Leadership of social partners	3.0	=7	3.1	=9	2.9	=8
Efficient monitoring and feedback	2.8	11	3.1	=9	2.9	=8
Support from national government	3.5	2	3.8	1	3.2	=4
Interdepartmental co-operation	3.4	3	3.7	=2	3.2	=4
Strong community consensus to set priorities	3.0	=7	3.1	=9	3.0	7

Question 5.2: Please rate the following factors in limiting local authority attempts to promote sustainable development where 4=very important, 3=important, 2=not very important, 0=don't know/not relevant

Rate factors in limiting local authorities' attempts at promoting sustainable development	All (Mean)	All (Ranking)	NI (Mean)	NI (Ranking)	RoI (Mean)	RoI (Ranking)
Insufficient information	2.9	=7	2.6	=8	2.9	=5
Insufficient expertise	2.8	=9	2.6	=8	2.8	=7
Insufficient financial support	3.3	=3	3.6	2	2.9	=5
Insufficient community interest	2.9	=7	3.1	5	2.6	1
Lack of leadership of elected members	3.3	=3	3.0	4	3.3	1
Lack of leadership of senior council officers	3.4	2	3.5	3	3.2	2
Lack of leadership of social partners	3.0	6	2.9	6	2.7	=9
Insufficient monitoring and feedback	2.8	=9	2.6	=8	2.8	=7
Insufficient support from national government	3.5	1	3.7	1	3.1	=3
Lack of interdepartmental co-operation	3.2	5	1.5	11	3.1	=3
Lack of community consensus to set priorities	2.8	=9	2.7	7	2.7	=9

SECTION 6: IDENTIFYING EXAMPLES OF GOOD PRACTICE

Question 6.1: Identified examples

14 Councils responded to this question, with three recurring themes:

- Partnerships (2 Northern Ireland and 1 Republic of Ireland council)
- Waste management/recycling initiatives (7 Republic of Ireland councils)
- County/City Development Boards (3 Republic of Ireland councils)

13 councils did not respond (5 NI and 8 RoI). Three councils from the South nominated the strategy preparation for their City/County Development Board (CDB).

Northern Ireland
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nine Lives project, Brighton Borough Council (see: www.ninelives.tv)• 21 Case Studies on LA21, Belfast City Council• No Age to Golden Age. Energy project, Bryson House, Belfast• North Down Environment Awareness Project, North Down Borough Council• Indicators Report, Carrickfergus Borough Council• ECOS Millennium Environmental Centre, Ballymena District Council• Community and School Food Gardens Project, Dungannon & South Tyrone BC
Republic of Ireland
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Limerick Enterprise & Development Partnership, LEDP, Limerick• Suburban Environmental Management, a Participatory Approach (SEMPA), Fingal County Council, Co Dublin• Sustainable Recreational Use of Natural Resources (SRUNR), Dublin Regional Authority• Dublin Bay Wastewater Project, Dublin City Council• Naval Wastewater Plant, Meath County Council• Meath Energy Agency, Meath County Council

SECTION 7: CROSS-BORDER INITIATIVES FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Question 7.1: What issues, if any, do you think require a cross-border response to more effectively promote sustainable development in Ireland?

	All authorities		Northern Ireland		Republic of Ireland	
	Number	% of respondents	Number	% of respondents	Number	% of respondents
Waste management	11	39%	8	67%	3	19%
Transportation	6	21%	3	25%	3	19%
Water issues	5	18%	4	33%	1	6%
Energy renewable	5	18%	4	33%	1	6%
Balanced regional development	2	7%	1	8%	1	6%
Tourism	2	7%	2	17%	0	0%
Air quality	1	4%	1	8%	0	0%
Farming	1	4%	1	8%	0	0%
Trade	1	4%	1	8%	0	0%
Recycling	4	14%	1	8%	3	19%
Others	4	14%	1	8%	3	19%
Not stated	11	40%	3	25%	8	50%

“Others” include:

Northern Ireland

- “Most issues have an all Ireland dimension” (1 council)

Republic of Ireland

- Leadership, promotion, education, challenging low performance (1 council)
- Inclusive community forums (1 council)

Question 7.2: Please identify any existing cross-border initiatives (local or national) that you believe offer an important contribution to the promotion of sustainable development

The responses to this question included:

- Shannon-Erne Waterway
- Blackwater catchment initiative
- 'ERNIE' programme, EU river basin management project involving Omagh District Council
- “Regeneration of cross-border waterways”
- North Down Borough Council's partnership with Fingal County Council in the Edge Cities network
- Tradenet Ireland Ltd
- North West Cross-border Management Strategy, initiated by ERNACT (European Regions Network Accessing Computer Technology)
- Cross-border Waste Forum
- Maracycle

Question 7.3: Please describe any cross-border initiatives broadly related to sustainable development that your organisation is involved in

There were no new initiatives mentioned here. 5 councils reported the same answer as to Q 7.2 and the remainder (12) responded ‘don't know’ or did not respond.

Question 7.4: Are there any specific cross-border initiatives that you feel could be usefully established to further promote sustainable development in Ireland?

Northern Ireland

- Environmental initiatives in relation to recycling markets on an all Ireland basis (economy of scale) e.g. the North South East Corridor (1 council)
- Integrated transport (1 council)
- Better co-ordination/information between North/South initiatives in relation to organic growing, sustainable building etc (1 council)

Republic of Ireland

- Cross-border motoring offences (1 council)

SECTION 8: OTHER COMMENTS

13 councils made additional comments in this open, final section. These included:

- Language of LA21 and SD concepts vague. More concise and understandable concepts would be helpful (1 council)
- Local community groups not aware that LA21 is a consultative process to empower local people to develop in a more sustainable manner (1 council)
- LA21 not given statutory status to force implementation at a local government level (1 council)
- "Questionnaire presupposes understanding of SD and LA21 and participation - all of which are not well understood" (1 council)
- That Sustainable Development and LA21 are happening at all is by default rather than by intent (1 council)
- Insufficient leadership centrally and locally on LA21 (1 council)

APPENDIX 3:

REPORT OF LA21 IN IRELAND SURVEY 2002: SOCIAL PARTNER FINDINGS

REPORT OF LA21 IN IRELAND SURVEY 2002: SOCIAL PARTNER FINDINGS

1. Sample and Responses

Valid responses were received from the following social partners:

- Black Mountain Group, Belfast
- Colin Glen Trust, Belfast
- Corpus Christi Services (NI)
- Belfast Energy Efficiency Advice Centre
- Groundwork (NI)
- Inland Waterways NI
- Lenadoon Community Forum (NI)
- Mourne Heritage Trust (NI)
- The National Trust (NI)
- National Energy Action (NI)
- NI Cycling Initiative
- NI Environment Link
- Rural Community Network (NI)
- Sustainable NI Programme
- Environmental Campaigns (NI)
- WWF (NI)
- Arklow Community Enterprise (Rol)
- Ballyhoura Development Ltd
- Bray Partnership (Co Wicklow)
- Earthwatch FOE Ireland
- Eiri Corca Baiscinn (Co Clare)
- Ird Duhallow (Co Cork)
- Oak Partnership
- COSTA Community Organisation (South Tyrone + areas)
- STEP South Tyrone Empowerment Organisation
- KELT (Kildare European Leader Teo)
- River Bann/Lough Neagh Assoc
- Wicklow Uplands
- Sunflower Recycling, Dublin
- Teagasc - Environmental Research Centre, Co Kilkenny
- Transport 2000 (NI)
- Global Action Plan (GAP) Ballymun, Dublin
- Irish Congress of Trade Unions (ICTU), Dublin
- Friends of the Earth (NI)
- Cork Environmental Forum
- Environmental Protection Agency (Rol)

SECTION 1: NATURE OF THE SOCIAL PARTNER ORGANISATION

Question 1.3: Respondent's role/position within the organisation

Northern Ireland
Chief Executive, Chair or Director (12 organisations)
Coordinator (2 organisations)
Secretary (2 organisations)
Development/policy officer (2 organisations)
Community development worker (1 organisation)
Campaigner (1 organisation)
Regional Manager (1 organisation)
Republic of Ireland
Chief Officer (2 organisations)
Development/scientific officer (5 organisations)
Manager (3 organisations)
Community coordinator (3 organisations)
Project leader (1 organisation)

Question 1.4: Overall aims and activities of the social partner organisation

Sustainability (including sustainable development, sustainable communities or sustainable tourism) (7 organisations)
Combating social exclusion (5 organisations)
Managing natural and human heritage (4 organisations)
Promoting renewable and energy efficiency (1 organisation)
Umbrella organisation for environmental groups (1 organisation)
Environmental improvements (1 organisation)

Question 1.5: How would you categorise your organisation?

(Please note some organisations noted more than one category)

	All social partners	NI social partners	Rol social partners
Semi-state or statutory	2	0	2
Business/private	1	0	1
Community-based groups	2	1	1
NGO: Social issues	12	6	6
NGO: Economic issues	8	5	3
NGO: Environmental issues	18	13	5
Educational sector	1	1	0
Professional assoc.	1	0	1
Other	2	2	0

Question 1.6: What best describes the scale of your organisation's activity?

(Please note some organisations noted more than one category)

	All social partners	NI social partners	Rol social partners
Local	16	5	11
Regional	12	10	2
National	8	3	5
International	1	1	0
Total	37	19	18

Question 1.7: Relationship to local authorities

Respondents were asked to note if their organisation worked with one or more local authorities, and if it worked with a limited number of councils, to note which ones.

	All social partners	NI social partners	Rol social partners
Works with one LA	8	3	5
Works with few LAs	9	4	5
Works with many LAs	16	11	5
Total	33	18	15

The Councils that the social partners noted working for include:

- **Northern Ireland:** Belfast City, Dungannon, Lisburn, Newtownabbey, Newry & Mourne, Down, Banbridge, Ballymoney, Dungannon & South Tyrone, Armagh.
- **Republic of Ireland:** Bray Town, Wicklow County, Cork County, Cork City, Kilrush Urban District, Clare County, Clare County Development Board, Dublin City - Ballymun Regeneration, Kerry County, Offaly County, Kildare County, Dun Laoghaire/Rathdown County, Fingal County.

Question 1.8: If your organisation is NOT in the private sector, how is it funded?

(Only the sources indicated as providing 50% or more of total funding are shown, so some organisations are represented twice in the table).

Funding source	All: Social Partner	NI: Social Partners	Rol: Social Partners
Charitable donations	2	2	0
Business/Corporate	2	0	2
EU (Core costs)	3	1	2
EU (Project funding)	3	2	1
Central Government (Core costs)	11	3	8
Central Government (Project)	8	4	4
Local Government (Core costs)	1	0	1
Local Government (Project)	1	1	0
Other grants	1	1	0
Self-generated income	1	1	0
Membership fees	5	5	0
Other	3	1	2
Total	41	21	20

Question 1.9: Please estimate how many people are employed by your organisation

		All: Social Partners	NI: Social Partners	Rol: Social Partners
No. employed in Ireland	<10	10	6	4
	10-50	10	5	5
	51-100	2	0	2
	>100	1	1	0
No. employed in office	<10	11	6	5
	10-20	9	3	6
	>20	2	1	1

SECTION 2: YOUR ORGANISATION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT RELATED ACTIVITY

Question 2.1: What are the most important things your organisation does to promote sustainable development?

	All: Social Partners	NI: Social Partners	Rol: Social Partners
Nature conservation	5	2	3
Community capacity-building	14	5	9
Awareness raising	17	10	7
Tourism	3	2	1
Promoting energy efficiency	2	1	1
Influencing government policy	6	6	0
Waste management	2		2
Transport	2	1	1
Publications/research	1	1	2
All organisation's activities are important	2		3
Other	10	5	5
Not stated	1	1	0

The "Other" activities defined as important were:

- Housing
- Accessing funding
- Provision of leisure facilities
- Climate change
- Indicators
- Grants
- Childcare
- Employment
- Assistance to local authorities in pollution control and related environmental protection issues

Question 2.2: Please note the appropriate involvement, if any, of your organisation, in any of the following sustainable development related activities in your area

	Informal involvement	Formal partners	Leading the process	Providing paid staff	Offering financial support	Offering volunteer support
LA21 consultation	10	8	2	1	0	1
Specific LA21 advice	4	7	2	0	0	0
General sustainable development consultation	13	9	3	1	1	1
Specific sustainable development advice	5	6	3		1	1
Specific LA21/sustainable development project	2	5	8	1	1	26
No involvement	2	0	0	0	0	0

Question 2.3: If you have been involved in a specific project initiative, please give details of your organisation's role

Initiative	Role
Northern Ireland	
SNIP	Founding organisation or partner (4 organisations)
Urban regeneration	Partnership
Conservation volunteer programme	Lead player
Sustainable tourism	Lead player
Clean-up projects	Organise community groups
Consortium of community, statutory and private groups	Lead partner
Sustainable communities project	Partner
Eco Schools	Lead partner
Natural resource advisory committee	Provision of advice
Republic of Ireland	
Creating statutory/non-statutory partnerships for community participation in sustainable development decision making process	Initiating Wicklow/Dublin Mountains Board
Founder of an LA21 network, working with stakeholders	Providing volunteers and taking part in process
Community woodlands project	Project organiser, providing materials
Global Action Plan (GAP) pilot projects	Networking
All Ireland Community Recycling Network(CRN)	Partners with SNIP
Earth Summit consultation progress	Partners
Members of Comhar	
Local food production support	Partnerships with other NGOs
Water based leisure/conservation projects	Facilitator
Community planning	Facilitator
Education and awareness programmes	Lead partner
Rural environment planning	Development of technical framework
Waste action plan	Project organiser

SECTION 3: EVALUATION OF LOCAL AGENDA 21

Question 3.1: Do you think that the term ‘Local Agenda 21’ is now an appropriate description of the process of developing sustainable development at a local level?

	Is Local Agenda 21 an appropriate description?					
	Yes		No		Don't know	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
North	4	21%	11	58%	4	21%
South	6	38%	5	31%	5	31%
Total	10	29%	16	46%	9	26%

Question 3.2.: If NO, is there a term you think is preferable?

Alternatives include:

- Local Sustainable Development (2 organisations)
- Sustainable Development Agenda or Sustainable Living Agenda
- Improving Sustainable Development Locally
- Sustainable Development
- Living for the Future
- Community Plan

Question 3.3: Has the local authority in your area formally established a process that it refers to as ‘Local Agenda 21’?

	Has the Local Authority established a process it refers to as LA21?					
	Yes		No		Don't know	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Northern Ireland	9	50%	1	6%	8	44%
Republic of Ireland	5	31%	4	25%	7	44%
Total	14	41%	5	15%	15	44%

Question 3.4: If NO, do you know if the local authority has any plans to establish such a process?

Only 3 respondents answered this question which points to a failure in communications between social partners and local authorities and thus a lack of interest and awareness about the process.

Question 3.5: If YES, what has this process involved so far?

	All Social Partners	NI Social Partners	RoI Social Partners
Participative process with local community	12	6	6
Multi-sectoral conferences/working groups	13	7	6
Vision statement	10	8	2
Development of LA21 action plan	7	3	4
Vision statement	12	9	3
Monitoring reports	5	3	2
Implementation	3	2	1
Other LA21 activities	2	1	1

Question 3.6. What has been your involvement, if any, in the Local Agenda 21 Process?

There were 11 responses from Northern Ireland, including:

- Membership of LA Forum (2 councils)
- Membership of Ministerial LA21 Advisory Panel
- Advising and working with communities
- Facilitating participative approach to consultation with 5 different councils

There were 8 responses from the Republic of Ireland, including:

- Membership of Local Strategic Policy Committee (SPC)
- Chairmanship of LA21 citizens group
- “Working with statutory bodies directly implementing Agenda 21 projects and process” (2 organisations)
- Aim to get state and semi-state and local government to own and adopt LA principles
- Facilitating consultation

Question 3.7: To what extent do you think these activities have achieved the ideal set out for the Local Agenda 21 in the Rio Declaration?

	All Social Partners		NI Social Partners		RoI Social Partners	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Generally achieved	2	6%	1	5%	1	6%
Partially achieved	20	56%	13	68%	7	41%
Not achieved at all	8	22%	4	21%	4	24%
Not stated	6	17%	1	5%	5	29%

Question 3.7a: Please comment on the reasons for answer to 3.7

Some of the responses to this question were as follows:

Benefits of SD to community not made relevant (7 organisations, 5 from NI, 2 from RoI)
Local authorities have limited power to deliver(3 organisations all from NI)
Local authorities are good on consultation, but poor on real engagement/action (2 organisations, both from NI)
Good work by LA: wider public need to be more involved (2 organisations, 1 from NI, 1 from RoI)
Patchy work by LAs across region, some notably good (3 organisations, all from NI)
No true partnership, only lip service (3 organisations, all from NI)

Question 3.8: How relevant do you think “Local Agenda 21” is to the current attempt to promote sustainable development?

	All Social Partners		NI Social Partners		RoI Social Partners	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Very/fairly relevant	12	33%	4	19%	8	53%
Relevant	3	8%	3	14%	0	0%
Not relevant	4	11%	4	19%	0	0%
Not stated/don't know	17	47%	10	48%	7	47%

Question 3.9: What types of initiatives would you wish to see emerge from WSSD in Johannesburg to further help the promotion of sustainable development in your area?

The types of initiatives listed in the responses included:

- Greater central and local government commitment to sustainable development
- Increased public awareness of sustainability issues
- Integrate sustainable development with other government functions
- Further development of sustainability indicators
- US involvement
- More attention to energy users, particularly action on fuel
- More education in schools as part of party manifestoes
- Making sustainability personally relevant e.g. energy conservation
- Twinning with towns in the Southern Hemisphere

SECTION 4: EVALUATION OF OTHER SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES AND POLICIES

Question 4.1: Are there any other initiatives that you think we should know about (other than the LA21 process discussed above), that could be broadly classified as contributing to “sustainable development” in your area?

Fifteen social partners suggested that there were other initiatives not previously identified in the survey. These are detailed under the responses to question 4.2.

Question 4.2: If yes, please list what you believe are the five most significant initiatives?

There was a good response to this question, with 17 from Northern Ireland and 9 from the Republic of Ireland and most responses noted at least two examples.

There were 17 responses from Northern Ireland, including:

- **Recycling and waste minimisation/management**
The impetus for these initiatives appeared to be coming from various local authorities, in particular Belfast City Council and Bryson House, were seen as being key organisations. Bryson House was also the lead organisation in a community development and energy efficiency project. It was also noted that some of the organisations were using funding through the landfill tax to employ community environment and education officers in the local authorities (e.g. Ulster Wildlife Trust).
- **Neighbourhood renewal**
6 respondents cited initiatives involving renewal of deprived areas. The lead organisations were the councils, city centre management companies, Encams, the

Department for Social Development, and a joint North/South project involving Inland Waterways Association of Ireland and Waterways Ireland.

- **The Saffron Project**
This project creates jobs and educates the public within the Belfast Hills and was an initiative led by an environmental group.
- **Planning and transport issues**
The Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan (BMAP) and the Regional Transport Strategy (RTS) were noted as being significant sustainable development initiatives.
- **Partnerships/forums**
There were also references to the work of two forums and two partnerships. For example the Civic Forum and Belfast LA 21 Forum initiated by Belfast City Council provide fora for various sectors pursuing sustainable development.
- **Partnerships**
Local Strategy Partnerships (LSPs) in the North bring together social partners, local authorities (usually the lead organisation) and other community stakeholders to deliver EU funding. The respondents from Northern Ireland mention LSPs throughout their survey responses and it appears that these may have the potential to put into practice what one social partner calls the “truly integrative value of sustainable development”. Community Safety Partnerships were also mentioned, led by the PSNI and involving the local authority and other community stakeholders. These dealt with basic security issues and evoked the response from one social partner that these issues are “crucial to the success of sustainable development”.
- **Community Relations Policy**
One respondent mentioned this initiative, because “Sustainable Development in Northern Ireland is the Peace Process” (respondent's emphasis).
- **Other issues**
A number organisations also saw tools such as sustainability audits/indicators or Best Value practice as significant.

There were 9 responses from the Republic of Ireland, including:

- **Development Plans**
Three respondents referred to the development plans issued City/County Development Board. The Dublin City Council Management Plan was mentioned by one of the respondents.
- **Agriculture**
Support for small farms from government funding bodies and a Focal Farming Programme feature here.
- **Coastal Management**
A coastal zone management plan, not formally included in LA21 but encompassing many similar principles, was noted by one respondent.
- **Community initiatives**
A number of community-based initiatives were noted by the Republic of Ireland respondents, including community visioning, and community based indicators for monitoring.
- **Neighbourhood renewal**
Integrated Area Plans (IAPs) led by Dublin City Council where community participation is high was one example given, as was the redevelopment of Dublin Docklands, where a Dockland council was formed involving community representatives. Village renewal, led by the social partners and the local authority as well as by a social partner-driven Community Forum, was important to a rural based respondent.

Question 4.3. Please comment on which of these you feel has been the most effective in promoting sustainable development

There were 11 responses to this question (7 from Northern Ireland, 4 from the Republic of Ireland). Of these, four respondents suggested that it was too early to judge how well the initiative had been implemented.

The remaining effective initiatives were:

Northern Ireland
Two Bryson House led schemes and a community development/energy efficiency project at Beechmount in west Belfast
Neighbourhood renewal
The Regional Transport System – although this could have been more focused on sustainability issues
Local Strategy Partnerships
Omagh Pride in our Town - wide range of stakeholders and targeted education programme
Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan (BMAP) - it is hoped that this may show progress on the links between transport patterns and land use
Belfast County Council initiated some excellent sustainability policy thinking, with its Forum having the potential to transform rhetoric into reality
Republic of Ireland
Bantry Bay Project - this engaged all sectors and contributed significantly to community development
A community based accessible and inclusive structure whereby people can become involved as active agents in the process of rural sustainability
Community Development Board (CBD), Dublin, whose main aim is to cover the social economic and cultural heritage of Dublin

SECTION 5: PARTICIPATION AND THE ROLE OF THE LOCAL AUTHORITY

Question 5.1: What participation methods have been used to engage the public in the LA21/sustainable development-related process?

	All Social Partners		NI Social Partners		RoI Social Partners	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Public meetings/Community forums	20	56%	12	57%	8	53%
Posters/public exhibition	12	33%	7	33%	5	33%
Surveys and questionnaires	12	33%	80	38%	4	27%
Community workshops	13	36%	8	38%	5	33%
Multi-sector planning with participation	12	33%	5	24%	7	47%
LA21 progress reporting	9	25%	6	29%	3	20%
Working groups	13	36%	9	43%	4	27%
Focus groups/round table	14	39%	10	48%	4	27%
Interactive websites	4	11%	3	14%	1	7%
None of the above	9	25%	5	24%	4	27%
Other	2	6%	2	10%	0	0%

Question 5.2: How successful do you feel these methods have been in terms of being both participative and inclusive?

How successful are these methods?	All Social Partners		NI Social Partners		RoI Social Partners	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Totally effective	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Generally effective	12	38%	7	39%	5	36%
Generally ineffective	9	28%	6	33%	3	21%
Totally ineffective	2	6%	1	6%	1	7%
Not stated	9	28%	4	22%	5	36%

Question 5.3: Please give a few brief reasons for this view

The responses to this question fell into those that gave reasons for being successful and those that gave reasons for the ineffectiveness of the consultation process.

Issues of success

A comment made by 3 social partners (2 from NI, 1 from RoI) was that where the actual consultation process had been well designed and thought through, there had been a high level of participation. One organisation from the Republic of Ireland noted that where the community themselves were given stewardship of initiatives, they were generally more successful.

Lack of effectiveness

The main reasons given were that social partners perceived that there were not enough attempts at community participation or the initiatives that were attempted lacked relevance and understanding of the issues involved (7 respondents, only one from the RoI). 2 respondents from the Republic of Ireland felt that specific groups were not adequately targeted, while another believed that there had been little impact on policy change especially with regard to planning and sustainable development. One respondent from the Republic of Ireland highlighted the importance of monitoring the participative process, to ensure some understanding was generated of who had been involved, and who had been left out.

There was also some understanding of the difficulties faced by the local authorities in increasing opportunities for participation, as some social partners appreciated that the LAs may have limited access to power, time and dedicated staff, as well as the fact that the councils vary a lot in their commitment (the last point was made by 5 organisations, all from Northern Ireland). Furthermore, there was a recognition that the effectiveness of the social partners themselves may have reduced effectiveness in participation because they sometimes feel diluted by apathy, or that views are unbalanced because of the stronger voices of more vocal, better organised groups, e.g. on issues of social inclusion (4 respondents, 3 from Northern Ireland).

Question 5.4: What do you think best describes the local authority's role in sustainable development in your area? Please rank the descriptions 1-5 with 1 being the most fitting and 5 being the least

Respondents were asked to rank each of the following roles of the local authority and the social partner most worked with. These rankings were then scored, with the top ranking given a score of 5 and the lowest 1. The mean scores shown below are averages of those aggregate scores and the overall ranking derived from them.

	Mean score: All Social Partners	Ranking: All Social Partners	Mean score: NI Social Partners	Ranking: NI Social Partners	Mean score: RoI Social partners	Ranking: RoI Social Partners
Provides civic leadership	1.5	5	1.6	4	1.3	5
Leads by example	1.6	4	1.3	5	2.1	3
Encourages others	2.1	2	1.8	2	2.4	2
Facilitates others	1.8	3	1.7	3	1.9	4
Pays lip service	2.6	1	2.0	1	3.2	1
Frustrates progress	0.8	6	0.8	6	0.7	6

Question 5.5: Is it your perception that the local authority that you work mostly with is better or worse than other councils in the way it has promoted sustainable development?

The local authority promotes sustainable development.....	All Social Partners		NI Social Partners		RoI Social Partners	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
...better than most other councils	9	25%	5	26%	4	27%
... the same as most other councils	16	44%	8	42%	8	53%
...worse than most other councils	2	6%	1	5%	1	7%
N/A or don't know	9	25%	5	26%	4	27%

SECTION 6: CONSTRAINTS AND OPPORTUNITIES

Question 6.1: Please rate the following factors in determining the successful promotion of sustainable development by the council that your organisation mostly deals with. Please use 4=very important, 3=important, 2=not very important, 1= not at all important, 0=don't know/not relevant

	All Mean	All Ranking	NI Mean	NI Ranking	Rol Mean	Rol Ranking
Reliable and accurate information	2.9	=6	3.2	=5	2.6	=8
Skilled expertise	2.9	=6	3.3	=2	2.3	=10
Adequate financial support	3.0	=4	3.2	=5	3.0	=1
Community interest	3.1	=2	3.2	=5	2.9	=2
Leadership of elected members	2.7	=10	2.9	=8	2.3	=10
Leadership of senior council officers	2.9	=6	3.3	=2	2.8	=4
Leadership of social partners	3.0	=4	2.9	=8	2.9	=2
Efficient monitoring and feedback	2.7	=10	2.7	=11	2.6	=8
Support from national government	3.1	=2	3.3	=2	2.8	=4
Interdepartmental co-operation	3.2	=1	3.7	=1	2.8	=4
Strong community consensus to set priorities	2.9	=6	2.9	=8	2.7	=7

Question 6.2: Please rate the following factors in limiting local authority attempts to promote sustainable development, using the same rankings, 4=very important, 3=important, 2=not very important, 1= not at all important, 0=don't know/not relevant

	All Mean	All Ranking	NI Mean	NI Ranking	Rol Mean	Rol Ranking
Insufficient information	3.1	=5	3.4	=4	3.2	=6
Insufficient expertise	3.0	=7	3.3	=7	3.1	=7
Insufficient financial support	3.3	=1	3.6	=1	3.5	=2
Insufficient community interest	2.8	=10	3.1	=9	2.8	=11
Lack of leadership of elected members	3.1	=5	3.4	=4	3.0	=9
Lack of leadership of senior council officers	3.3	=1	3.5	=3	3.4	=3
Lack of leadership of social partners	2.9	=9	3.2	=8	3.1	=7
Insufficient monitoring and feedback	2.8	=10	2.9	=11	3.0	=9
Insufficient support from national government	3.3	=1	3.4	=4	3.6	=1
Lack of interdepartmental co-operation	3.2	=4	3.6	=1	3.3	=4
Lack of community consensus to set priorities	3.0	=7	3.0	=10	3.3	=4

SECTION 7: IDENTIFYING EXAMPLES OF GOOD PRACTICE

Question 7.1: Identified examples

- The Plastic Bag Levy implemented by the DoELG in the Republic of Ireland (quoted by 3 organisations, all from NI)
- Community projects with an environmental focus
- Cross community initiatives in NI such as Greencare and Creating Common Ground
- EU funded Community Counselling service (NI)
- SNIP and their Sustainable Communities Programme
- Green Purchasing
- Community Pharmacy scheme (NI)
- Lower Watts Housing (energy efficient houses) (NI)

- ECO schools (NI)
- Reed Bed project (RoI)
- Youth Forum (RoI)
- The All Ireland Community Recycling Network (cross-border)
- Mourne/Wicklow Twinning project (cross-border)

SECTION 8: CROSS-BORDER INITIATIVES FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Question 8.1: What issues, if any, do you think require a cross-border response to promote sustainable development in Ireland more effectively?

	All Social Partners		NI Social Partners		RoI Social Partners	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Transportation	3	8%	3	8%	0	0%
Waste Management/recycling	1	3%	1	3%	2	6%
Energy issues	5	14%	5	14%	0	0%
Water issues	3	8%	3	8%	0	0%
Tourism	3	8%	3	8%	1	3%
Farming/food	2	6%	2	6%	2	6%
All-island fiscal measures	2	6%	2	6%	0	0%
Biodiversity	1	3%	1	3%	1	3%
Urban poverty	1	3%	1	3%	1	3%
Encouraging great cross-community links	3	8%	3	8%	1	3%
Other	5	14%	5	14%	4	11%
Not stated/don't know	2	6%	2	6%	6	17%

Question 8.2: Please identify any existing cross-border initiatives (local or national) that you believe offer an important contribution to the promotion of sustainable development

There were just 6 responses to this question, 4 from NI and 2 from RoI, which included:

- The North South Ministerial Council
- The campaign to close Sellafeld
- The Ireland Fund
- Mourne Wicklow Twinning Group
- Erne Shannon Link
- The Enterprise train service

Question 8.3: Please describe any cross-border initiatives broadly related to sustainable development that your organisation is involved in

16 groups responded, as follows:

- The All Ireland Recycling Network (3 social partners, 2 from RoI, 1 from NI)
- Internal networking with bodies like Friends of the Earth, Earthwatch and An Taisce (4 social partners, 1 from RoI, 3 from NI)
- Mourne Wicklow twinning group (2 social partners, 1 from RoI, 1 from NI)
- North South Voice (1 social partner)
- UCD (1 social partner)
- Energy efficiency (1 social partner)
- Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) (1 social partner)
- Cross-border project to deliver work base (1 social partner)
- Re-opening of the Ulster Canal (1 social partner)

Question 8.4: Are there any specific cross-border initiatives that you feel could be usefully established to further promote sustainable development in Ireland?

15 issues were mentioned, many of which had been noted in previous answers. The issues that were mentioned here for the first time include:

- Encouraging cross-border dialogue between academics, policy makers and practitioners (1, NI)
- Establishing Comhar as an All Ireland Partnership (1, ROI)
- Encouraging more cross-border dialogue in the NGO sector (1, NI)
- An all Ireland spatial strategy (1, NI)
- Joint study on renewable energy on an all island basis (1, NI)

SECTION 9: OTHER COMMENTS

There were 12 respondents who offered comments, some echoing points made earlier in the questionnaire. The comments included:

From Northern Ireland:

- A desire to explore cross-border links further
- A re-iteration of the view that among many ordinary people there is a total lack of understanding about LA21, which is often further frustrated by the language used
- Criticism of current local and regional government organisation being at odds with LA21 initiatives
- A view that the key problems lie with the current process, rather than the concept of LA21
- Political will or leadership is probably the biggest weakness in hindering pressure to advance sustainable development at all levels, not just top-down, and that partnership agreements are hampered by adversarial political roles
- The debate is not being engaged in seriously enough to make a discernable difference

From the Republic of Ireland:

- Sustainable development/LA21 is a brilliant idea but it is being buried by the State and, to a lesser extent, forgotten by the social partners
- LA21 could do with a re-launch and re-branding of what sometimes appears to be an outdated and confusing name
- A realisation that LA21 is not utilised as an integral part of the respondent's programme

APPENDIX 4:

LOCAL SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT CASE STUDIES

4.1: Case Study 1: Foyle Basin Council

Introduction

The Foyle Basin Council (FBC) was a small environmentally-based NGO operating in the North West of Ireland, straddling the administrative boundary of Donegal County Council and Derry District Council. It was very active in promoting the local sustainable development agenda in this area between 1997–2000, has been widely quoted as a key organisation in stimulating a more grass-roots vision of LA21 in Ireland¹ and was one of the relatively few voluntary organisations involved in sustainability issues on both sides of the border. Despite this apparent success, the FBC encountered a number of problems that made it difficult to continue in this role, ultimately resulting in its office being closed in late 2002. The use of the organisation as a short case study therefore seeks to illuminate some of the financial and political issues related to NGO involvement with LA21.

Case Study Method

The use of the Foyle Basin Council as a case study has offered a number of difficulties. The most significant was the fact that the organisation had been wound down by the time the case study was conducted, so there were difficulties in contacting relevant individuals who were involved within the FBC and its partner organisations, such as the local councils. In addition, some of the key issues related to the case study were related to events that took place up to five years ago, so that even some of those closely involved had some difficulty in recounting the detail of what happened. Finally, the Foyle Basin Council was a small, voluntary organisation and as such had limited administrative resources and capacity for publication so that written sources are not as freely available as for some of the other case studies. Despite these obstacles, interviews were undertaken with 4 key individuals related to the organisation, either as employees, funders or as council officers in its partner local authorities. The accounts of all these were largely compatible and it is therefore believed that a generally accurate picture of the organisation's activities has been established. Some of the lessons identified use the Foyle Basin Council as an illustration, but tend to be very general in nature.

Background to the Foyle Basin Council

The FBC emerged as an identifiable entity, with an office and full-time staff, in 1997. It had its origins as a loose federation of smaller community-based environmental organisations (e.g. groups from Moville, Inishowen and Buncrana) who had come together around the campaign against the Du Pont² proposal to develop a chemical incinerator in an industrial estate on the outskirts of Derry City. The campaign was successful, if not entirely conclusive, and the groups decided to build on the energy, experience and awareness developed during the campaign to develop the environmental agenda in the area further. The newly formed organisation received generous PEACE I funding in 1997, enabling it to formalise its staffing arrangements and enter into substantive dialogue with the councils in the area.

¹ The Foyle Basin Council also received "official" endorsement from the government of the Republic of Ireland, with the former Environment Minister, Noel Dempsey, appearing in its promotional video. It was also given an Environmental Partnership Award two years in a row for its LA21 awareness raising by Donegal CC and the DoELG

² Du Pont encountered a number of vociferous and largely successful campaigns against their installations in Ireland (see Allen and Jones, 1990).

Project aims

The aims of the Foyle Basin Council³ were:

- The promotion of meaningful Local Agenda 21 processes
- Freedom of access to information
- Meaningful community participation in decision-making
- The maintenance of the integrity of the Foyle Basin eco-system and commitment to the Irish environment

These clearly reflect common perspectives held by local activists campaigning against proposed development, often viewing local authorities as siding with potential developers, frustrating genuine debate of the issues and engaging in tokenistic participation. Notably, these are also key issues recognised at an international level as being obstacles to local sustainability⁴ and seen as being constraints to successful LA21. These aims also show a willingness to go beyond the adversarial relationship with the local authority characterised by anti-development struggles, and to establish partnership through the LA21 process. Notably, the first of these aims, particularly the insertion of the word “meaningful”, also suggests some initial scepticism that the local councils would promote LA21 processes that would not fully grapple with some of the more difficult issues related to local sustainability, and a belief that if they were close to the process a “stronger” version of sustainable development might evolve. The other noteworthy issue related to these aims was that the organisation was focused on the ecological territory of the Foyle Basin, spanning the border, rather than tying its activities to any specific political-administrative unit.

Organisation

The FBC was initially funded for two years (1997-1999) through PEACE I funding. This was extended by another year up to 2000 and amounted to a total of nearly £70,000 for core costs, supplemented by discrete funding of a variety of projects (for example from the Irish Republic's National Education Development Fund, and Derry City Council). The core funding enabled the organisation to secure office accommodation and employ three members of staff: a Coordinator/Manager, an Administrator and an Administrative Assistant. In addition to this, there were other short term appointments, including someone to develop the website, and the office also provided accommodation for a number of volunteers, some of whom would have secured their own grant funding from the Millennium Sustainable Development Fund. The employees were accountable to a cross-community Management Board.

Although the cross-border location of the project was central to accessing PEACE funding, the issue of bringing together communities from Donegal and Derry was not consciously pursued, but was a function of basing the campaign on the physical entity of the river basin.

Activities

Although the FBC emerged from a campaigning organisation, once established it sought to develop a positive dialogue with the local councils (primarily Derry City) and aimed to outline a more "radical" model for LA21 before the council began to adopt what FBC perceived to be a "more watered down" version of local sustainable development. At this time it was probably one of the only social partners in Northern Ireland pushing a local council into a "stronger" version of

³ See <http://www.sustainableireland.org/services.htm>

⁴ For example the Aarhus Convention (1998. Article 4 of which relates to access to environmental information and Article 6 to public participation)

LA21. It began this dialogue at a propitious time, when Tony Blair was expressing a desire for all UK local authorities to adopt LA21 plans by 2000 and when local council officers were internally grappling with the implications and logistics of beginning the LA21 process. Therefore, while it would be inappropriate to claim that FBC initiated the Derry LA21 process, its approach to the council did enable the issue to rise up the political agenda of the local authority and enabled council officers to engage senior staff and politicians to commit the council to the process.

Although FBC worked with both Derry and Donegal councils, it struck up a closer partnership with the former, where it was the main, perhaps only partner, with the city's LA21 process. This clearly gave the FBC some influence in the direction of the process, but also worked well for the local authority, which saw FBC as a good source of advice on environmental issues. Council officers recognised the talents of FBC's Coordinator, who had greater ability to enthuse less energetic council staff and other organisations into the adoption of LA21 principles. FBC agreed a "framework for partnership" with the council and prepared a work programme for the development of a LA21 strategy. As well as working directly with the Council on the LA21 process, FBC also continued to exert political pressure on the Council, for example working with War on Want to get the Council to commit to Fairtrade principles.

However, the ultimate outcome of the city's LA21 process has been a little mixed and partly (but by no means exclusively) tied up with the ultimate demise of the FBC. Derry Council has now completed an LA21 Action plan, which was due to be launched by the Minister of the Environment prior to the suspension of the NI Assembly in 2002. The assertions that Derry's LA21 would have progressed quicker and with a "stronger" version of sustainability if FBC had continued to have a presence are difficult to discern, although Derry Council is quite rare in Northern Ireland for having established a cross-departmental sustainability group as a result of the group's involvement.

In addition to this role as an LA21 partner, FBC also:

- Delivered training in sustainable development to staff of Derry Council
- Undertook a LA21 survey in Derry
- Organised a series of conferences, such as one on Gender, Social Justice and the Environment that brought together representatives of Nigeria's Ogoni people with campaigners in NI to discuss issues of corporate responsibility (i.e. Shell and Du Pont). Another conference focussed in the issue of 'faith communities' and the role of churches in taking forward LA21 and highlighted theological support for sustainable development. This conference gave rise to the broader concept of "eco-congregations" and some activities are still on going in the Derry area e.g. Holy Family Church is still involved in a recycling scheme and has recently been funded with £18,000 by Derry Council.
- Established a series of Sustainable Community Information Points (SCIPS), which were aimed at providing an information stand for local libraries to hold leaflets etc on LA21 activities and to encourage people to access the FBC web site. This project was funded up to £15,000 by Derry Council.
- Supported individuals to access Millennium Sustainable Development Fund, and then support the individuals in their funded projects
- Engaged in awareness raising of LA21 and the "stronger" versions of sustainable development in Northern Ireland and the Irish Republic, being invited by many organisations across the island, such as Chambers of Commerce, to discuss its work.

Decline of Foyle Basin Council

Although the Foyle Basin Council was relatively influential in its engagement with local councils through LA21, it failed to acquire funding through PEACE II, because of new criteria which focused more on reconciliation activities directly related to the Troubles. Because the organisation was overly dependent on PEACE I as a source of funding, it encountered financial difficulties; partly as a result of this uncertainty, the Coordinator took up a post elsewhere in Northern Ireland. This individual was clearly central to FBC's capacity to deliver many of its projects and its LA21 dialogue with councils, to the point that officers in Derry Council believed that without him the FBC had a much-reduced role. This contributed to the Council's subsequent employment of its own LA21 Officer, and with the establishment of this in-house expertise, it then became less reliant on external sources of advice. There is also an issue of "competition" with advice becoming available from the Sustainable Northern Ireland Programme (SNIP), which has become more firmly established in the last 4 years, funded by the local authorities of Northern Ireland and based in Belfast.

These funding difficulties were also accompanied by a number of difficulties in the political relationship with Derry Council, when FBC provided advice to its Sinn Fein members on the Council's plans to look again at proposals for an incinerator. Given the acute sensitivity over political relationships in Northern Ireland, this resulted in a breakdown in the trust between FBC and the Council, and particularly with its largest party, the SDLP. This did not help the organisation when opportunities for funding were dwindling.

The Coordinator left FBC in September 2000 and in a climate of uncertainty over future funding, the organisation had difficulty in recruiting an adequate replacement. This also then had a knock-on impact in that it then faced difficulties in persuading would-be funders that it had the capacity to deliver on projects. The activities of the FBC declined during 2001, with the Administrator remaining in a voluntary role until late 2002, when it closed its office. It is currently inactive.

Analysis of the case study

As noted above, the researchers faced a number of problems in collecting data for this case study. As a result it is difficult to provide hard evidence of any of the outputs from the Foyle Basin Council, in particular to evaluate accurately its impact on Derry's LA21 process. This is, however, a common issue in the evaluation of LA21 at the local level, dealing as it does with a process-driven and value-laden area of activity. Nevertheless, the account given above does highlight a number of issues related to the assumptions of the role and capacity of voluntary organisations in the LA21 process. Without wanting to appear judgmental on the role of Derry Council or the Foyle Basin Council itself, an attempt has been made to highlight some of the strengths and weaknesses *of the contribution of the FBC to the LA21 process*. This is the only focus of this brief evaluation and it does not touch on any broader consideration of FBC or the Council.

Strengths

The need for councils to be open in public participation

The willingness of Derry Council to establish a partnership with Foyle Basin Council, formerly opponents on waste management issues, represents a maturity and openness that should be at the core of the LA21 process. The process of civic engagement is difficult; the engagement of those who may have very different views from the Council will ensure a more robust consideration of key issues.

The need for credibility in public participation

The Council also recognised that, given the relatively poor profile and performance of local authorities in public participation, there was much to be gained by establishing an open and close relationship with an organisation with a campaigning background such as Foyle Basin Council as a way of gaining credibility. This was intended to give a strong message that the Council was serious about engaging the local community on environmental issues, although it is unclear how local business interests may have perceived the relationship. A more cynical view may interpret this as perhaps being a tactic to exploit FBC's credibility by bringing them into the process and thus neutralising potential criticism, but it appears both sides were genuine about the LA21 process.

Ways of "strengthening" the concept of local sustainability

The Foyle Basin Council was very clear in its view that, without any serious engagement with environmental interests, the Council was likely to adopt a rhetorical position on local sustainable development. It therefore judged that, in the spirit of LA21, it would be better to enter into a dialogue with the council to influence the "strength" of the model of sustainable development to be discussed, rather than adopt a more adversarial position on council policy. This must have had an impact on the Council, through debate and ensuring that the Council reflected on its own policy. It is unclear how far FBC was ultimately able to influence the final LA21 process, but does show a good understanding of why a wide range of stakeholders should be involved in LA21.

The critical role of Practice-Orientated Evangelists (POEs)

Other sections of this report discuss in more detail the idea that the driving force in many examples of good practice in local sustainability rests with those identified as being Practice-Orientated Evangelists (POEs) – energetic individuals who work relentlessly to “spread the word” of sustainability through local community activity. It appears that much of the success of the Foyle Basin Council was dependent on the skills and drive of its Coordinator who had enthusiasm and a clear vision of what the organisation could add to the local sustainability agenda. This was recognised by the local community and the local authority, thus making Foyle Basin Council an attractive LA21 partner. There are, however, a number of issues that emerge from the role of these POEs, although these are extremely general in nature. Firstly, their enthusiasm, expertise or zeal is often unmatched by others in their organisations, particularly in small NGOs such as FBC and even in local authorities. As a result of this dependence, when the POEs move on, for whatever reason, projects or initiatives may collapse – particularly in an area such as sustainability which is not a statutory function of local authorities. Secondly, if there is a heavy reliance on these POEs to take forward the sustainability agenda, their role can be a frustrating one, constantly facing hurdles from the individuals and a system that has not yet “seen the sustainability light”. This can be an exhausting experience, perhaps increasing the likelihood of their searching for alternative roles.

Weaknesses

Problems related to financial sustainability in the voluntary sector

Voluntary organisations such as FBC constantly face problems of securing long term funding, which clearly creates difficulties for the organisation and its employees, as well as for the local authority seeking to develop long-term partnerships with such local social partners. Indeed, local authorities may underestimate the difficulties faced by such organisations and may expect high levels of commitment to the LA21 process, without realising the significant financial costs this may have for voluntary sector organisations. In hindsight, it can be seen that FBC were over-dependent on a single source of funding and would have benefited from employing a fundraiser, or alternatively committed more of its existing staff resources to its financial

sustainability. Although receiving core funding from local councils could compromise the views of organisations such as FBC, it does point to the potential benefit of a more centrally controlled fund for local sustainability in Ireland, perhaps as an extension of the existing landfill levy in Northern Ireland.

The limited capacity of LA21 Social Partners

While local authorities are adapting to managing increased levels of public participation, they sometimes tend to look to social partners (including NGOs and businesses) to provide high levels of advice or human resources to LA21 - as if this were their main *raison d'être*. The local authorities may not fully appreciate the limited capacity of NGOs to provide such resources, particularly given the funding issue mentioned in the last point.

Both social partners and local authorities need to adjust to new partnership arrangements

It is generally accepted that moving towards more participative forms of governance required by LA21 requires new ways of appreciating local political relationships (e.g. see Young 2000). Critics invariably point to the local authorities as the key protagonists in such a situation, for example for their unwillingness to cede control of certain policy arenas, while this case study also points to the need for social partners to also adjust to a new spirit of partnership. As was explained above, FBC emerged from a background of local environmental campaigning, implying a more adversarial relationship with the council, while its new role as a LA21 partner required a more co-operative approach. However when new proposals for an incinerator began to emerge, it created tensions within the organisation as it was drawn back into its former lobbying activity, while the new role of LA21 partner really demanded a more discrete and practical approach to the issue. The reversion to lobbying was not appreciated by certain members of Derry City Council and resulted in a breakdown of trust, as discussed above. While this situation also reflects poorly on the political culture of the Council in how they dealt with the issue, the case study does point to the need for *all* stakeholders in LA21 to adjust to new partnership arrangements – not necessarily to drop previous principles, but to act differently, in a more discursive way, which requires openness on both sides. For environmentally-based stakeholders there is therefore a need to appreciate the subtle differences between sustainability as a negotiated consensus and environmentalism as an area of political struggle.

Opportunities for the future

Although the above discussion represents a very generalised and simplistic picture of the Foyle Basin Council, it does highlight a number of important issues related to the role of NGOs in LA21. Some key lessons for local sustainability in Ireland could therefore be seen as being thus:

- The limited capacity and financial constraints on the voluntary sector should be recognised and potentially ameliorated through a sustainability based funding mechanism.
- The partnership arrangements required by LA21 require mutual adjustment by local authorities and social partners. Failure to embrace the implications of new forms of governance will inevitably lead to a deterioration of the relationship and, ultimately, the failure of the LA21 process.
- It is important to ensure that as wide a range of stakeholders is involved in LA21 as possible as they will inevitably all hold differing perspectives on what it means to be "sustainable". Only by a working through of local issues can a shared appreciation of a sustainable future be achieved.
- As sustainable development is not an area of statutory responsibility, it appears that examples of good practice are particularly influenced by enthusiastic individuals, labelled here as Practice-Orientated Evangelists (POEs). These are energising forces within

local sustainability and consideration is needed about how their zeal can be supported and encouraged.

References

Allen, R. and Jones, T. (1990) *Guests of the Nation: the People of Ireland versus the Multinationals*, London, Earthscan.

Aarhus Convention (1998) *Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, agreed at Aarhus, Denmark, on 25 June 1998*. ECE/CEP/43. The full text of the Convention is available at www.eel.nl/treaties/CEP43E.htm.

Young, S.C. (2000) 'Participation strategies and environmental politics: Local Agenda 21', in G. Stoker (ed) *The New Politics of British Local Governance*, Basingstoke, Macmillan

4.2: Case Study 2: SEMPA

Introduction

Suburban Environmental Management – A Participatory Approach (SEMPA) was a large, innovative community planning project with an impact on over 30,000 residents of the northern suburbs of Dublin. The project was led by Fingal County Council, and was initially driven by the need to develop an area management plan on foot of the assignment of a Special Amenity Area Order (SAAO) to the Howth Peninsula. The project sought to avail of this opportunity to develop competence in and understanding of, on both the local authority and community sides, participatory planning approaches.

Background

The project

The SEMPA project ran from 1999 to 2002, funded by the EU through the LIFE programme, with a total project budget of about €5.5M. The project was led by Fingal County Council, with partners Dublin City Council, Irish (Suburban) Rail, Howth-Sutton 2000 (a local community group), Howth-Sutton-Baldoyle Chamber of Commerce and the Natural Resources Development Centre in Trinity College Dublin.

The area

The project area is a suburban district on the northern side of Dublin, about 12 to 15 kilometres from the city centre. The area, which includes the neighbourhoods of Howth, Sutton, Baldoyle, Kilbarrack, Grange and part of Raheny, has a population of about 31,000, and stretches across the jurisdictions of two local authorities, Fingal County Council and Dublin City Council.

Two particularly important ecological areas are contained within the range of SEMPA: the coastal ecosystem of North Dublin Bay, one of only two UNESCO Biosphere Reserves designated in Ireland, and Howth, which is governed by a Howth Special Amenity Area Order. The recent classification of Howth as an area of special amenity was part of the impetus for the SEMPA project. As well as these ecological distinctions, the area also possesses a very wide range of social and economic characteristics, from very exclusive residential areas to areas of high social deprivation.

Project aims

SEMPA literature stated the aims of the project as a demonstration of “new approaches to environmental management” which have direct relevance to:

- The management of environmental, land use and transport resources in cities, and city suburbs in particular, throughout Europe
- The management of coastal environments and other high quality natural and semi-natural environments under development pressure
- The integration of statutory environmental designations into a community centred approach

(Source: <http://www.sempa.ie/>):

The objectives of the planning approach to be tested in the project were given as (SEMPA website):

- Strengthen the capacity of local groups to participate in all stages of the planning process
- Focus local resources in areas suffering from social exclusion, places lacking an identity, and community groups lacking cohesion

- Resolve conflicts of interest, in particular between local and non-local groups
- Integrate 'top down' and 'bottom up' planning processes
- Monitor and measure the success of local plan making and mobilisation activities
- Promote participation in all stages of the planning process from data collection to the later stages of plan implementation, monitoring and review
- Use local planning programmes to raise environmental awareness and to promote the idea of effective local action
- Develop and use local sustainability indicators

Project approach and structure

The project was overseen by a steering group (called Environmental Forum and consisting of representatives of local community groups, a public transport agency [Irish Rail], and the two local authorities). Its function was to take an overarching view of the project and its plans, resolve conflict or provide guidance as necessary, and generally steer the project. The work of the project was structured through five Local Planning Groups (generally referred to as LPGs). These were project teams based around specific themes (an area management plan for Howth and the development of an area plan on recreation and tourism were the themes for LPG1 and LPG2 respectively, as set out in the original project proposal; the themes for the other three groups were developed with the partners as the project proceeded). Most LPGs consisted of about 15 to 20 people.

The project was organised in two phases, the first developing two LPGs as well as engaging in consultation to determine the themes of phase II, which would create three more LPGs. It was planned that the five main project partners would ultimately each chair one of the five LPGs. Irish Rail, for example, chaired LPG 3, which dealt with area transport issues.

The five LPG themes were:

- LPG 1 – Preparation of a management plan for the Howth Special Amenity Area Order (SAAO)
- LPG 2 – Development of recreation and tourism in the area
- LPG 3 – Transport, particularly looking at ways to encourage non-car transport to and from DART (suburban rail) stations, chaired by Irish (suburban) Rail
- LPG 4 – Environmental behaviour among local businesses, chaired by Howth-Sutton-Baldoyle Chamber of Commerce
- LPG 5 – Issues in the Dublin City Council area of SEMPA, including management of green areas, chaired by Dublin City Council

Initial developmental work was based on community meetings (three meetings in each of six areas) using approaches such as planning for real and community mapping. The planning groups were formed out of these initial meetings, and with reference to existing groups and structures.

The project placed considerable emphasis on this locally based planning activity, one of its innovative elements. Also external facilitators were engaged for the meetings, and formal community planning techniques employed.

As the local planning groups coalesced and undertook their work, the project team gave support and encouragement, providing information and administrative support, and generally guiding the project and the groups. Phase II of the project, centring on LPGs 3, 4 and 5, involved a smaller number of wider based community meetings. As the project proceeded, slippage had occurred and time frames and budget were tighter for the latter activities.

The main project outputs are the reports of the LPGs. LPG 1 and LPG 2 in particular produced sizeable and detailed plans for their areas and themes, and have been well received by the local authorities. Some elements of the plans have already been implemented or taken on as objectives by the local authorities. Other LPGs also produced output plans. In general, the project focused on planning rather than implementation, and these reports were the end of the main project itself. Some implementation elements were planned, but for the most part were not completed due to time and budgetary constraints.

Another output of the project, from the schools' element, is an environmental education resource CD-ROM, which has been distributed widely. As an element of the initial project plan, some work was undertaken on indicators, but not as much as originally envisaged, and with no major outputs.

The project closed with a large conference in Dublin in September 2002, with about 100 participants for a series of talks and workshops. The case study author presented a paper drawing on this research project. The conference was a valuable experience-sharing event, which included international as well as national speakers, and many members of the LPGs and the local communities participated.

Case study methods

Compared to other cases studies in this project, there is a large amount of formal and informal written material on SEMPA, including many evaluation reports and ancillary analyses. These materials form a significant input into this case study analysis (see references). In addition, three of the main project personnel were interviewed.⁵ The case study author, as a speaker at the SEMPA conference, used the opportunity to talk to a number of people associated with the project, including several members of the LPGs and community activists. All of these conversations form part of the broad data set for this case study⁶.

Analysis

General views of the project are largely very positive. Certainly there has been little criticism of its intentions or its values. Some reservations have been expressed about its success and its legacy, particularly regarding the step from planning to implementation. The project co-ordinators themselves are the first to acknowledge this potential weakness. However at the very least the project contributed much to learning and capacity building, and has the potential to foster better relations between the local authorities and the communities for the future.

Positive outputs

The most obvious tangible benefit of the project was the set of plans developed by the LPGs. There were often detailed, well thought through documents which had gathered together considerable local knowledge and led to recommendations considered legitimate by a wide range of actors, including the local communities and the local authorities themselves. The attributes of enhanced information and quality, and shared ownership are particularly valuable.

Other tangible benefits of the project include:

- The Howth community council-local development structure that grew directly out of one of the local planning groups

⁵ Two of the project planners were interviewed together after the close of the project. The project leader was informally interviewed through a series of conversations relating to the SEMPA conference and at other points in the project.

⁶ Individuals were made aware of the data collection interest of the author when appropriate.

- An enhanced proficiency in consultation among Fingal County Council personnel
- Better informed local authority plans

These are to identify the most tangible positive legacies of the project, but there are of course wider positive attributes. The planning model proved largely robust and seems to have much to offer participatory planning. LPGs successfully bring local experts and interested parties together with wider expertise and with the planning authorities themselves. This offers the potential for outputs to draw upon optimal knowledge resources and to achieve full legitimacy and shared ownership.

The project managers report success in terms of bringing disparate elements together around common environmental interests. These interests related to local environment and quality of life issues, particularly litter and waste; development pressures; transport; and recreation, youth and social exclusion. Despite the wide range of communities covered by the project, interest seemed to coalesce around these themes, and the project offered opportunities for shared planning on the issues.

Strengths

SEMPA gave people real influence on the development plans, strategies and county council work programmes for their areas

There is no doubt that the project was successful in giving many people the opportunity to communicate with their local authorities in a way that led to meaningful influence on plans and priorities. This included the benefits of:

- better relationships
- better legitimacy for decisions
- better decisions by including local knowledge and local priorities
- building the status of participation among exposed council people

In several areas of local authority work (e.g. parks, roads), there was evidence of the influence of SEMPA outputs.

The project established better relationships between the communities and the local authorities

In a context of relatively poor prior relationships and considerable cynicism among local people, SEMPA succeeded in improving mutual understanding and respect in a number of areas. Among other achievements, a better local understanding of the thinking of the local authority was achieved. There are, however, risks associated with this if the local authority is perceived as having not followed through on planning into implementation of the plans (see below).

Local communities were given the opportunity to improve local structures and communications

Some of the groups brought together as LPGs or other such organisations have stayed active and become local forums. This shows a strong positive effect in building local community identity. On the other hand, there were cases where existing community divisions had to be skirted around in order to gain access in the first place, and so in some cases community divisions were avoided rather than tackled.

Weaknesses

The project placed too little emphasis on implementation

While recognising that the project's principal aim was to pilot innovative planning processes, it is widely recognised that the lack of clear procedures (and budgets) to ensure implementation of the plans produced was a weakness of the project. As well as failing to capitalise on valuable

information and well-produced plans, poor implementation, as mentioned earlier, risks creating more cynicism and setting back the agenda of encouraging genuine participation.

Community empowerment was limited to building on existing social capital rather than generating newly empowered communities

It is possible to argue that the SEMPA model relied on communities to have structures in place prior to the project, which were then built upon by the project. While this worked well to build the power and capacity of certain communities and individuals, those that were 'outside the loop' prior to SEMPA were most probably still excluded by the end of the project. In other words, the project was more successful in leveraging existing social capital to give it greater access and influence, than in creating new social capital.

The community planning ethos failed to establish itself fully in the local authorities

There is evidence to suggest that development of a community planning ethos and competence was restricted within the local authorities to the direct project participants. SEMPA remained somewhat in the mode of a project, bound by area and by time, rather than a new way to carry out all planning business for the future. While it is very positive that competent community-oriented planners are begin fostered and rewarded, it would be unfortunate if a project like this did not manage to disseminate the culture to other planners and officials in the local authorities. If significant long term change is to be achieved, this dissemination is vital.

Opportunities for the future

Among the key lessons from the project are:

Local planning activities require skilled facilitators

Too often it is assumed that any official can conduct a local participation meeting or process; SEMPA reveals that the added value from bringing in trained and experienced facilitators is considerable.

Local empowerment is a difficult, long term process

Local power structures, community divisions, disinterest and negative attitudes all develop over long periods of time, and a change in planning approach cannot be expected to address or change all of the these in just a couple of years. Good participation requires positive attitudes and trust on both sides, and this needs a long period of building through goodwill and genuine interactions.

The importance of elected councillors

Local councillors often seem to be spoken of as a threat to initiatives such as SEMPA rather than as resources or partners. Authorities and officials who wish to foster participatory planning thinking need to include elected officials in this process, and share information and ownership.

SEMPA has built up better community/authority relations in the project areas, and these can be further developed in the future. In addition, capacity and skill in participation have been developed on both sides, and the project has proven the value of the philosophy and the specific techniques. If SEMPA is seen as a beginning rather than a once-off project, the potential for change over time is considerable.

4.3: Case Study 3: Sliabh Beagh

Introduction

The Sliabh Beagh Cross-Border Partnership is a community-based environmental regeneration project, based in Rosslea and straddling the counties of Fermanagh, Monaghan and Tyrone. Like the Foyle Basin Council (case study 1), it represents a widely respected example of cross-border community action, but while the FBC was aimed at the *management* of the LA21 process, Sliabh Beagh is focused on the *implementation* of the core principles of sustainable development for job creation and environmental regeneration and as such has become a focal point for feelings of "environmental citizenship".

Case study method

Information on this case study was generated from a critical review of a range of published material relating to the Sliabh Beagh Partnership, complemented by interviews with a range of individuals closely related to the project, including three community development workers with the Partnership, the overall Programme Co-ordinator, a representative of a key project funder (the Rural Development Council) and the local authority officer with responsibility for Fermanagh District Council's LA21 Plan.

Background to the Sliabh Beagh Partnership

The mountain region and surrounding lowland of the Sliabh Beagh area cover an area of approximately 800 square miles of lakes, rivers and forestry including an area of Special Scientific Interest and a Natural Heritage area. It includes many picturesque, unspoilt areas with breathtaking views over the surrounding counties. Although now being home to around 16,000 persons, over the last thirty years the area has suffered depopulation arising from poor employment opportunities, weak infrastructure and the disruption to social life and economic livelihoods arising from its border location during the Troubles. The area suffered particularly because of the large number of security-induced road closures during the Troubles, when nearly all roads in the area were closed at some point and only opened again from 1997 onwards.

The project has its origins in the creation of the Sliabh Beagh Cross-Border Development Association in the mid-1990s, formed as an alliance of 10 local community groups. The Development Association subsequently appointed Peter Quinn Consultancy, Co Fermanagh, to develop a Tourism Strategy for the area in 1996. The following extract from the subsequent Strategy describes the area at that time:

Sliabh Beagh is highly disadvantaged socially and economically, in both absolute and relative terms; many of its communities (especially on the Northern side of the border) are suffering serious depopulation and exhibiting other signs of declining rural communities such as high male:female ratios, high emigration, high dependence on low-value-added agriculture and a high proportion of farms in less favoured areas. Unemployment and long-term unemployment are both high with the Northern communities suffering most in this respect; the standard of housing is poor as are public amenities generally and the deprivation rankings indicate that most of the geographic area of Sliabh Beagh is amongst the most deprived rural parts of the island of Ireland. North Monaghan has some manufacturing industry, but the northern part of Sliabh Beagh has virtually none.

(Peter Quinn Consultancy, 1996)

Project aims

The terms of reference for the preparation of the Strategy sums up the ambition of the Partnership, seeking to investigate:

The feasibility of a community-initiated and community-managed tourism project for the Sliabh Beagh area which will act as a catalyst in the social, economic, infrastructural and environmental regeneration of the area and to produce a strategy for achieving the aims set for that initiative and an implementation plan for its delivery.

(Sliabh Beagh Development Association quoted in Peter Quinn Consultancy, 1996)

The resulting Strategy recommended a number of programmes to be implemented by both the Partnership and its individual members, aimed at establishing 'Sliabh Beagh' as a brand in the tourism marketplace. On the strength of the Strategy, the Partnership expanded its membership to include 13 community groups in the counties of Tyrone (Clogher Valley), Fermanagh (Southeast) and Monaghan (North) and set about fundraising to implement the actions identified in the Strategy. In 1997 it was able to appoint a Programme Coordinator, which enabled the development of a Five Year Development Strategy, later revised to cover 2001-2006 and informed by two conferences on sustainability. The mission statement in this Strategy makes clear links to sustainable development and Local Agenda 21:

The Sliabh Beagh Cross-Border Partnership representing a unique and distinctive cross-border community seeks to unite groups from all communities to work together in partnership with community and statutory agencies to promote regeneration through social, cultural and economic development... By 2006 the Sliabh Beagh Region will have improved the quality of life for its residents through the provision of a range of region-wide education and life-long learning programmes and co-ordinated development initiatives targeted at tackling social and economic deprivation and building genuine cross community and cross-border relations... (to this end) the Partnership's projects and programmes are set to address the social, cultural, environmental and economic regeneration of the area with a community wide focus ...

(Sliabh Beagh Partnership, 2001)

Activities

In an attempt to realise this vision, the Partnership has embraced a commitment to care for and treasure their countryside, matching this with economic and community regeneration objectives through a range of activities, including eco-tourism, recycling and ICT.

Eco-Tourism: Walking and Cycling Trails and Mapping Project

This project involves the development of a series of walking trails and cycle routes in an area of 200 square miles and funded from a mixture of sources that included the EU's INTERREG 2 Programme, the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (NI), the International Fund for Ireland, Erne East Area Based Strategy, South Tyrone Area Partnership and Fermanagh Leader Action Group. The project included a series of walking circuits of varying length and degrees of difficulty, including the long distance Sliabh Beagh Way: a 25 mile walk which runs through the three counties of Fermanagh, Monaghan and Tyrone. Each of the walking routes has been named and signposted, with information panels and way-markers erected. Although facing significant logistical and managerial difficulties in implementation, Monika Donnelly, Sliabh Beagh Programme Co-ordinator, suggests that *"Part of the reason for the success of our*

Walking and Cycling Trails is that here is area not owned by one community. People worked together". Completion of the project ultimately took 3-4 years and was opened by Brid Rodgers, Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development for Northern Ireland, in June 2002. At the launch she paid tribute to the partnership for its dedication:

This project represents a major step forward for this partnership in developing the economic, environmental, social and cultural regeneration of the Sliabh Beagh cross-border region; helping to retain the important character of rural areas that makes them attractive to live in and visit... As a truly cross-border initiative the Sliabh Beagh Partnership is a model of co-operation for mutual benefit.

(quoted in Sliabh Beagh documentation)

Recycling Awareness Initiative

In order further to entrench Sliabh Beagh as an area of environmental quality that would attract tourists, the local community recognised the need for greater awareness of the effects of litter and of other waste management issues. The Partnership has therefore been successful in obtaining funding from the EU Programme *Building Sustainable Prosperity* (BSP), via the Rural Development Council (an independent organisation under the Northern Ireland Department of Agriculture's Rural Development Programme), with the aim of:

- Providing cascade training for all partnership members
- Cleaning up of walking trails and surrounding rural environment
- Dissemination of information on recycling and waste management

Information and communications technology

A further dimension to the Partnership's activities has been an attempt to overcome the area's peripheral location, increase links to the wider social world and facilitate greater economic capacity. It has thus secured funding for information and technology development under the PEACE 1. A computer link-up between Sliabh Beagh groups and the main project office now means that Internet, e-mail and video conferencing facilities are available to each of the project-partners. The assessing body, the Rural Development Council, saw this proposal as innovative for a number of reasons:

- Members of the Partnership can more easily keep in touch and network
- Groups with a less developed capacity can better keep up with more active groups
- It shows evidence that the whole Partnership is proactively involved and committed

In order to maximise access and use of these facilities, the Partnership has also established a *Training and Resource Centre*, which provides courses on:

- Internet Awareness
- Accredited Computers for Beginners courses
- A Diploma in Community Development and Education from the University of Ulster
- An Environmental Business Opportunities Training Programme, which provides advice and support on the development of environmental based businesses, targeted at members of the farming community interested in diversification.

Arts Programme

A final area of activity is the Partnership's Arts Programme, facilitated by the appointment of a Community Arts Co-ordinator by the Sliabh Beagh Partnership in 1999. When combined with the Partnership's other activities, this has been able to foster symbolic cultural practices in relation to the environment, which has helped create markers of belonging and difference. The programme has developed a number of innovative features that emphasise common

environmental connections, such as a Heritage Drama Trail that involves the performance of drama and dance pieces in the forestry sections of way-marked walks highlighting features of the local landscape and lakes, while performances developed in community arts workshops link environmental citizenship at a local scale to the theme of eco-tourism. As part of the challenge of bringing communities together, traditional choices such as Irish music have been eschewed in favour of more novel approaches, including the 3 County Walking Festival held on 13th and 14th September 2003. This 2-day event has as a focus a walk to the top of Sliabh Beagh, where the counties of Monaghan, Tyrone and Fermanagh meet, thus emphasising a common regional identity.

Assessment

Ultimately the success of the Sliabh Beagh partnership will depend on its ability to bring greater prosperity to a remote and underdeveloped rural area, without major outside European and other funding sources. This may depend on the creation of leisure and tourist facilities that have appeal to the local community and to visitors from further afield. The evidence is that this is happening. The mountain, bog and forest walks amidst spectacular scenery are already attracting vastly enhanced visitor numbers through the Sliabh Beagh Tourism Centre in Knockatallon. The strength of the Partnership is its focus and the single-minded commitment to common regional economic uplift with a respect for environmental values. The assessment must be that a greater sense of environmental citizenship is being engendered based on common bonds to place, and indeed this has been a central tenet of the whole endeavour. Sliabh Beagh is still a long way from being a 'honey pot' on the Irish tourism trail and in this sense trade-offs between the environment and economic development have not been an issue as elsewhere. Such a test of environmental citizenship remains some way off.

References

Peter Quinn Consultancy Services (1996) *Sliabh Beagh Tourism Strategy*, Fermanagh, PQCS.

Sliabh Beagh Partnership (2001) *Strategy Document 2001-2005*, Fermanagh, SBP.

4.4: Case Study 4: Groundwork NI

Introduction

Groundwork NI is a NGO whose general mission is local community and economic development uplift through environmental regeneration. It is part of the wider Groundwork movement in the United Kingdom, based on a network of relatively independent local charitable trusts, which date in origin to the 1980s. Groundwork NI has a strong record of being a proactive social partner in local sustainable development and while the organisation does not use the term "*environmental citizenship*" directly in its publicity, the emphasis it places on "*creating common ground*" highlights the value of the social capital dimension to local sustainable development.

Background

The origins of Groundwork date to a UK government experiment initiated by the Countryside Commission in the early 1980s to reclaim urban fringe derelict land. This role evolved through the 1990s to become an approach based on people-based community building using the environment as a catalyst for action, specifically targeted on inner city and rural areas with high unemployment and low "social capital". According to one senior Groundwork staff member, the movement is less a "green" organisation than "*a people centred task force*" (quoted in Walpole 1998, p.159). In 2002 there were 46 Groundwork Trusts operating across the UK and a number of Groundwork projects in Eastern Europe (Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2002). These partner trusts to Groundwork NI involve 450 board members, 750 staff and over 300,000 days annually of volunteer time (Walpole, 1998; Joseph Rowntree, 2002).

Case study methods

Interviews were conducted with the Director and the Director of Development of Groundwork NI and a project worker involved on a particularly intractable Belfast interface zone. A member of the research team has also observed the Steering Group of a Groundwork initiative with Leitrim Partnership to take forward community environmental-led regeneration in Border areas. The case study also draws on material presented at two conferences where the Groundwork philosophy and project approach has been a centre of attention, supplemented by secondary sources such as the Joseph Rowntree Foundation's evaluation of Groundwork and other literature, noted where appropriate.

Groundwork NI philosophy

Groundwork's stated purpose in Northern Ireland is "*to build sustainable communities through joint environmental action*" with a "*sustainable community*" defined as one which "*...is vibrant, healthy, safe, which respects the local and global environment and where individuals and enterprise prosper*" (Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2002). While this encompasses the currently acknowledged social, economic and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, the essence of the Groundwork philosophy is its participative approach to local 'place-making'. Building effective relationships to local place with the enhancement of self worth involved in such collective endeavour is central to the Groundwork approach across all the autonomous trusts. In Northern Ireland, Groundwork seeks to apply this in areas of acute cultural division, following the maxim that:

It is only when a community has reached a level of self confidence in its own identity that it is confident to engage with other communities on tangible issues of mutual concern such as the use of the external environment.

(McKee, 2001, p.77)

Range of Groundwork Projects in Northern Ireland

The current portfolio of Groundwork projects in Northern Ireland covers 15 programmes of work touching over 70 communities. These projects are funded from a variety of sources, including private funding from Marks and Spencer, British Telecom, Dunloe Ewart Plc and First Trust, and public sector grants from the EU, central government and quasi government. A strong emphasis is placed on partnership working with important environmental stakeholders. Key themes in using the environment as a focus of community empowerment include mobilisation around landscape improvements, neighbourhood renewal that includes community safety, recreation projects and environmental education involving young people. Examples of recent work include:

- In partnership with Newtownabbey Borough Council and the NI Housing Executive, Groundwork NI has completed a major sport and recreation scheme in Monkstown and a borough-wide street tree planting initiative. In cooperation with the Newtownabbey Environmental Initiative, Groundwork has also been working with primary schools in educating pupils about sustainable development and what this means for waste management.
- In March 2001 in partnership with Derry District Council and with funding from Barclays and Marks and Spencer, Groundwork completed an outdoor recreation area for young people in the Irish Street district of the city. The signage and seating were designed by the youth of the area.
- In conjunction with the NI Housing Executive Groundwork has been working since 2002 in 10 estates seeking to reduce crime through environmental design solutions. This is a £600,000 programme funded through the Northern Ireland Office.

The most innovative areas of practice, however, relate to Groundwork's attempts at bridging and ameliorating ethnic difference in a context of community division, in particular the so-called "risk projects" operating in and around Belfast's peacelines. These have attracted international attention – for example, following a fact finding visit to Belfast in 2002 the Institute for Conflict Analysis Resolution (ICAR) based in Virginia, USA, acknowledged that *"the environment might provide a basis for groups in conflict to construct and agree on over-arching common values"* (ICAR, 2002). Groundwork has also been involved in drafting of *Guidance on Community Cohesion* by the UK Home Office's Community Cohesion Unit following the civil disturbances in Bradford, Oldham and Burnley in the summer of 2001. Examples of Groundwork NI's involvement in such projects, include:

- *Mount Vernon, North Belfast.* Mount Vernon is a small Protestant community that has carried the stigma of being known as "Mt. Vermin". Residents identified paramilitary graffiti as one of the most pressing environmental issues and young people were subsequently involved in coming up with ideas focused on the non-violent aspects of the estate's history. A mural was replaced with less contentious motifs and there is now an active Mt. Vernon Environmental Group that runs projects ranging from regular litter pick-ups to transforming the derelict "mucky field" in the heart of the area into a community garden. Residents also meet on a regular basis with representatives from three other communities at the sharp end of the 'Troubles': the Markets and New Lodge (Catholic) and Sandy Row (Protestant). These communities come together under a

wider Groundwork programme (Greencare) that focuses on cross-community relations and environmental concerns.

- *Limestone Road, North Belfast.* The Limestone Road Project started in late 2001 as a youth centred programme involving "single identity work" with two communities, Tiger's Bay and Parkside. The goal is to develop environmental awareness and promote neighbourhood renewal through a series of small environmental improvement projects, issue based training sessions and related field trips. The project is set on an interface and seeks to promote improved community relations and enhanced common "environmental citizenship" under the most difficult of conditions. The aspiration is to "*unite young people through a common understanding of local and global environmental concerns*" (Groundwork NI, 2001).
- *Short Strand and inner East Belfast.* Following serious interface violence in the summer of 2001 and with funding from the Princess Diana Trust, Groundwork NI has been working with other conflict mediation professionals to dampen ethnic animosity. Groundwork has locally recruited two project workers to focus on environmental actions with young people around the interface. This has included joint school photography projects exploring local place character and history combined with the use of art to "vision" the area as it could be. The project won the UK-wide Guardian Public Involvement Award in 2003.
- *Greencare.* A first phase of the Groundwork Greencare programme provided the auspices for involvement of Mount Vernon project noted above. This continues under the banner of the "Crossroads Cross-Community Group". In 2001, Groundwork launched Greencare II that brings into dialogue the Turf Lodge, Inverary, Ligoniel and Tiger's Bay areas of Belfast. This is promoted by Groundwork as "*a practical example of Local Agenda 21 in action, empowering residents of disadvantaged and marginalised communities in Belfast to be part of the decision making process in their areas through partnership with NI Housing Executive and Belfast City Council*" (Groundwork NI, 2001). Landscape plans have been produced covering projects prioritised by each community including neighbourhood entrance features, sports facilities, children's play areas, horticultural elements and interface/community safety.
- *Creating Common Ground.* In conjunction with the NI Community Relations Council, Groundwork has developed a policy framework, 'Creating Common Ground', to promote the idea that while the environment can be a contentious issue in the context of segregated space, it can also be a key issue that motivates communities to come together for practical action.
- *Changing Places, Changing Lives Project.* Between 1999 and 2001, Groundwork worked with the County Leitrim Partnership to engage 8,000 people from 21 communities from both sides of the Border in joint working on environmental regeneration. The environment was consciously used as an issue that could unite culturally different communities and engage those who felt disenfranchised. The official evaluation of this initiative was extremely positive, stating that "*The work of Groundwork NI and its partners in local regeneration illustrates that the energies and know-how are there to be harnessed, allowing the connection of the Government's vision of inclusive and sustainable communities to the realities of implementation on the ground*" (Blake Associates, 2002).

An independent evaluation of Groundwork's activities in the UK suggests that:

the results demonstrate that local environmental action can transform the social and economic prospects of run-down areas through engaging local communities and marginalised individuals... Groundwork (here) is playing a key role in achieving neighbourhood renewal.

(Lord Best in Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2002)

Groundwork NI was one of the trusts that was scrutinised during this evaluation, endorsing that it has strong professional support (e.g. four landscape planners), a critical organisational mass and continuity of funding. It has embedded itself as a strong social partner within Northern Ireland's network of governance and is publicly supported by both David Trimble and Gerry Adams. It appears to be making a difference. Nevertheless, Groundwork is no panacea. The social processes generating the problems, which Groundwork seeks to tackle, are strong. However, in the face of such countervailing forces Groundwork has come to represent what is perhaps best about a citizenship-based approach to Local Agenda 21.

Opportunities for the future

Groundwork is presently taking forward a participative scoping exercise in cooperation with Leitrim Partnership, on how to take the *Changing Places, Changing Lives* project forward. This work has strong European support and is funded under Measure 5.1 of the EU Programme for Peace and Reconciliation (2000-2004) administered by Co-operation Ireland. The aim is "to develop the strategic framework to take forward, on a cross-border basis, the policy and practice of building inclusive, vibrant and safe communities through a process of environmental regeneration". In addition to this Groundwork has commissioned research to examine and advise on how the organisation could usefully make a wider contribution in the Republic of Ireland (Moore, 2003).

References

Blake Associates (2002) *Changing Places, Changing Lives*. Evaluation Report.

Groundwork NI (2001) Annual Report, Belfast.

Institute for Conflict Analysis Resolution (2002) *Working Group Report on Groundwork NI*, Virginia, US, ICAR.

Joseph Rowntree Foundation (2002) *Building Sustainable Communities: a study of Groundwork's Role in Neighbourhood Renewal*, York, JSF.

McKee, M. (2001) 'Local environmental projects across the divide: Groundwork NI' in W.J.V. Neill and H. Schwedler (eds) *Towards Environmental Citizenship: LA21 and Overcoming Socio-cultural Barriers in Belfast, Berlin and Dublin*. Berlin, European Academy of the Urban Environment.

Moore, N. (2003) *Addressing Social Exclusion in the Rol. a Report for Groundwork NI*, Belfast.

Walpole, Ken (1998) 'Bottle banks in Arcadia?' in D. Warburton (ed) *Community and Sustainable Development*, London, Earthscan.

APPENDIX 5:

**The Johannesburg Call:
a statement by local governments of the world at the
World Summit on Sustainable Development, Johannesburg, South Africa (2002)**

**The Johannesburg Call:
a statement by local governments of the world at the
World Summit on Sustainable Development, Johannesburg, South Africa,
30 August 2002.**

(source: www.iclei.org/lgs/johannesburg_call.pdf)

We, the leaders and representatives of local governments from across the globe, gathered in Johannesburg, South Africa, in August 2002, commit ourselves to the sustainable development of our planet and people.

Since 1992, local governments have made significant strides towards realising the goals and aspirations of the Rio Earth Summit. Today, we pledge to intensify those local efforts to realising the aspirations, goals and targets of the Johannesburg Summit, as well as all existing international protocols and declarations, including Agenda 21, the Millennium Declaration and the Habitat Agenda. As the interface between government and people, we are dedicated to the attainment of a more just, equitable and caring world.

We realise that local actions alone will not save the planet. We therefore urge our national governments, representative international bodies and the United Nations to enhance our capacity and ability to launch a frontline attack on poverty and underdevelopment. Given our pivotal role in this universal battle, we also urge these national and international bodies to make all efforts to strengthen institutions of organised local government. In the African context, we call on all international institutions, including the United Nations, to work through the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) to support local government in the continent.

We call on national governments to recognise local government as a vital sphere of government that is the most visible face of the developmental state.

We call for a new form of global solidarity where all like-minded individuals, organisations and spheres of government rally together to build a new tomorrow.

We are deeply concerned about the impact of globalisation at the local level, especially within the developing world and countries with economies in transition. We have witnessed firsthand the devastating effects of aspects of our international system on local communities and our local spaces.

We therefore call for a fundamental restructuring of international relations in order to realise a just and more humane world order. We believe that the current structure of the world economy limits local governments' ability to fulfil our developmental mandate. Inadequate access to international markets, an inequitable global trade regime, unsustainable debt, declining levels of Overseas Development Assistance and the digital divide impede our efforts to govern with authority and humanity.

We urge the world's states and international representative organisations gathered in Johannesburg in 2002 to heed the voice of international local government. As we venture into the new millennium, we commit ourselves to:

- Halving the number of people without access to safe water and sanitation
- Undertaking active steps to address public health problems, in line with the WTO/TRIPS agreement
- Improving access to affordable modern energy services
- Increasing market access for goods from the developing world

- Moving towards technology and knowledge partnerships in the context of a fair and accessible intellectual property regime
- Ensuring equitable access to quality education at all levels for all

We commit ourselves to achieving these targets by 2015.

We, as local government from across the globe, acknowledge that ours is not an equal, fair or just world. If international gatherings like this one are to make a meaningful difference to people's lives, we – the representatives of the people – must be bold and unequivocal about making changes. We recognise that without political commitment, nothing will be achieved. We therefore pledge our unwavering commitment to eradicating poverty, correcting the imbalances between the developed and developing world and fundamentally reshaping our world. We also commit ourselves to developing very practical, realistic Action Plans and to implement them through Local Action 21 programmes to realise these goals. We challenge all Heads of State meeting in Johannesburg next week to do the same.

The time to act is now. Let us not lose this opportunity; there may not be another.

LOCAL ACTION 21

Implementation Framework for the post Johannesburg decade of Local Agenda 21.

Ten years after the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, Implementation of Agenda 21, the Rio conventions, and the Habitat Agenda is proceeding so slowly that the horrors of global poverty and environmental disruption are becoming ever more overwhelming. We demand, therefore, a profound shift in the current development model to one based on true equity and deep reverence for the processes of nature. We commit ourselves to the Earth Charter and the Melbourne Principles, and assert the following:

- Local Governments implementing sustainable development are determined to enter a decade of accelerated, effective action to create sustainable communities and protect the global common goods
- Local Governments will work to ensure viable local economies, just and peaceful communities, eco-efficient cities, and secure and resilient communities able to respond to the change, while ensuring safe and accessible water supplies and protecting our climate, soil, biodiversity and human health
- Local Governments call for Local Action 21 – the *motto* for accelerated implementation of sustainable development in the decade following the Johannesburg World Summit
- Local Governments call for Local Action 21 – a *mandate* given by the World Summit on Sustainable Development to local authorities worldwide to engage in the implementation of local agendas and action plans
- Local Governments call for Local Action 21 – a *movement* of cities, towns, and counties and their associations towards action for sustainability
- Local Governments will reinforce their commitment to Local Agenda 21 and its implementation throughout the next decade of Local Action 21

APPENDIX 6:

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS AT FOCUS GROUPS AND DISCUSSION GROUPS

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS AT FOCUS GROUPS AND DISCUSSION GROUPS

Cork Focus Group (Imperial Hotel, Cork, 4/12/2002)

Dr Gerard Mullally	University College Cork
Jacqi Hodgson	Cork Environmental Forum
Pat Ledwidge	City Development Board (CDB), Cork City Council
Margaret Desmon	Rapid Co-ordinator, Cork
Gerard O'Connell	Secretary of the Irish Farmers Association, Cork
Charlie Hennessy	Cork Environmental Forum representative on Cork City Council's Environment Strategic Policy Committee (SPC)
Bernie Connolly	Vice Chairperson of Cork Environmental Forum

Dublin Focus Group (ENFO, Dublin, 24/02/2003)

Ray Bateson	Dublin Healthy Cities Project
Brian McManus	Dublin City Council
Senan Turnbull	Fingal County Development Board
David Cotter	South Dublin County Council
Tom Gorman	Dublin City Council

Northern Ireland Focus Group (Castle Espie Conservation Centre, 10/02/2002)

John McIntyre	Carrickfergus Borough Council
Claire McKeown	Belfast City Council
Keith Chalmers	Invest NI
Billy Reid	Ballymena Borough Council
Betsy Gray	North Down Borough Council
Michael Donnelly	SNIP (Sustainable Northern Ireland Partnership)

Dublin Discussion Group (ENFO Office, Dublin, 27/02/2003)

Noel Casserly	Comhar
Marie Hughes	Comhar
Billy Murphy	Sustainability Co-ordinator, County Wexford Partnership

Additional written comments from Mark Callanan, Institute of Public Administration (IPA), Dublin

Northern Ireland Discussion Group (Castle Espie Conservation Centre, 27/02/2003)

Tony Weekes	Civic Forum
Gordon Woods	Civic Forum
Sue Christie	Northern Ireland Environment Link
Brian Hanna	UK Sustainable Development Commission
James Orr	Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust/Civic Forum