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OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT

1. Objectives and Scope

The purpose of this GreenCOM task order was to provide strategic environmental communications support to USAID/Indonesia’s Strategic Objective 12, which focuses on decentralized and strengthened natural resource management. The GreenCOM project helped mobilize constituencies around a national agenda for halting illegal logging that was tied explicitly to economic justice and good governance. More specifically, it directly supported the achievement of USAID’s Intermediate Result (IR) 3, which calls for “broader and more knowledgeable constituencies developed to support sustainable natural resources management.”

Illegal logging has ravaged forests across Indonesia. It is not only a serious environmental problem, depleting valuable natural resources and causing floods; it also has heavy economic, social, and moral costs for the nation. More than Rp30 trillion (around $3.7 billion) are lost in revenues each year, according to the Ministry of Forestry. At the same time, Indonesia is in desperate need of funds to solve pressing social problems such as inadequate health care and education and poverty. Moreover, illegal logging thrives on corruption and bad governance, while the gains from illegal logging fuel further corruption and act as an incentive for bad policies and lawlessness.

GreenCOM worked in close collaboration with key governmental and nongovernmental partners who were already addressing the threat of illegal logging. By harnessing the communication strengths of partners, facilitating a multi-level approach to this complex issue, and providing technical assistance when possible, GreenCOM developed a highly strategic, nationwide mass media and social mobilization campaign that reinforced ongoing initiatives to halt illegal logging in Indonesia. The media campaign helped to clarify the issue, providing compelling reasons for concern, encouraging effective participation, and motivating action by policymakers, forest-dependent communities, the private sector, and the general public.

The project was conceived and planned in conjunction with representatives from major stakeholder groups, particularly Indonesian nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). The core objectives of the project were as follows:

- Increase media coverage of illegal logging to heighten public awareness of and demand for sustainable forestry management.
- Encourage stakeholder actions against illegal logging in target urban and rural areas as a result of public demand.
- Mobilize and build on current grassroots efforts to halt illegal logging through a small grants program.
- Improve the ability of local and national partners to implement effective social mobilization and communication campaigns in their respective regions.
A national media campaign encompassing both paid advertising and editorial placement was implemented to deliver an action-oriented message that would motivate the general public to consider illegal logging as an important campaign issue in a major election year, and to vote for political parties and candidates who support sustainable forestry management and condemn illegal logging. This, in turn, helped to make sustainable forestry and illegal logging part of the political dialogue leading up to the parliamentary and presidential elections in 2004.

The combined “top-down” national media campaign and “bottom-up” coalition-building approach was intended to bring the issue of illegal logging to the forefront of public discourse and become part of the political dialogue in this election year.

Phase One

The project was implemented in three phases. The first phase began in early 2002 and focused on coalition building, training, research, and creating a groundswell of support in preparation for launching the more visible mass media campaign.

Phase Two

The second phase linked the “top-down” approach utilizing advertising and mass media with “bottom-up” activities to mobilize the public to take action in particular target regions. This phase began with a public campaign launch in March 2003 and continued through July 2004 with advertising, talk shows, and other media events and media outreach. Public service advertisements (PSAs) appeared in two waves, first from mid-February 2004 until the April 7 parliamentary election, then again from mid-May until the first round of the presidential election on July 5. Talk shows and media outreach by GreenCOM and its NGO partners—starting with the March 2003 launching event and accelerating from October 2003 onward—reinforced the key campaign messages and actions and maintained a flow of news and dialogue about illegal logging. Small grants, implemented from January through June 2004, enabled NGOs to mobilize grassroots constituencies and to focus media attention on illegal logging at the local level. Training workshops for journalists and NGOs from August 2003 till June 2004 enabled them to participate more effectively in the campaign.

Phase Three

During the third phase, from May through September 2004, additional research was commissioned to evaluate the success of the campaign and to enable GreenCOM to share these results with its partners. A joint evaluation with INFORM was conducted to draw lessons learned from both campaigns and to provide recommendations on future environmental communication campaigns in Indonesia.
2. Timeframe, Budget, and Level of Effort

The original period of performance of the project was from February 2002 until January 2004, with a task order ceiling of $3,267,677.

USAID approved a contract modification extending the period of performance through July 2004 and increasing the task order ceiling. The approved budget for the project after the contract modification was $3,606,890.

The period of performance was extended again through September 2004 with no further increase in the task order ceiling.

The overall level of effort (LOE) expended in the project was 3,924 person days, consisting of 992 days by US national staff and consultants and 2,932 person days by Indonesian staff and consultants. Indonesia-based project staff and consultants are listed in Annex 6.

3. Deliverables

1. A two-phased advertising and media campaign on illegal logging
2. A video news release to support the first wave of the campaign
3. Training workshops for NGOs
4. Journalist workshops
5. Spokesperson trainings for NGOs
6. Research reports on formative and evaluative surveys and in-depth interviews
7. Reports quantifying the reach of the campaign
8. Final written report on activities of long-term and short-term consultants

4. Key Accomplishments

Media Outreach & Advertising

A hard-hitting, national media campaign calling for action against illegal logging reached a majority of Indonesians in cities in Java, Sumatra, Kalimantan, and Papua.

- PSAs appeared 608 times on television, 86 times in print media, and 1,656 times on radio.
- Forty-six percent of respondents polled in eight cities saw at least one of the PSAs.
- More than 1,700 people called the toll-free number featured in the PSAs.
- Negative attitudes toward illegal logging measured at the end of the campaign had increased significantly compared to the pre-campaign baseline measurement. Respondents who agreed or strongly agreed that illegal logging had a negative impact on themselves or their families increased from 48% to 62%.
• People likely or very likely to take action against illegal logging increased from 23% before to 35% at the end of the campaign.

• Ninety percent of registered voters surveyed at the end of the campaign ranked illegal logging as an important or very important issue in their choice of a presidential candidate.

• Twenty-three talk shows broadcast on 59 radio stations and two talk shows on national television featured discussion of illegal logging with live audience participation.

• Three high-profile public events featured the presidential campaign teams speaking about illegal logging, including a major seminar attended by representatives of all five candidates at the height of the campaign.

• Special pages or inserts on illegal logging were carried in two national newspapers and three local papers.

• A video news release about the environmental, economic, and social impact of illegal logging was shown at a high-level campaign launching event in 2003.

**Capacity Building**

Environmental communication skills of stakeholders at the national and local levels were significantly enhanced, contributing not only to the impact of this campaign but also to the capacity to undertake future environmental campaigns.

• Ninety-one people, representing 76 NGOs from 16 provinces in Sumatra, Java, Kalimantan, Sulawesi, and Papua, participated in environmental communication training workshops.

• Fifty-eight journalists working in Sumatra, Java, Kalimantan, and Papua were trained in environmental and investigative journalism.

• Twenty-four staff of the Ministry of Forestry, Ministry of Environment, and nongovernmental partners received spokesperson training.

• Fifteen NGOs from Sumatra, Java, Kalimantan, Sulawesi, and Papua received training in video production.

**Research**

Rigorous, independent research formed a basis for the campaign strategy, design of PSAs, and evaluation of the reach and effectiveness of the campaign.

• Focus group testing and in-depth interviews of stakeholders in Jakarta, Sumatra, Kalimantan, and Papua assessed their knowledge and level of concern about illegal logging and tested the viability of various messages.

• A pretest survey of 1,600 respondents in Java, Sumatra, Kalimantan, and Papua established a baseline of knowledge, attitudes, and commitment regarding illegal logging among the general public before the advertising campaign.
• Focus group testing in Jakarta, Sumatra, and Kalimantan helped in the selection and refinement of messages for the PSAs.
• A post-test survey of 1,600 respondents measured the reach and effectiveness of the campaign.
• Analysis of media coverage since the campaign launch event and during the presidential election campaign measured the frequency of stories about illegal logging.

**Phase One: Development and Preparation**

This section covers the first phase of the project, from February 2002 until March 2003, which focused on coalition building, training, research, and creating a groundswell of support in preparation for launching the mass media campaign. It also covers research that played a critical role in the design of the PSAs (focus group testing) and established a baseline for measuring the reach and impact of the campaign (pretest survey).

### 1. Coalition Building

**Stakeholder Consultation**

Five preparatory workshops were held with national and local NGOs, religious groups (such as the SAFE Forum, Society for Awareness of the Future Environment), and journalists to build support for the national media campaign, gather information and views, and discuss campaign priorities and themes. A number of local and international NGOs in particular contributed to the design and implementation of the national media campaign:

• Telapak, an NGO that works on illegal logging investigation and advocacy
• WALHI Jakarta (Indonesian Forum for Environment), the largest advocacy network in Indonesia with 450 member organizations
• Forest Watch Indonesia (FWI), a research organization focusing on illegal logging issues
• Kemala, an organization that focuses on strengthening local community groups’ ability to carry out environmental protection and human rights activities through funding and technical assistance
• AMAN (Indonesia Traditional Community Alliance), a network of traditional community groups across Indonesia
• WWF Indonesia and The Nature Conservancy, which jointly manage the USAID-funded Global Development Alliance against illegal logging in Indonesia. WWF also implements a related anti–illegal logging program in collaboration with the World Bank.
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• INFORM (Indonesia Forest and Media Campaign) a coalition of Conservation International, BirdLife Indonesia, Flora and Fauna International, The Nature Conservancy, WWF Indonesia, and Forest Watch Indonesia. INFORM was established in October 2002 with funding from the World Bank’s Global Environment Facility as a response to the decreasing quality and quantity of Indonesia’s forests. These organizations build the capacity of journalists and NGOs to combat forest degradation.

Principle Partners

Government of Indonesia

The National Development Planning Agency (BAPPENAS) through its office of Natural Resources and Environmental Management served as the principle governmental counterpart to the project. GreenCOM also consulted with the Ministry of Forestry on all matters of technical implementation and worked closely with the ministry’s Forestry Information Center (known as PUSINFO). Both of these agencies were consulted in the preparation and design of the campaign, including the formulation of the PSAs. They both regularly received copies of the monthly and quarterly reports. GreenCOM provided technical advice and training to PUSINFO staff, including spokesperson training, coordination as part of a government-NGO working group on illegal logging, and assistance on a forestry pavilion at the 2004 Jakarta Fair, where the video news releases produced by GreenCOM and INFORM were shown.

In addition, GreenCOM was asked by a joint working group of the Ministries of Environment, Forestry, and Marine Affairs together with related NGOs to support communications efforts by the Indonesian delegation to the World Parks Congress in September 2003. GreenCOM prepared 2,000 copies of a fact sheet on illegal logging and actions being taken to combat it in national parks. GreenCOM also arranged a press conference for the delegates prior to the congress.

INFORM Coalition

From its inception in 2002, INFORM worked closely with GreenCOM in the design and implementation of two campaigns. The INFORM campaign dealt with multiple aspects of forest conservation and sustainable management, while GreenCOM focused on illegal logging. The GreenCOM campaign launch event in March 2003 was held jointly by GreenCOM and INFORM.

In February 2004, USAID and INFORM agreed that INFORM would endorse GreenCOM’s advertisements with its logo and support the PSAs with public response channels managed by INFORM member organizations. This close partnership leveraged skills and resources to the mutual benefit of the two campaigns. INFORM and GreenCOM collaborated closely in the planning and production of talk shows, public media events, media outreach, and post-test surveys of the campaigns. They conducted a joint evaluation
together in August and September 2004 to distill and disseminate lessons learned and recommendations for future initiatives.

**NGO Task Force**

An advisory group, or “task force,” consisting of representatives from 10 key NGOs, was established in April 2002 to provide expert advice to the GreenCOM project and its proposed communications campaign. Membership of the task force was later reduced to seven organizations: six NGOs (Telapak, WALHI, Forest Watch Indonesia, Kemala, AMAN, and WWF Indonesia) and the INFORM coalition (see above). The individual members of the task force are listed in Annex 1.

The task force held regular meetings and developed an action agenda. The members represented interests with strong links to local environmental NGOs, indigenous communities, advocacy groups, research institutions, and international organizations. The task force assisted in developing the original work plan for the project and provided advice on activities and background on issues related to illegal logging for GreenCOM, the media, the Indonesian government, and other stakeholders. The task force was instrumental in providing contacts and logistical arrangements for the March 2003 campaign launch event. The task force also provided input on the design of the small grants program, and three of its members sat on the grants review committee. In August 2003 it was decided that the services of the task force were no longer needed, although GreenCOM continued to work with individual task force members on various activities.

**Natural Resources Management Program**

The USAID-funded Natural Resources Management Program (NRM), with a core focus on improving policies and practices for sustainable forestry, provided a wealth of information and experience on which to build GreenCOM’s campaign. Technical experts from NRM provided valuable advice on the economic impact of illegal logging, policymaking related to forest management and governance, and actors and agencies in Indonesia’s forest sector. GreenCOM provided training to NRM staff and technical and financial assistance to two environmental news groups established and supported by NRM: *Ulin* in East Kalimantan and *Alamku* in Papua, both of which participated in GreenCOM training and produced news inserts on illegal logging that appeared in local newspapers. A third environmental news group affiliated with NRM in North Sulawesi, *Lestari*, partnered with GreenCOM to provide environmental communications training to Sulawesi-based NGOs.

**2. Social Mobilization Through Small Grants**

The small grants program was intended to foster local and regional capacity building for NGOs to increase their networks and facilitate media campaigns against illegal logging. In May 2003, GreenCOM established a small grants advisory committee composed of representatives of GreenCOM and national NGOs to advise on areas of assistance, eligibility requirements, appropriate size of individual grants, and criteria for soliciting...
applications (the members of the advisory committee are listed in Annex 1). All small grants documents were finalized and translated into Bahasa Indonesia. Approval to issue the grants was received from USAID in June 2003.

The RfA and application documents were sent by e-mail and post to 44 NGOs selected by the advisory committee based on their capacity and their ongoing efforts against illegal logging. Twenty-seven NGOs submitted proposals.

3. Social Marketing Research

A reputable local research firm, Asia Market Intelligence Indonesia (now known as Synovate), was selected to conduct focus group testing and in-depth interviews with a statistically representative sample of target audiences for the media campaign. The objectives of the research were to determine the viability of various messages concerning sustainable forestry and illegal logging and to assess the issue knowledge and level of concern of these targeted groups. The results of the research were critical in helping to determine the most effective messages to use in reaching the target audiences and laid the foundation for the refinement of GreenCOM’s strategy.

Analysis of the data revealed the following significant findings:

- **Action:** Audiences were familiar with traditional arguments against illegal logging, such as the loss of a significant natural resource and negative impact on biodiversity. However, they did not feel empowered to address the problem and were therefore not compelled to take any action. The most positive response to taking action was to plant trees, although respondents felt that tree planting was the responsibility of timber companies.

- **Advertising:** Of the 24 focus group tests and 68 in-depth interviews conducted in Papua, Sumatra, East Kalimantan, and Jakarta, most respondents felt that a national advertising campaign by itself would do little to effect change. They saw a need for additional local and regional activities. This feedback from the research reinforced the strategy for a multifaceted campaign that incorporated advertising as a component but did not rely on advertising alone.

- **Livelihoods:** Most people interviewed were skeptical that revenue captured from illegal logging would be used for community improvement and most did not distinguish between legal and illegal logging; logging in any form was destroying the forests. Immediate concern about livelihoods and the reliance on forests for sustenance took precedence over long-term concern for saving biodiversity.

Subsequent research aided in the design of PSAs and the evaluation of the reach and effectiveness of the campaign. The PSAs were twice tested in focus groups in three cities to select and refine the most effective messages. The overall reach and effectiveness of the media campaign was measured by comparing results from surveys done in eight cities.
before and after the PSAs had been seen. Media coverage of illegal logging was monitored in print media for 15 months after the campaign launching event and more intensively on television during the presidential campaign in June 2004 to measure the frequency of stories about illegal logging and trends in coverage. A list of research reports produced for the project is provided in Annex 2.

4. National Media Campaign

The resulting national media campaign designed by GreenCOM was aimed at mobilizing public opinion and action, particularly in the 2004 elections, to exert political pressure on elected representatives and leaders to stop illegal logging. In a newly democratic Indonesia, politicians are more readily influenced than before by the public outcry against corruption and demands for reform. GreenCOM’s focus group testing of PSA messages showed that Indonesians cared far more about the economic and social costs of illegal logging than they did about its environmental impacts. Thus, by explicitly linking illegal logging to the hot-button issues of corruption, morality, and economic justice, the national media campaign helped move an issue formerly perceived as an environmental problem into the mainstream of the 2004 political debates.

Indonesians have good reason for concern about the economic and social costs of illegal logging, which, as the core campaign message emphasized, drain resources that might otherwise be available to fund urgently needed improvements in education, health care, and poverty alleviation. Over Rp30 trillion (more than $3.5 billion) in revenue is lost to illegal logging each year, according to the Ministry of Forestry. At the same time, Indonesia desperately needs more money for health and education; it ranks 112 of 175 countries surveyed in the world, below all other Southeast Asian countries on the United Nations Development Program’s Human Development Index. Indonesia is the poorest country in Southeast Asia in terms of child mortality rate, access to clean water and sanitation, nutrition, and access to schooling.

Indonesians are also rightly concerned about the moral integrity of public officials. Transparency International in 2002 ranked Indonesia as the sixth most corrupt nation in the world. In a Gallup poll that year, a large majority of Indonesians said corruption had a significant impact on the culture and values of their society. On the other hand, 41% were optimistic that corruption would decrease in the future. This was echoed in the 2004 parliamentary election, in which new smaller parties perceived to have a strong anti-corruption platform (such as the Democratic Party and PKS) performed better than expected.

The national media campaign, supported by an NGO coalition and small grants program, provided a national call to action that resonated well with popular concerns. The PSAs encouraged people to speak out and take positive action to claim their rights to better education, health care, and quality of life by voting for political candidates and parties that pledged to curb corruption and illegal logging. Talk shows and media outreach by GreenCOM and its NGO partners maintained a flow of news and dialogue about the
economic, environmental, and social ills associated with illegal logging as well as actions being taken and opportunities for actions to stop illegal logging. Small grants to NGOs helped to mobilize such actions regionally and to bring local and national attention to them through media coverage. Training for journalists, NGOs, and government partners gave them communication skills to participate more effectively in the campaign.

**Preparatory Events**

A number of outreach activities and high visibility events were conducted before the campaign, such as a talk show–style debate at the June 2002 meeting in Bali of the Preparatory Committee for the World Summit on Sustainable Development and a journalist briefing with 57 participants at a meeting of the Consultative Group on Indonesia in Jakarta in October 2002. These helped to gather momentum and focus attention on the problem of illegal logging before the campaign was formally launched.

**5. Campaign Pretest Survey**

Prior to the start of the advertising campaign, a pretest survey of knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions about illegal logging was initiated in nine cities. The survey established a baseline against which to measure the impact of the PSAs by conducting a similar, post-test survey after the ads had run.

Taylor Nelson Sofres (TNS) was contracted to conduct the pretest survey in October 2003. A household survey of knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions about illegal logging covered a sample of 1,623 adults in nine cities in Java (Jakarta, Bandung, Surabaya), Sumatra (Medan, Pekanbaru), Kalimantan (Banjarmasin, Samarinda), and Papua (Jayapura, Manokwari). The results showed that a strong majority of respondents believe illegal logging is a serious economic, social, and moral problem for Indonesia (Table 1).
Table 1. Attitudes Toward Illegal Logging, October 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total 1623 MS</th>
<th>Java 1270 MS</th>
<th>Sumatra 207 MS</th>
<th>Kalimantan 102 MS</th>
<th>Papua 45 MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illegal logging has a negative impact on Indonesia’s welfare.</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal logging has a negative impact on your welfare or the welfare of your family.</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal logging is taking money from education and health programs.</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal logging has a negative environmental impact such as causing landslides and erosion or contributing to floods and drought.</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal logging is an immoral action.</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TNS Pretest Survey
Base: All respondents
A1 Please tell me to what extent you agree or disagree with the statement about illegal logging. (5 point scale rating, 1 is “strongly disagree” and 5 is “strongly agree.”)

Only a small portion (2%) said they had personally taken any action against illegal logging. Asked why not, most (64%) of those who said they had taken no action responded that illegal logging was not a problem that affected them or their families.

Clearly, motivating this large majority who believed that illegal logging was a serious problem for the country but one that did not affect them personally and that they need not or could not take action to eliminate was to be a major aim of the media campaign. When asked whether they were likely to call a toll-free number, visit an appropriate Web site, or write a letter to a make their voices heard against illegal logging, 23% of respondents answered “likely” or “very likely,” which validated the decision to include public response channels in the PSAs.

Most respondents (62%) believed the government bore primary responsibility for illegal logging, compared to minorities who felt other groups were most responsible (Figure 1).
A significant result was a substantial majority who responded that the illegal logging issue was important to them in deciding for which party or candidate to vote. When asked to assess the importance of a political party’s or presidential candidate’s commitment to prevent illegal logging, 75% said it was important or very important for choosing a party, and 85% said it was important or very important for choosing a presidential candidate (Figure 2).
6. PSA Development

GreenCOM subcontracted Fortune Indonesia, a local advertising agency, to develop the PSAs for the national media campaign. Creative concepts, storyboards, and pretesting of messages and campaign formats were completed in 2003, and the ads appeared in print and on radio and television beginning in February 2004. The advertising campaign was implemented in two phases. Phase I, during the two months preceding Indonesia’s general election in early April, and Phase II, in the one-and-a-half months before the first round of the presidential election in early July.

Focus Group Testing

Fortune, working closely with GreenCOM, developed several versions of creative concepts for the campaign in July. These focused on the themes agreed to in consultation with the project’s NGO task force: human rights, governance, corruption, and the economic impact of illegal logging. The PSA concepts were presented for review and comment to USAID, the Ministry of Forestry, BAPPENAS, task force members, the NRM program, the Ministry of Trade and Industry, and AED in August and September 2003. Revisions were made to the PSAs on the basis of feedback received.

New versions of the PSAs were submitted for focus group testing in Jakarta, Samarinda, and Pekanbaru by the Polling Center in October 2003. The PSAs focused attention on so-called illegal logging tycoons (cukong), symbolized by an effigy of such a tycoon that featured a giant hand uprooting a tree. The tycoons were blamed for robbing Indonesians of their forest wealth, thus depriving the public of funds that might otherwise be used to address urgent problems such as health care, education, and clean water. Some versions linked illegal logging to environmental problems such as flooding and drought.

The strongest reaction from the Jakarta focus groups came from the ads’ argument that illegal logging costs the nation Rp83 billion per day. People were shocked and appalled by that figure and felt cheated. Groups in Samarinda and Pekanbaru, on the other hand, were less surprised—even cynical—about the economic cost. All groups felt strongly that government was largely to blame for illegal logging and other problems of forest mismanagement. Some people criticized the ads’ emphasis on illegal logging tycoons as too narrow, given that corruption in Indonesia is not restricted to the private sector.

Education and health were perceived as critical social issues to be addressed. Floods were also recognized as a serious problem, with some (though not all) respondents perceiving a direct link to illegal logging. Clean water and degraded forests were not seen as particularly compelling issues. People in Samarinda and Pekanbaru felt that attention should be given to issues of local importance (such as the loss of livelihoods and land rights in forest-dependent communities) in addition to the national issues. The effigy conveyed a mixed message and called to mind a number of familiar symbols involving trees, thus causing some confusion.
The groups appreciated the opportunity to respond to the ads through a toll-free number and other channels, but they also felt that some credible organization(s) capable of taking action should be associated with the PSAs.

The key changes made in response to focus group results were the following:

- Replace the reference to “illegal logging tycoons” with “a high-level conspiracy” to indicate involvement of corruption in many sectors.
- Revise the “effigy” picture along the same lines.
- Emphasize more vividly the cost of illegal logging (“We are being robbed of Rp83 billion every day”).
- Drop the ad dealing with the issue of clean water.

The revised PSAs were tested in a second round of focus groups in the same three cities. The Jakarta groups in particular reconfirmed the shock value of the economic impact of illegal logging presented in the ads. They also confirmed the effectiveness of the message that a conspiracy of corruption, implicitly involving various social and political sectors, drives the problem of illegal logging. Focus groups in Samarinda and Pekanbaru, on the other hand, wanted to see more attention given to pressing social issues such as the insecurity of forest land tenure by local communities and the local (as opposed to national) economic impact of illegal logging.

GreenCOM again modified the PSAs based on the focus group test results and presented the revised versions to USAID staff. Local partners were encouraged to develop local content for PSAs in their provinces, including photos and captions reflecting locally important issues linked to illegal logging. Some of GreenCOM’s grantees developed such local PSAs (see section on social mobilization below).

**PHASE TWO: IMPLEMENTATION**

**1. Launch Event**

In March 2003, a campaign launch event was held to draw attention to the NGO-led campaigns of both GreenCOM and INFORM and the efforts to combat illegal logging. This event drew hundreds of attendees and many dignitaries from government and the public sector. A twelve-page brochure, featuring facts and photos on illegal logging along with suggested actions that people could take to help stop it, was prepared and distributed along with other giveaways as reminders of the importance of the campaign. A video news release (VNR) was screened and copies distributed. Presented in a fast-paced, news-oriented tone, the six-minute VNR featured an overview of the major issues surrounding illegal logging across Indonesia. Media awards were given to a national newspaper, *Suara Pembaruan*, and the national news magazine *Tempo* for their active and comprehensive news coverage of illegal logging. A radio talk show about the event that aired one week later was carried by more than 100 radio stations throughout Indonesia.
2. Advertising and Mass Media

Public Service Advertisements

The PSAs portrayed the shockingly large amount of money lost to the nation from illegal logging—Rp83 billion every day—as an economic crime committed by a high-level conspiracy, that is, a conspiracy of corruption. This loss was contrasted to the desperate need for funds for critical social services and to poverty reduction. Three versions of the PSAs depicted social programs (poverty alleviation, education, and health care) in need of funds, while a fourth version linked illegal logging to flooding.

The implicit message in the PSAs—reinforced through other channels such as print articles and radio talk shows—was that the corrupt few get rich from their crimes while many suffer. This message was coupled in the ads with a call for action: “Demand justice. Vote for leaders who will take action.”

The PSAs also offered channels for public response and further information via a toll-free telephone number, post office box, and Web site. The ads were broadcast on television and radio and appeared in newspapers and magazines in two phases in 2004. The first phase, from mid-February to early April, covered the period before and during the election campaign for parliament. The second phase, from mid-May to early July, led up to the first round of the presidential election. These periods were chosen with the intention of influencing voters, political parties, and candidates to make illegal logging a significant issue in the elections. The pretest survey had shown that a majority of Indonesians of voting age across the country already perceived commitment to stop illegal logging as important in choosing which party or candidate to vote for (Figure 2). The media campaign, and the PSAs in particular, would reinforce that belief and, it was hoped, motivate the parties and individual candidates to make such commitments part of their election platforms.

The four print versions of the ads are shown in Figures 3A, B, C, and D. Next to each of the ads in Indonesian appears an equivalent version in English. These were developed for publication in the Jakarta Post, a leading English-language daily newspaper (only the “Welfare” and “Health” versions appeared).
Figure 3A. Children’s Welfare Version of PSA

KITA SEDANG KEJUDDAN
RP 83 Milyar
SETIAP HARI

Persekongkolan tingkat tinggi merampok kekayaan hutan kita setiap harinya.

WE ARE BEING ROBBED OF
RP 83 Billion
EVERYDAY

A high-level conspiracy is pocketing the wealth of our forests

Di lapisan bawah, kemiskinan yang kian menghimpit memaksakan anak-anak untuk hidup di jalan.

while the weight of poverty forces children to live on the streets.

STOP
PERAMPOKAN
HUTAN

Hak anda untuk menuntut keadilan. Saatnya kita bulatkan suara untuk menentang korupsi atas kekayaan hutan kita.

STOP
FOREST ROBBERY

It is your right to demand justice. We must work together to stop the pillaging of our forests.

PILIH PEMIMPIN
YANG BERANI
BERTINDAK TEGAS

Choose a leader who dares to take a stand against illegal logging

Hubungi kami sekarang juga.

Contact us now

bebas pulsa 0800-1-4hutan
www.inform.or.id
kotakpos 1100/BOUT, Bogor 16161

bebas pulsa 0800-1-4hutan
toll free 0800-1-448826
www.inform.or.id
PO BOX 1100/BOUT, Bogor 16161
**Figure 3B. Education Version of PSA**

**KITA SEDANG KECOLONGAN**
**RP 83 Milyar**
**Setiap Hari**

*Persekongkolan tingkat tinggi merampok kekayaan hutan kita setiap harinya.*

**STOP PERAMPOKAN HUTAN**

*Hek anda untuk menuntut keadilan. Saatnya kita bulatkan surga untuk menevent korrupsi atas kekayaan hutan kita. PILIH PEMIMPIN YANG BERANI BERTINDAK TEGAS*

Hubungi kami sekarang juga.

bebas pulsa 0800-1-4hutan
www.inform.or.id
kotakpos 1100/BOUT, Bogor 16161

**WE ARE BEING ROBBED OF**
**RP 83 Billion**
**Everyday**

*A high level conspiracy is pocketing the wealth of our forests*

**STOP FOREST ROBBERY**

*It is your right to demand justice. We must work together to stop the pillaging of our forests.*

*CHOOSE A LEADER WHO DARES TO TAKE A STAND AGAINST ILLEGAL LOGGING*

Contact us now

toll free 0800-1-448826
www.inform.or.id
PO BOX 1100/BOUT, Bogor 16161
Figure 3C. Health Care Version of PSA

KITA SEDANG KECOLONGAN
RP 83 Milyar
SETIAP HARI

Persekongkolan tingkat tinggi merampok kekayaan hutan kita setiap harinya.

Di sisi lain, sangat kurangnya dana menghambat pelayanan kesehatan yang merata.

STOP
PERAMPOKAN HUTAN

Hak anda untuk menuntut keadilan. Saatnya kita bulatkan suara untuk menentang korupsi atas kekayaan hutan kita.

PILIH PEMIMPIN
YANG BERANI BERTINDAK TEGAS

Hubungi kami sekarang juga.

bebas pulsa 0800-1-4hutan
www.inform.or.id
kotalpes 1100/BOUT, Bogor 16161

WE ARE BEING ROBBED OF
RP 83 Billion
EVERYDAY

A high-level conspiracy is pocketing the wealth of our forests

while a lack of funds prevents equal access to public health services.

STOP
FOREST ROBBERY

It is your right to demand justice. We must work together to stop the pillaging of our forests.

CHOOSE A LEADER WHO DARES TO TAKE A STAND AGAINST ILLEGAL LOGGING

Contact us now

toll free 0800-1-448926
www.inform.or.id
PO BOX 1100/BOUT, Bogor 16161
Figure 3D. Flooding Version of PSA

KITA SEDANG KECOLONGAN
RP 83 Milyar
SETIAP HARI

Persekongkolan tingkat tinggi merampok kekayaan hutan kita setiap harinya.

STOP PERAMPOKAN HUTAN

Hak anda untuk menuntut keadilan. Saatnya kita batal dan suara untuk menentang korupsi atas kekayaan hutan kita.

PILIH PEMIMPIN YANG BERANI BERTINDAK TEGAS

Hubungi kami sekarang juga.
bebas pulsa 0800-1-4hutan
www.inform.or.id
kotakpos 1100/BOUT, Bogor 16161

WE ARE BEING ROBBED OF
RP 83 Billion
EVERYDAY

A high-level conspiracy is pocketing the wealth of our forests.

STOP FOREST ROBBERY

It is your right to demand justice. We must work together to stop the pillaging of our forests.

CHOOSE A LEADER WHO DARES TO TAKE A STAND AGAINST ILLEGAL LOGGING

Contact us now
toll free 0800-1-448826
www.inform.or.id
PO BOX 1100/BOUT, Bogor 16161
From February through July 2004, the PSAs appeared 608 times on television, 86 times in print, and 1,656 times on the radio.

The distribution of the PSAs among this mix of print and electronic media was designed by Fortune in close consultation with GreenCOM and INFORM partners. Indonesians get their news primarily from television, followed by newspapers, radio, and magazines (Figures 4 and 5). However, television is also the most expensive medium for advertising and may be less effective than newspapers and magazines in reaching certain key target audiences such as policymakers, business executives, and the intelligentsia. Many Indonesian television stations and some newspapers reach a national audience. Radio, the cheapest medium on which to advertise, is more fragmented among local stations, although many of these are organized into national networks.

Figure 4. Sources of News and Information

GreenCOM’s print PSAs appeared mainly in two daily newspapers and one weekly news magazine having national circulation and known to be read by decision makers in government, the private sector, and civil society: *Kompas* (the newspaper with the largest circulation in Indonesia), *Suara Pembaruan*, and *Tempo* magazine. In June the PSAs also appeared in several local newspapers in selected provinces, including USAID’s priority areas for forestry: East Kalimantan and Papua. The television PSAs ran on a variety of programs on stations with national coverage. There was a fairly heavy concentration on news programs and talk shows, particularly those that focused on the election campaigns, but the ads also ran on popular entertainment programs in order to reach a wide audience. Radio PSAs ran mainly at prime time.
(during morning and evening rush hours) on the 68H network in Jakarta and major provincial cities. The complete schedule of PSAs appears in Annex 3.

Figure 5. Where People Saw the PSAs

Radio & Television Talk Shows

During the period from October 2003 to July 2004, GreenCOM organized 23 talk shows on radio and two on television. Each talk show focused on a different aspect of illegal logging in line with the themes of the campaign: economic impact, corruption, governance, and human rights. GreenCOM was also responsive to opportunities afforded by breaking news stories, partners’ activities, and other events. Examples include the following:

- Two of the most dramatic and popular of the talk shows, which aired in November 2003, featured an eyewitness and victim of the catastrophic flood in Bohorok, Sumatra. The flood claimed dozens of lives and was widely blamed on illegal logging inside Mount Leuser National Park. The flood and the illegal logging issue were front-page news in early November. GreenCOM made arrangements to bring the flood victim accompanied by a representative of a local environmental NGO to Jakarta for the two talk shows. The media demand was so great that they were also asked to appear on six additional TV interviews in one day.

- GreenCOM organized a series of eight live, interactive radio talk shows about illegal logging that ran on Saturday afternoons from November 2003 through January 2004 on Radio Republik Indonesia (RRI), the state-owned radio station.

- Two talk shows were broadcast on Radio Delta FM, a popular urban station. Guests included the director of the Ministry of Forestry’s Information Center; the directors of three well-known environmental NGOs; and a prominent forest economist from the Centre for International Forest Research. Among the topics discussed in relation to illegal
logging were forest law and law enforcement, governance, corruption, implications of decentralization, national debt, money laundering, forest law and human rights, and illegal logging and social responsibility.

These talk shows were very popular, with many listeners calling in to join the often lively discussions. Consequently, GreenCOM and RRI agreed to extend the series of Saturday talk shows on illegal logging for another 10 broadcasts. The new series started in February 2004 with a discussion that contrasted the scarcity of funds for medical services with the amount of money lost to illegal logging. The topic was linked to the ongoing dengue epidemic in Indonesia, which had been much in the news, and with the media placement that week of a version of the PSA focusing on health care.

In a departure from the earlier talk shows, all of which had been broadcast from Jakarta, some segments in the second series were aired from regions outside Jakarta where illegal logging was a serious problem and where some of GreenCOM’s local NGO partners were working. One such show, in March 2004, was broadcast live from West Kalimantan, where the RRI crew visited an illegal logging camp and interviewed loggers, members of the local community, and representatives of government and environmental NGOs.

Other topics covered in the series included a national legislative initiative for government action against illegal logging, illegal logging in West Java (broadcast live from the field), and on several occasions, illegal logging as an election campaign issue. A complete list of talk show guests and topics appears in Annex 3.

Print Editorial Placement

GreenCOM worked with a variety of national and local print media outlets, to increase coverage of illegal logging issues. The capacity of the Indonesian media to cover illegal logging stories, especially at the local level, was enhanced through training workshops for journalists (see the section on training workshops below). Among the highlights were the following placements:

- GreenCOM provided technical and financial support for publication of the December 2003 issue of *Ulin*, a monthly environmental newspaper insert in East Kalimantan. The theme for the entire issue was illegal logging, with a particular focus on the problem of illegal sawmills operating in the province.
- GreenCOM organized a special page on illegal logging for the *Jakarta Post*’s environment page on April 27, 2004. Two articles were provided by INFORM partners.
- In May and June 2004, *Suara Pembaruan* ran a weekly special page on illegal logging featuring articles provided by GreenCOM.
- An opinion piece in *Sinar Harapan*, entitled “Illegal Logging: Isu Strategis Kampanye Capres,” (“Illegal Logging: A Strategic Issue in the Presidential Campaign”), contrasted the economic burden of illegal logging with the need to fund social programs.
- GreenCOM sponsored special editions on illegal logging of the monthly environmental news inserts *Alamku*, in Papua, and *Ulin*, in East Kalimantan, in April and June 2004.
- GreenCOM sponsored an environmental media award ceremony, organized and presented by INFORM, in August 2004. Awards were presented to three outstanding...
newspapers and three journalists, as judged by a panel of independent experts chosen by GreenCOM and INFORM. Winners were selected for their coverage of illegal logging and other forestry issues during the past year.

**Media Events**

Media events were organized in order to amplify and support the key messages of the campaign. These included three public events featuring the presidential campaign teams, including a major seminar attended by representatives of all five candidates.

GreenCOM sponsored three forums in June 2004 to address how presidential candidates would deal with Indonesia’s “forestry crisis,” particularly illegal logging. Two of the events were organized by SKEPHI (The Indonesian NGO Network for Forest Conservation) with support from INFORM. All five presidential candidates were invited to speak and two accepted: Amien Rais, represented by Drajat Wibowo of his campaign team, and Wiranto, represented by his running mate, Solahudin Wahid. The speeches, attended by journalists, NGOs, and government officials, were given extended national television coverage by the state-owned television network, TVRI.

The third public forum was a seminar on the five presidential candidates’ commitment to deal with illegal logging, organized jointly by GreenCOM and the Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). The seminar, sponsored together with INFORM and *Sinar Harapan* newspaper, featured representatives of all five presidential campaign teams, who presented their candidates’ platform on illegal logging and forestry issues. Emil Salim, former environmental minister and director of the Indonesian Biodiversity Foundation, and H. S. Dillon, Director of the United Nations Development Program’s Partnership for Governance Reform, gave opening presentations. The event was attended by 270 people from government, the national legislature, academia, NGOs, the media, and the private sector.

### 3. Social Mobilization: Small Grants

The aim of the small grants program was to augment the national “call to action” voiced through advertising and mass media with efforts to mobilize constituencies in selected parts of the country where illegal logging is a problem. Small grants were used as a mechanism to enable local and national NGOs to implement media and outreach activities, particularly in regions outside Jakarta; to strengthen local networks of NGOs fighting illegal logging in those regions; and to link and coordinate with each other and the national campaign.

The grants ranged from Rp182 million to Rp210 million (approximately $21,400 to $24,700). Figure 6 shows how the budgets of the grantees were allocated. The criteria for selection were established and published with the request for applications in July 2003, and an NGO review committee recommended awards from among the 27 proposals received. The final selection was reviewed and approved by USAID. The eight grantees included two national NGOs based in Jakarta and six local NGOs in North Sumatra, Bengkulu, Riau, West Java, West Kalimantan, and
Papua (see Table 2). A more detailed description of the organizations awarded grants is contained in Annex 4.

Figure 6. Allocation of Small Grant Budgets for Various Activities
Table 2. GreenCOM Small Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Project &amp; Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Yayasan Leuser Lestari (YLL)                 | North Sumatra| Campaign Against Illegal Logging in North Sumatra
Gunung Leuser National Park, Bukit Barisan Nature Reserve |
| Yayasan Lingkungan Hidup Humeibou Manokwari (YALHIMO) | Papua        | The Impact of Illegal Logging and Indigenous Community Advocacy on Natural Resource Management in Manokwari District, Bintuni Bay, and Wondama Bay
Bintuni Bay and Wondama Bay                    |
| Yayasan Ulayat Bengkulu                      | Bengkulu     | Campaign to Fight Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Kerinci Sebelat National Park (TNKS)
Kerinci Sebelat and Bukit Barisan Selatan National Parks |
| Sekretariat Nasional Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara (AMAN) | National    | Facilitating and Strengthening the Indigenous Community to Combat Illegal Logging
Papua, East Kalimantan, and West Sumatra        |
| Institut Hukum Sumberdaya Alam (IHSA)         | National     | Provision of Information and Data to Increase Understanding and Build Capacity of Stakeholders Involved in Illegal Logging Legal Issues
East Kalimantan and Jakarta                    |
| Yayasan Madanika                             | West Kalimantan| Campaign Against Illegal Logging Through Religious Institutions and Leaders in West Kalimantan
West Kalimantan                                |
| Yayasan Pemerhati Kehutanan dan Lingkungan Tatar Sunda (DPKLTS) | West Java    | Capacity Building for Communities and Reporters Against Illegal Logging in West Java
West Java                                      |
| Hakiki Foundation                            | Riau         | Campaign Against Illegal Logging to Save Riau’s Forests
Bukit 30 National Park, Tahura SSQ Minas, SM, Kerumutan, SM, Bukit Rimbang–Bukit Baling, and Hutan Lindung Bukit Batabuh |

GreenCOM facilitated an orientation workshop in Jakarta for grantees on how to prepare monitoring plans, identify needs for technical assistance, learn how to manage USAID grants, and identify opportunities to work with one another and the national campaign. Activities commenced in January 2004 and concluded in May and June and included the following:

- Outreach to local groups to help them defend their own communities against illegal logging. Among these were indigenous communities in Papua, Kalimantan, and Sumatra, farmers’ organizations in Sumatra and Java, and religious leaders and their communities in Kalimantan.
- Public hearings, dialogues, and workshops facilitating different stakeholder groups—communities, NGOs, government agencies, and journalists—to cooperate to stop illegal logging. One example was a series of meetings of farmer groups, NGOs, and government agencies (including local police and forestry officials) to agree on steps to curb illegal
logging that was degrading irrigation systems in Sumatra. Another is a multi-stakeholder workshop to gain a common understanding of national and local laws governing forests in East Kalimantan.

- Events aimed at gaining wider exposure and discussion of illegal logging, such as a seminar for political parties contesting the regional parliamentary election in West Java and a series of radio talk shows on illegal logging in West Kalimantan.

These activities were supported by information gathering and consultation in and around affected communities and training of community-based field teams. Altogether, 1,829 people took part in workshops, seminars, training courses, and other events; 348 participants (19%) were women. Table 3 shows the number of men and women who participated in events organized by the grantees.

**Table 3. Gender Composition of Participants in Grantee-Sponsored Events**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YLL</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yalhimo</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulayat</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMAN</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHSA</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madanika</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPKLTS</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakiki</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>348</strong></td>
<td><strong>1481</strong></td>
<td><strong>1829</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grantees employed various media mechanisms to reach their target groups, including PSAs tailored for a local audience, video documentaries about illegal logging and its impacts on local communities, and fact sheets about the problems of illegal logging in particular regions. They also produced campaign materials such as posters, stickers, and T-shirts, which were distributed to workshop participants and other stakeholders. Further details about the grantees’ products and events are in Annex 4.

The grantees’ performance was monitored by the GreenCOM small grants coordinator through regular monthly reports, final reports including monitoring forms, occasional field visits, and frequent telephone and e-mail consultation. Two grantees received technical assistance in video production and editing from Yayasan SET, a member of the USAID-funded Media Coalition contracted by GreenCOM.
4. Training Workshops

GreenCOM conducted two main series of regional training workshops: one in environmental communications for NGOs and the other in environmental journalism for journalists. The chief trainer in all of these workshops was Harry Surjadi, an experienced freelance environmental journalist formerly affiliated with Kompas, Indonesia’s leading newspaper. Course outlines for the NGO and journalist training workshops are presented in Annex 5.

The workshops drew trainees from Indonesia’s major islands: Sumatra, Java, Kalimantan, Papua, and Sulawesi. Each workshop was organized and run by GreenCOM in collaboration with a local NGO, which served as a node for a regional network of NGOs and journalists focused on illegal logging. The workshops were held from June 2003 through May 2004.

Environmental Communications for NGOs

The environmental communications workshops trained staff from local and national NGOs engaged in the campaign against illegal logging. The training helped them to develop media strategies and provided them with media outreach skills. Ninety-one people were trained in five regional workshops.

To help small NGOs develop their own locally appropriate media strategies, GreenCOM provided them with basic training in environmental communication to improve their knowledge, skills, and capacity to effectively utilize mass media. Trainees learned why and how to develop media-oriented communication strategies, including the identification of target audiences and crafting of appropriate themes and messages for those audiences. They gained practical skills such as preparing press releases and convening press conferences, and they were taught how to use the Internet as a communication tool.

Environmental Journalism

Despite the fact that media coverage of environmental issues, including illegal logging, has been increasing in recent years, there are still only a limited number of journalists with the training and experience to properly investigate and report such stories. Most reporters who do cover the environment do not possess a scientific or environmental background. However, many of them do realize that environmental issues are complex and feel a professional interest and responsibility to learn more about them. They may also thereby gain a professional advantage because of the scarcity of trained environmental journalists.

The environmental journalism workshops provided journalists with skills to investigate and report on illegal logging. They were given general information about illegal logging and its impacts and, guided by local NGOs, they made field visits to sites affected by illegal logging. Fifty-seven journalists were trained in four regional workshops (in all the major islands except Sulawesi).

In addition to gaining technical knowledge helpful for reporting about illegal logging and other forestry issues, trainees were taught practical skills in investigative reporting and journalistic
writing. They also discussed ethical standards such as the difference between advocacy and straight reporting and the importance of balancing perspectives. Each participant prepared a plan to write about forestry and illegal logging issues, to be implemented after he or she completed the training workshop.

**Other Training**

Additional training included the following:

- NGO and journalist trainees were brought together after four of the workshops to help them bridge communication gaps between the two groups, identify common interests and complementary skills, and form cooperative networks. One hundred twelve trainees participated in these joint workshops.
- Four spokesperson training events were held in July 2002 with the Minister of Environment, Ministry of Forestry Information Center staff, and NGOs. The training included active participation through videotaped practice sessions with participants responding to questions from “the press” and analyzing their performance afterwards.
- Training in video production was provided by Yayasan SET for NGOs across Indonesia, including a number of GreenCOM grantees and others that had participated in the environmental communications training workshops.
- Joint training for NGOs and journalists in the *Ulin* news network in East Kalimantan was conducted by GreenCOM.

Altogether about 200 people throughout Indonesia were trained in 24 workshops (Table 4).
### Table 4. Training Workshops Conducted by GreenCOM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic &amp; Total No. Trained</th>
<th>Date &amp; Location</th>
<th>Participants/Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Communication for NGOs</strong></td>
<td><strong>August 20–23, 2003</strong></td>
<td>20 participants / 19 NGOs in Jayapura, Sorong, and Manokwari and the Provincial Forestry Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 Individuals Trained</td>
<td><strong>Jayapura, Papua</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>September 10–13, 2003</strong></td>
<td>21 participants / 19 NGOs in DI. Yogyakarta, Bandung, Bogor, and Jakarta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Cikarang, Jakarta</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>October 8–11, 2003</strong></td>
<td>18 participants / 18 NGOs in Pekanbaru and Inderagiri Ilir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pekanbaru, Riau</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>March 1–5, 2004</strong></td>
<td>14 participants / 14 NGOs in West, Central, East, and South Kalimantan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pontianak, West Kalimantan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>May 24–25, 2004</strong></td>
<td>18 participants / 18 NGOs in North, Central, Southeast, and South Sulawesi and Central Kalimantan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Journalism</strong></td>
<td><strong>June 12–15, 2003</strong></td>
<td>14 participants / 15 local media outlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 Individuals Trained</td>
<td><strong>Pekanbaru, Riau</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>July 28–31, 2003</strong></td>
<td>14 participants / 13 local media outlets in East, West, and South Kalimantan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sintang, West Kalimantan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>August 25–28, 2003</strong></td>
<td>16 participants / 16 local media outlets in Jayapura, Manokwari, Timika, and Sorong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>January 19–22, 2004</strong></td>
<td>13 participants / 13 media outlets in Bogor, Bandung, Cirebon, and DI Yogyakarta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NGO-Journalist Workshops</strong></td>
<td><strong>August 28, 2003</strong></td>
<td>27 participants / 14 NGOs and 13 local media outlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 Individuals Trained</td>
<td><strong>Jayapura, Papua</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>October 11, 2003</strong></td>
<td>23 participants / 18 NGOs and 5 local media outlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pekanbaru, Riau</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>October 11, 2003</strong></td>
<td>38 participants / 20 NGOs, 17 local media outlets, and The Nature Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Bandung, West Java</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>March 6, 2004</strong></td>
<td>24 / 14 NGOs, 9 local media outlets, Illegal Logging Response Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pontianak, West Kalimantan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audio-Visual Techniques</strong></td>
<td><strong>June 7–14, 2004</strong></td>
<td>15 participants / 15 NGOs in Central, North, and Southeast Sulawesi, East Kalimantan, West and Central Java, Riau, Lampung (Sumatra), and Papua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Individuals Trained</td>
<td><strong>Jatiluhur, West Java and Jakarta</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spokesperson Skills</strong></td>
<td><strong>July 12, 2002</strong></td>
<td>State Minister of Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Individuals Trained</td>
<td><strong>Jakarta</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>July 15, 2002</strong></td>
<td>6 participants / Ministry of Forestry’s Information Center and NRM/EPIQ Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Bogor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>July 16, 2002</strong></td>
<td>14 participants / NGOs, Ministry of Environment, and NRM/EPIQ Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Bogor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PHASE THREE: MONITORING AND EVALUATION

1. Campaign Reach and Impact

The effectiveness of the media campaign, particularly the PSAs, was systematically measured through independent research by means of a pretest/post-test comparison. Effectiveness was assessed in terms of reach and impact. Reach is the number of people or percentage of the target audience who saw or heard the PSAs. Impact is the change in knowledge, attitudes, and practices as a consequence of the campaign.

Taylor Nelson Sofres (TNS) conducted two national surveys of 1,623 adults in nine cities. The first, a pretest survey in October 2003, established a baseline of knowledge, attitudes, and practices about illegal logging before the PSAs appeared. The second, a post-test survey in June 2004, near the end of the media campaign, measured the campaign’s reach by asking whether respondents recognized one or more of the PSAs. It also asked some of the same, or similar, questions as in the pretest survey to measure changes in knowledge, attitudes, and practices.

Reach and impact are also indicated by the number or increase in number of calls to the toll-free telephone number and visits to the Web site listed in the PSAs during the time they appeared in the media.

The pretest/post-test comparison shows that GreenCOM’s PSAs were seen by nearly half (46%) of respondents surveyed. Negative attitudes toward illegal logging increased from an already high level at the time of the pretest. Among respondents who had seen the PSAs, the increase in some attitudes was even greater, particularly the belief that illegal logging has a negative impact on the welfare of the country and families. Conversely, there was a marked decrease in the number of respondents who agreed with the statement “Illegal logging is not a problem that affects me and my family,” particularly among those who had seen the PSAs. Also, respondents who had seen the PSAs ranked illegal logging higher in importance as an election issue than did those who had not seen the PSAs.

Campaign Reach Measured by the Pretest and Post-Test Surveys

The post-test survey found that 83% of respondents recalled seeing at least one of the four GreenCOM PSAs (Figure 7). However, this result must be adjusted because of a common phenomenon known as “false recall.” Some respondents who never actually saw an advertisement will falsely report having seen it when asked. In order to estimate the magnitude of this bias, respondents in the October 2003 pretest survey were shown a picture of a “dummy” PSA about illegal logging that had not yet appeared in the media. They were asked if they had ever seen the PSA. Thirty-seven percent of respondents in the pretest reported having seen the dummy PSA. Therefore, to gauge the true level of recall of the real PSAs that appeared from February through June 2004, the total recall is adjusted by subtracting the previously measured false recall percentage (37%). The percentage of respondents judged to have actually seen at least one of the PSAs is 46%. This adjusted measure of campaign reach, reflecting true recall, is shown in Table 5.
Figure 7. Campaign Reach: Total Recall and False Recall of GreenCOM PSAs

Table 5. Campaign Reach: True (Adjusted) Recall of GreenCOM PSAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Java</th>
<th>Sumatra</th>
<th>Kalimantan</th>
<th>Papua</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never saw ad</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw 1 ad</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw 2 ads</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw 3 ads</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw 4 ads</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Source: TNS Pretest and Post-test Surveys |
| Base: All respondents (46% of respondents saw at least one PSA) |
Campbell Impact Measured by Post-Test Survey

Attitudes on Illegal Logging

In both the pre- and post-test surveys, respondents were asked whether they thought illegal logging negatively impacted Indonesia’s welfare, the welfare of themselves or their families, education and health programs, and the environment, as well as whether they considered illegal logging an immoral action. According to the post-test results, negative attitudes about illegal logging increased for four of these five questions. The exception was the negative perception of illegal logging as a cause of environmental problems such as floods and landslides, which was already very high in the pretest (4.61 on a scale of 1.00 to 5.00). Changes in attitude about illegal logging from the time of the pretest in October 2003 till the June 2004 post-test are shown in Table 6.

The increase in negative attitude was statistically significant for two questions: “Does illegal logging have a negative impact on the welfare of you or your family?” and “Does illegal logging take money away from education and health programs?” (Although the increase in negative attitudes for the other questions—on the impact of illegal logging on Indonesia’s welfare, environmental impacts, and the immorality of illegal logging—were not statistically significant, they were already quite high in the pretest).

Table 6. Changes in Attitude Toward Illegal Logging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n (WTD)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Java</th>
<th>Sumatra</th>
<th>Kalimantan</th>
<th>Papua</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre 1623</td>
<td>Post 1623</td>
<td>Pre 1270</td>
<td>Post 1261</td>
<td>Pre 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal logging has a negative impact on Indonesia’s welfare.</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal logging has a negative impact on your welfare or the welfare of your family.</td>
<td>3.32→ 3.60</td>
<td>3.27→ 3.89</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal logging is taking away money from education and health programs.</td>
<td>3.11→ 3.69</td>
<td>3.14→ 3.84</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.67→ 3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal logging has a negative environmental impact such as causing landslides and erosion or contributing to floods and drought.</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal logging is an immoral action.</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TNS Pretest and Post-test Surveys
Base: All respondents
A1 Please tell me to what extent do you agree or disagree with the statement about illegal logging.
5 point scale rating, 1 is “strongly disagree” and 5 is “strongly agree.” Arrow (→) denotes significant differences at the 95% confidence level.
Among those who had seen at least one PSA, the negative attitudes were significantly higher than among those who had not seen the PSAs on the two questions about whether illegal logging impacts national welfare and personal or family welfare (Table 7).

Table 7. Difference in Attitude Toward Illegal Logging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n (WTD) =</th>
<th>Never Seen</th>
<th>1 Ad</th>
<th>2 Ads</th>
<th>3 Ads</th>
<th>4 Ads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal logging has a negative impact on Indonesia’s welfare.</td>
<td>4.13 → 4.29</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal logging has a negative impact on your welfare or the welfare of your family.</td>
<td>3.37 → 3.65</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal logging is taking away money from education and health programs.</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal logging has a negative environmental impact such as causing landslides and erosion or contributing to floods and drought.</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal logging is an immoral action.</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TNS Post-test Survey
Base: All respondents
A1 Please tell me to what extent you agree or disagree with the statement about illegal logging.
46% of respondents saw at least one ad. Arrow (→) denotes significant differences at the 95% confidence level.

Action Against Illegal Logging

The percentage of respondents who reported having taken any action against illegal logging did not change significantly from the pretest to the post-test. However, there was a noticeable change in the reasons people gave for not taking action (Table 8). The percentage indicating that “Illegal logging…does not affect me and my family directly” declined from 64% to 47%, in line with the shift in negative attitude on this question as seen in Table 7. Conversely, the percentage saying, “Illegal logging is condoned by corrupt government,” increased from 12% to 26%. Both of these reflect core messages of the national media campaign. The combination of political discourse about corruption during both the parliamentary and presidential election campaigns and the anti-corruption message of the media campaign appears to have resonated with respondents.
Table 8. Reasons for Not Taking Action Against Illegal Logging (All Respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Not Taking Action</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Java</th>
<th>Sumatra</th>
<th>Kalimantan</th>
<th>Papua</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1598%</td>
<td>1599%</td>
<td>1261%</td>
<td>232%</td>
<td>197%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal logging is not a problem; it does not affect me or my family directly.</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal logging is condoned by corrupt government.</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private industry control is too strong to stop it.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others: Don’t know what to do, live far from forest, no time, no impact on me, not aware of illegal logging.</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TNS Pre- and Post-test Surveys
Base: Respondents who have not taken actions against illegal logging
A2c Why have you not taken any action against illegal logging?

Direct evidence that the media campaign was effective in delivering the message that illegal logging is a problem that should concern all Indonesians can be seen in Table 9. The percentage of respondents who said “Illegal logging…does not affect me and my family directly” was significantly lower among those who had seen all four PSAs than among those who had not seen the ads.

Table 9. Reasons for Not Taking Action Among Respondents Who Saw PSAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Not Taking Action</th>
<th>NEVER SEEN</th>
<th>EVER SEEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>280%</td>
<td>1319%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal logging is not a problem; it does not affect me or my family directly.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal logging is condoned by corrupt government.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private industry control is too strong to stop it.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others: Don’t know what to do, live far from forest, no time, no impact on me, not aware of illegal logging.</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TNS Post-test Survey
Base: Respondents who had not taken action against illegal logging (46% of respondents saw at least one ad.)
A2c Why have you not taken any action against illegal logging? Boxes denote significant difference at the 95% confidence level.

Although most respondents did not report having taken action against illegal logging, this does not mean that they would not consider doing so. There was a significant increase (from 23% to 35%) from pretest to post-test in the expression of willingness to take action (likely or very
likely) and a corresponding decrease in the percentage (from 41% to 28%) of respondents who said they would be unlikely or very unlikely to take action against illegal logging (Table 10).

Table 10. Future Intention to Take Action Against Illegal Logging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Java</th>
<th>Sumatra</th>
<th>Kalimantan</th>
<th>Papua</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP 2 BOXES</td>
<td>23→</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20→</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither likely nor unlikely</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTTOM 2 BOXES</td>
<td>41←</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TNS Pretest and Post-test Surveys
Base: All respondents

A4 How likely are you to take action against illegal logging in the future? Arrow (→) denotes significant differences at the 95% confidence level.

Compare this with a similar result found in the post-campaign study conducted for the INFORM project. That study also measured reach and impact of the GreenCOM PSAs (which bore the INFORM logo), albeit in a smaller number of provinces than GreenCOM’s own post-test survey. The authors of the INFORM study found that respondents who were “informed,” that is, who recalled at least one PSA or other campaign element, were more likely than others to be willing to take action against forest destruction, including illegal logging. The campaign’s message to call on others to stop forest destruction or forest robbery was mentioned by half of the respondents as an activity they would be willing to join (Figure 8).

---

Illegal Logging As an Issue for Voters

In October 2003 the pretest survey found that the importance to prospective voters of a party’s or candidate’s commitment to prevent illegal logging was already very high (see Figure 2). By the time of the post-test survey in June 2004, during the presidential election campaign, this had increased to even higher levels, as shown in Tables 11 and 12.

Source: IHS-INFORM Campaign Monitoring and Evaluation Follow-up Survey 2004
Table 11. Importance of Illegal Logging in Voting for a Political Party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SAW AD*</th>
<th>NEVER SAW AD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=(WTD)</td>
<td>1329</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither/nor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN SCORE</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TNS Post-test Survey
Base: All respondents (*Saw at least one ad)

A6a How important was a political party’s commitment to prevent illegal logging in making your decision to vote for a particular party?

Table 12. Importance of Illegal Logging in Voting for a Presidential Candidate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SAW AD*</th>
<th>NEVER SAW AD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n=(WTD)</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither/nor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important at all</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN SCORE</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TNS Post-test Survey
Base: All respondents (*Saw at least one ad)

A6a How important do you feel a presidential candidate’s commitment to prevent illegal logging is in your decision to vote for a particular candidate?

The increase in the percentage of respondents who said commitment to prevent illegal logging was important in their choice of a party or candidate was substantial among those who had seen at least one of the PSAs, rising from 75% to 84% for choice of party and from 85% to 91% for choice of candidate. In contrast to this shift, among respondents who had not seen the ads, there was virtually no change, though it is worth noting that the ranking of illegal logging as an important political issue was already very high in the October 2003 pretest. Thus, the media campaign was evidently effective in helping to increase already strong public support for making illegal logging an important political issue during the run-up to the elections.

Public Response Channels

A toll-free telephone number, post office box, and Web site were featured in all of the PSAs and operated by INFORM to provide information to members of the public who responded to the PSAs. Readers and viewers were invited to call the response center, operated by BirdLife Indonesia, to express their thoughts and concerns about illegal logging and request information. GreenCOM and INFORM created a special illegal logging page on the INFORM Web site, managed by Conservation International, where information was posted along with relevant news
articles. The information included facts and figures linked to specific messages in the PSAs, such as the basis for the statement that Rp83 billion is stolen by illegal logging ever day (from calculations of lost revenue by the Ministry of Forestry); a list of worthwhile initiatives—building schools, staffing health clinics, providing free education for poor children—that could be funded if that amount of money were available; and suggestions for actions people could take to help in the fight against illegal logging. From the same information, GreenCOM prepared fact sheets and other materials, including suggested actions that people could take, that were distributed to callers to the response center.

The call response center began service for the new toll-free telephone number in February 2004 when the PSAs first appeared. During the first phase, one full-time operator was employed for GreenCOM during regular working hours. Calls after operating hours were recorded and logged. During the second phase, in June 2004, the number of telephone operators and the hours of service at BirdLife Indonesia’s call response center in Bogor were increased to handle calls from 7:00 AM until 8:00 PM.

Altogether, 1,734 public responses to the PSAs were logged, most of them by telephone (Figure 9 and Table 13). Many calls were received after normal operating hours in Bogor and so were automatically answered and recorded. The volume of calls served as one measure of the level of public response to the PSAs.

Figure 9. Frequency of Calls to Response Center

![Bar chart showing the frequency of calls to the response center.](attachment:image)

Source: BirdLife Indonesia
Table 13. How Calls Were Handled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Voice mailbox</th>
<th>Automatic response</th>
<th>Mail response</th>
<th>TOTAL BY MONTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February &amp; March</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL BY TYPE</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1446</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1734</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BirdLife Indonesia

INFORM tracked Web site visits (number of people entering the Web site) and hits (number of times visitors clicked on different parts of the site) on a monthly basis. Although hits on the illegal logging pages were not tracked separately, the overall number of visits and hits increased markedly after the PSAs appeared (Figure 10). The increase is attributable in part to INFORM’s own PSAs, which ran from January to March 2004, as well as to the appearance of GreenCOM’s PSAs from February to July 2004.

Figure 10. Monthly Visits, INFORM Web Site

Source: INFORM
2. Analysis of Media Coverage

Illegal Logging and Other Forestry News in Print

Trends in print coverage of illegal logging and related forestry issues over the course of the campaign were measured by counting the frequency of news stories (including editorial and op-ed opinion) in seven daily newspapers and one news magazine from November 2002 through July 2004. Articles on forest-related topics were clipped and sorted into several categories, including illegal logging.

Figure 11 shows the number of news stories about illegal logging and other forestry news appearing each month in those print media monitored by GreenCOM. Note the sustained increase in coverage of all types of forestry news after March 2003, when the national media campaign was launched by GreenCOM, INFORM, and other NGOs.

Figure 11. News Stories on Illegal Logging and Forestry, November 2002 to July 2004

Similar statistics from more than a dozen newspapers were compiled by the Forestry Department’s Information Center, which shared their results for 2004 with GreenCOM and INFORM (The combined results of the two news monitoring efforts were used as a partial basis for INFORM’s media awards in August 2004 for outstanding coverage of forestry issues).

Television Coverage of Illegal Logging in the Presidential Campaign

GreenCOM commissioned ISAI, a member of the USAID-supported Media Coalition, to monitor television coverage of environmental issues in general, and illegal logging in particular,
during the presidential campaign in June. This research, which ISAI added to their ongoing study of election-related issues in the media, tracked and analyzed the frequency with which illegal logging and other environmental issues were mentioned and discussed in news and talk shows dealing with the presidential candidates. Owing to the cost of monitoring electronic media, this research was conducted only during the month of June 2004.

The results of this study show that the frequency with which environmental issues were raised by candidates and others in news coverage of the presidential campaign was small. Less than 1% of election-related news stories monitored by ISAI during the month-long presidential campaign dealt with environmental issues. Illegal logging was discussed in 12 of the 33 environment-related news stories. This result is surprising in view of the extensive coverage given to illegal logging in other news (as shown, for example in GreenCOM’s tracking of print media).

3. Grants Indicators

Grantees submitted monthly activity and financial reports. Final reports were received in June for those ending their program in May and in July for those extended until June 2004. Quantitative results reported by grantees include the number or frequency of materials such as posters, fact sheets, and PSAs as well as the number of people participating in events such as workshops and training courses (for details see Annex 4.)

The grants coordinator, media facilitator, and COP made field visits to observe some events organized by grantees and to monitor progress of particular media campaign activities.

GreenCOM’s small grants program achieved its objective of supporting the national activities call to action in local and regional target areas, building public concern about illegal logging, advocating for change among a range of stakeholders to counter illegal logging and supporting sustainable forest management. The following examples provide some indicators of that social mobilization:

- The district government of Mukomuko, Bengkulu province, conducted an inspection and hold evidence of illegally logged wood.
- Bengkulu police visited Ulayat (GreenCOM grantee in Bengkulu) to obtain information related to forest destruction in Lubuk Pinang prior to their visit to Lubuk Pinang.
- The chief of police and the head of tourism in Manokwari attended the event hosted by Yalhimo.
- The West Java provincial legislature hosted a Tatar Sunda (DPKLTS) event, which was opened by the vice governor of West Java.
- The indigenous community residing in six districts in Riau agreed to use Jaringan Aliansi Masyarakat Riau (Riau Indigenous Community Network) as their forum to combat illegal logging.
- Radio journalists visited Tatar Sunda (DPKLTS) in West Java and Madanika in Pontianak and attended the AMAN workshop to expand their knowledge and experience of illegal logging issues and efforts to combat it.
• Religious leaders in West Kalimantan broadcast a declaration of their commitment to tackle illegal logging and other environmental problems in West Kalimantan

4. Training Evaluation

To evaluate the effectiveness of the two main training workshops themes—environmental communications for NGOs and environmental journalism—GreenCOM surveyed 149 participants at the end of the program, in July 2004, and 78 responded. The respondents were asked whether the training had improved their skills; how in they had used those skills; and what obstacles, if any, they faced in using their skills.

Of these respondents, 75% reported they had applied new skills learned in the workshops, including (for journalists) writing articles about illegal logging and (for those from NGOs) producing press releases, PSAs, fact sheets, and other campaign materials. Those who reported they had not used new skills said they faced obstacles such as editorial opposition or indifference to illegal logging and lack of capacity on the part of some NGOs to mount a media campaign.

Therefore, environmental communication skills of stakeholders at the national and local levels were significantly enhanced, thus contributing to the impact of this campaign and to the capacity to undertake future environmental campaigns.

5. Joint Evaluation with INFORM

GreenCOM commissioned an evaluation team under the direction of MaX, an independent consulting firm, to assess the performance and results of the GreenCOM and INFORM campaigns toward the end of the two projects in August 2004. The purpose was to gauge the results of activities against project goals, judge the success of partnerships within and between the two projects, and provide recommendations for best practices for the design and implementation of future environmental campaigns in Indonesia. The evaluation team was assigned the following tasks:

• Review project work plans, reports, and other materials.
• Facilitate participation of project technical staff, consultants, and relevant subcontractors in interviews to assess strengths and weaknesses in each technical area.
• Interview key project stakeholders (NGO partners, government counterparts, donors, and media partners) to learn their perspective on campaign achievements and solicit their recommendations for future activities.
• Facilitate discussion of lessons learned and recommendations and options for future campaigns.

Results of the joint evaluation were to be presented to key stakeholders and submitted in a separate report in September 2004.
Summary of Evaluation Team’s Findings

*Overall Implementation and Results*

Both projects successfully implemented the activities laid out in their planning documents.

GreenCOM’s implementation was delayed by a six-month evacuation after the bombing in Bali in October 2002. The delay provided an unexpected opportunity to link the campaign’s core message with legislative and presidential elections in 2004. INFORM received a no-cost extension to extend or complete some ongoing activities and to partner more closely with GreenCOM during the run-up to the 2004 elections.

Both projects achieved or exceeded either the deliverables or outputs/outcomes described in their project planning documents.

*Design*

Both projects had strong, professional designs for implementing national NGO media campaigns through the use of (1) commercial media research organizations and advertising agencies, (2) formative media research for developing campaign strategy and approaches, (3) focus groups and pre- and post-testing to develop strong campaign messages and media, and (4) surveys to monitor reach and impact of the media campaign. In addition, the design of each program included strong participation and input of experience of Indonesian NGOs, both national and local.

In hindsight the anticipated impact of these campaigns, such as a spontaneous, nationwide call to action, appears to have been overly ambitious given the size and complexity of the issues addressed and the diversity of the nation itself. To achieve the hoped-for impact in the time allotted for the two campaigns would have required a much greater level of effort and funding.

*Use and Impact of Mass Media*

The formative media research used to develop campaign themes and messages resulted in focused themes showing the impact of deforestation and illegal logging on social and economic conditions (such as health care and education) with which the public in general can sympathize.

Pre- and post-campaign surveys conducted for GreenCOM, showed that the campaigns reached a broad segment of the Indonesian population and achieved some significant impacts:

- Negative attitudes toward illegal logging and deforestation increased by the end of the project.
- The public’s level of knowledge on issues of illegal logging and deforestation increased.
- There is more media coverage of illegal logging and deforestation.
• Both campaigns ranked high on a number of measures such as recognition and target audience rating points,2 well above acceptable standards for commercial advertisers.

Training

Capacity building in media campaigning and production is a strongly felt need among Indonesian NGOs, and the training conducted by the two projects was greatly appreciated. The training generally met the needs of participants and was hands-on and participatory. The evaluation team found that:

• NGOs and journalists have acquired and used skills from the training programs (e.g., the capacity to conceptualize, script, film, edit, and distribute audio visual media).
• Individual INFORM Consortium members have improved their ability to design and manage media campaigns and produce campaign materials.

Small Grants

Discussions with GreenCOM grantees indicated that the grants were effective in helping them build their own capacity and supporting them to implement their own campaign actions against illegal logging. However, GreenCOM’s small staff configuration meant that its program integration and field monitoring and consultation visits were at a bare minimum; greater staffing would have further strengthened the effectiveness of the grants. Nevertheless, on the whole, the evaluation found that the grants were effective in supporting the campaign and were a valuable component of the project.

Call Response Center

The call response center managed by BirdLife Indonesia was effective in providing a contact point for the public interested in campaign issues as well as acting as an additional tool for monitoring effectiveness of the campaigns by GreenCOM and INFORM. Unfortunately, the call center did not have the capacity to respond to reports of illegal activities as some callers would have wished.

Partnerships

Partnerships were critical to both projects, and each project developed a different structure for managing them. GreenCOM was contracted by USAID to implement a project with a relatively loose, independent coalition of NGOs. INFORM internalized partnerships among NGOs within the consortium and collectively made a contractual agreement with the Global Environment Facility.

In comparing these two organizational models for managing national campaigns, we see that GreenCOM’s coalition model provides (1) more flexibility for developing the roles of the

---

2 Target audience rating points (TARPs) are defined as the number of advertising spots per television program multiplied by the audience rating (percentage of the target audience watching that program) throughout the duration of the advertising campaign.
partners and thus requires greater partnering and negotiation skills; (2) greater initial reach to more potential partners and more freedom to work at various levels with different members of the NGO community; (3) potentially less concentrated benefits for each of the coalition members; (4) the opportunity to identify and hire the best quality staff available; and (5) split responsibility to the donor among coalition members because the GreenCOM project team was contractually bound to the donor whereas the other coalition members were not.

The INFORM consortium model provides (1) a clearer initial purpose and structure; (2) a focus of initial reach and benefits among the consortium members and their networks (adding reach requires more effort to form new partnerships); (3) direct cooperation and tight integration with consortium member projects in the field; (4) shared responsibility among all partners to the donor for project implementation; and (5) greater opportunity for continued operation as the consortium members may support consortium activities with their own resources.

**Stakeholders**

The stakeholders interviewed during the evaluation were generally very positive about the goals and design of the two projects. A common theme among NGO partners and stakeholders was that such projects were, and still are, strongly needed in order to support NGOs implementing national campaigns against illegal logging and deforestation and to strengthen NGO capacity in campaign strategy making, campaign design, media production, and outreach.

These respondents recognized the achievements of the national campaigns but were uninhibited in providing advice to increase integration with local campaigns, sharpen and focus the campaign messages, and be harder hitting, especially in the area of promoting law enforcement.

**Summary of the Evaluation Team’s Recommendations**

The recommendations below are based on the lessons learned from both campaigns and are presented as general recommendations for any national environmental media campaign. These recommendations thus do not reflect directly the strengths and weaknesses of the two projects evaluated.

**Media**

- Develop future campaigns within a long-term (five-year) framework that takes advantage of strategic hook dates, such as government budgeting deadlines and legislative debates, and leads up to a major campaign near the 2009 national and presidential elections.
- Create focused national core messages that (a) can be elaborated further at the local level; (b) are simple, specific, targeted, and relevant to target groups (local and national); and (c) suggest actions people can take to effect change and support the campaign.
- Integrate media, including television, radio, print, talk shows, public events, and public spaces (e.g., billboards) in the campaigns at both national and local levels.
- Develop a broad, effective network of NGO collaborators that share local messages and information on local conditions (including problems and successes) with the national
campaign and conduct local campaigns using styles and images from the national campaign.

- Budget resources for (a) collecting media-ready data systematically on regional and local issues and initiatives; and (b) continuously monitoring and adjusting the campaign at both local and national levels.
- Use social marketing at both national and local levels and make use of professional service providers for effective media design, production, placement, monitoring, and testing.

**Training**
- Continue building capacity in journalism and in campaign development and audio-visual production for NGOs. Base training on the equipment and resources available to those NGOs and plan to provide follow-up consulting and support.

**Grants**
- Design and staff future small grants programs to include clear and defined criteria, complete monitoring systems, and follow-up support and consulting.
- Integrate the grants program by using it as a follow-up to training and by ensuring that grantee media campaigns are connected to the national campaign through the use of common messages, icons, and themes.

**Call Response Center**
- Build the center’s current capacity so that it is more able to (a) involve callers in action at their local level or with the national campaign, and (b) refer those who report illegal or improper activities to organizations or agencies that will take action.

**INFORM**
- Should the consortium wish to develop and manage campaigns in a longer-term framework, conduct strategic planning to shift management approaches and thinking away from short-term project and organizational management. Such planning would increase the consortium’s ability to generate funds and to focus on providing services to its donors, members, and partners as well as improving decision-making and management systems.

**Partnerships**
- When developing partnerships, hold a series of coalition/consortium development and team building workshops that focus on defining relationships and building trust before concentrating on implementation.
- Follow up and meet all commitments to build trust.
- Discuss and renegotiate any changes to original agreements.
- Use planning, monitoring, and reporting systems that help manage the program, maintain information flows between partners, fulfill donor requirements, and track impact and change up to the level of forest management.
- Establish regular meetings of key teams that monitor and address both relationship issues and implementation issues.
- Hold annual retreats or evaluation and planning workshops.
• Use every available communication tool (meetings, email, phone, etc.) to compensate for physical locations of team members.

CONCLUSIONS

The GreenCOM project in Indonesia was an unprecedented effort to rally public support and mobilize public action for a difficult but simply expressed goal: stop illegal logging. By linking illegal logging to other issues of concern to many Indonesians, namely corruption, economic justice, human rights, and governance, the project successfully raised the profile of illegal logging as a mainstream issue worthy of attention in the political discourse and debates of the 2004 elections. It is noteworthy that corruption and governance were key issues in the March parliamentary election campaign and again in the presidential politicking in June. The GreenCOM project did not by itself bring those broader issues to prominence, but by successfully identifying them as core themes in 2002 and 2003 and designing the media campaign around them, GreenCOM and its partners were able to establish and reinforce the key message that illegal logging is high on the list of corrupt practices that must be stopped.

The nationwide call to action conveyed through many hundreds of PSAs, dozens of talk shows, newspaper and magazine articles, and other media events was augmented in local and regional target areas through the activities of GreenCOM’s eight grantees, the hundreds of local journalists and NGO activists trained by GreenCOM, and other local partners such as the Ulin and Alamku media networks. Government officials, policymakers, NGOs, journalists and politicians were engaged at the national level, though training workshops, seminars, and on talk shows; regionally, in grantee-organized events involving provincial legislators, governors, and forestry officials; and locally, again through grantees’ activities that brought heads of district government and law enforcement officials into direct dialogue with community representatives concerned about illegal logging. In a number of cases these efforts resulted in specific actions to stop or mitigate illegal logging, in others the local events became national news stories through the efforts of GreenCOM and its partners.

As a result of the project, significant numbers of Indonesians were persuaded or strengthened in their belief that illegal logging is a serious problem requiring action by leaders and by members of the general public. By a large margin, they viewed illegal logging as an important election issue. Illegal logging was covered extensively in the media and was addressed by candidates in presidential campaign.

• Negative attitudes towards illegal logging measured at the end of the campaign had increased significantly compared to the pre-campaign baseline measurement.
• People likely or very likely to take action against illegal logging increased from 23% before to 35% at the end of the campaign.
• Ninety percent of registered voters surveyed at the end of the campaign ranked illegal logging as an important or very important issue in their choice of a presidential candidate.
• Three high profile public events featured the presidential campaign teams speaking about illegal logging, including a major seminar attended by representatives of all five candidates at the height of the campaign.
• A significant amount of print and broadcast media coverage was generated on illegal logging and related issues throughout the course of the project.

The national media campaign concluded after the first round of the 2004 presidential elections, which winnowed the five candidates down to two who will contest the second round in September. All five of the original candidates endorsed commitments to tackle Indonesia’s forestry crisis, including illegal logging, as expressed for example at the CSIS-INFORM seminar sponsored by GreenCOM in June 2004. Regardless of who wins the second round, Indonesia’s next president and many new and reelected legislators will have made commitments, on the public record, to stop illegal logging. One of the tests of sustainability of the gains made by the national media campaign, in terms of public support and political commitment to deal with the forestry crisis, will be whether the public now holds their elected officials accountable for acting on those commitments.
### ANNEX 1. NGO TASK FORCE AND SMALL GRANTS COMMITTEE

#### NGO Task Force

Note: This list includes the seven members of the Task Force who were active until August 2003 and their organizational affiliations at that time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hapsoro</td>
<td>Telapak Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longgena Ginting</td>
<td>WALHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togu Manurung</td>
<td>Forest Watch Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dadang Tri Sasongko</td>
<td>Yayasan Kemala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewi Suralaga <strong>and</strong></td>
<td>WWF Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Pingkat Selamat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdon Nababan</td>
<td>AMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amalia Firman</td>
<td>Conservation International (for INFORM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Small Grants Advisory Committee

The Small Grants Advisory Committee consisted of three Task Force members and the GreenCOM Environmental Communications Specialist. Its activities were coordinated by GreenCOM’s training specialist, Erwina Darmajanti.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hapsoro</td>
<td>Telapak Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dadang Tri Sasongko</td>
<td>Yayasan Kemala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Pingkat Selamat</td>
<td>WWF Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henny Buftheim</td>
<td>GreenCOM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 2. RESEARCH REPORTS

The following reports were written by service providers commissioned by GreenCOM to conduct research for the national media campaign. They are in English except where otherwise indicated.


- Social marketing research conducted during the formative phase of the campaign


- First round of PSA focus group tests


- Second round of PSA focus group tests


- Household survey conducted prior to the appearance of the PSAs to establish baseline


- Household survey conducted at the end of the campaign to measure reach and impact


- Monitoring media coverage of illegal logging and other environmental issues in the presidential election campaign
ANNEX 3. ADVERTISING AND MASS MEDIA

PSA Frequency and Audience Share

Monthly Frequency of GreenCOM PSAs

Print Ad Placement

TV Ad Placement

Radio Ad Placement
## Radio Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Age of Listeners</th>
<th>SES Level</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>68 H</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>40+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakarta</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakarta</td>
<td>PRB</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakarta</td>
<td>RRI Pro 3-Jkt</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakarta</td>
<td>SK Radio</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jakarta</td>
<td>Trijaya</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Television Audience Share

GreenCOM placed advertisements on 5 television stations covering 51% of total audience share

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Share (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ANTV</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MTV</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>IVM</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LATIVI</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TPI</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>TV7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>RCTI</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SCTV</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>TRANS</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>TVRI</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Media Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Print</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOMPAS</td>
<td>2,189</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KORAN TEMPO</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINAR HARAPAN</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAKARTA POST</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUARAPEMBARUAN</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIKRIRANRKYAT</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAWAPOS</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANALISA</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJALATempo</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIKRIRANRKYAT</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIAUPost</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMARINDA Post</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BANJARMASIN POST</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENDRAWASIH POST</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Television</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METROTV</td>
<td>27,076</td>
<td>13,752</td>
<td>13,324</td>
<td>2,373</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>4,565</td>
<td>7,535</td>
<td>4,707</td>
<td>3,968</td>
<td>1,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCTI</td>
<td>28,895</td>
<td>14,587</td>
<td>14,308</td>
<td>2,399</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>4,687</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>5,150</td>
<td>4,518</td>
<td>1,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTV</td>
<td>28,840</td>
<td>14,570</td>
<td>14,270</td>
<td>2,399</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>4,684</td>
<td>7,851</td>
<td>5,144</td>
<td>4,499</td>
<td>1,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSTV</td>
<td>27,510</td>
<td>13,912</td>
<td>13,598</td>
<td>2,341</td>
<td>2,437</td>
<td>4,513</td>
<td>7,466</td>
<td>4,920</td>
<td>4,213</td>
<td>1,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVRI</td>
<td>27,267</td>
<td>13,810</td>
<td>13,458</td>
<td>2,291</td>
<td>2,396</td>
<td>4,551</td>
<td>7,396</td>
<td>4,812</td>
<td>4,227</td>
<td>1,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AC Nielsen 2003
Examples of Print Media Placement

Environment pages featuring insertions made by GreenCOM and PSAs in Suara Pembaruan daily and the English-language Jakarta Post daily

PSAs featured in Tempo magazine
Special issues on illegal logging of the monthly environmental inserts Alamku (Papua) and Ulin (East Kalimantan)
Talk Show Topics and Speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic &amp; Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Radio Talk Shows on RRI Pro 3 FM | November 8, 2003 | Update on Illegal Logging
Bambang Setiyono, Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)
Togu Manurung, Forest Watch Indonesia |
|                                | November 15, 2003 | The Government’s Role in Saving the Forest
Abdon Nababan, Congress of Indigenous Peoples of the Archipelago (AMAN)
Longgena Ginting, Friends of the Earth Indonesia (WALHI)
Togu Manurung, Forest Watch Indonesia |
|                                | December 6, 2003 | The Impact of Illegal Logging
Agus Setyarso, WWF Indonesia
Abdon Nababan, AMAN |
|                                | December 13, 2003 | Illegal Logging and Corruption
Togu Manurung, Forest Watch Indonesia
Emmy Hafild, Transparency International |
|                                | January 17, 2004 | The Need for Law Enforcement
Mas Achmad Santosa, Indonesian Center for Environmental Law (ICEL)
Togu Manurung, Forest Watch Indonesia |
|                                | February 7, 2004 | People’s Role in Saving the Forest
Longgena Ginting, WALHI
Dr. Mayling Oey, Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI) |
|                                | February 14, 2004 | The Role of NGOs in Taking a Stand Against Illegal Logging
Kurniawan Adi Nugroho, Team for the Legal Defense of Environmental Activists
Agus Setyarso, WWF Indonesia |
|                                | February 21, 2004 | The Sociocultural Impact of Illegal Logging
Dr. Mayling Oey, LIPI
Sulaiman Sembiring, Natural Resources Law Institute (IHSA) |
|                                | February 29, 2004 | Health Issues and Illegal Logging
Dr. Subagyo, Ministry of Health (DEPKES)
Elfian Effendi, Greenomics |
|                                | March 6, 2004    | The Role of the People’s Representatives in Putting Illegal Logging on the Government’s Agenda
Moh. Asikin, House of Representatives (DPR-RI)
Elfian Effendi, Greenomics |
|                                | March 14, 2004   | Illegal Logging in West Java
Endang Supriyadi, Ministry of Forestry
Asep Rahmat Sudrajat, Tatar Sunda |
|                                | March 21, 2004   | The Political Context of Illegal Logging
Indra J. Piliang, Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), Jakarta
Indro Tjahjono, Indonesian NGO Network for Forest Conservation (SKEPHI) |
|                                | March 27, 2004   | Illegal Logging in West Kalimantan
Sunarno, Ministry of Forestry |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic &amp; Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 4, 2004</td>
<td>Illegal Logging and the Parliamentary Elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Solihin GP, Former Governor of West Java</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nurahmat, PT. Inhutani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 13, 2004</td>
<td>The Economic Impact of Illegal Logging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fahriyan, WWF Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 20, 2004</td>
<td>The Presidential Candidates’ Platform on Illegal Logging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ignatius Yoyok, CINLES/University of Atmajaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hasjir Juned, SKEPHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 27, 2004</td>
<td>Grassroots Pressure on Illegal Logging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dedy Armansjah, AMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>La Apo, AMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Talk Shows on Suara Kejayaan Radio</td>
<td>May 25, 2004</td>
<td>The Decline of the Wood Industry in Central Java</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Irwan Gunawan, WWF Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Anwar, WWF Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 1, 2004</td>
<td>Effectiveness of the Media Campaign on Illegal Logging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amalia Firman, Conservation International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 8, 2004</td>
<td>The Alliance to Save the Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M. Anwar, WWF Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Talk Show on Radio Female</td>
<td>August 23, 2004</td>
<td>The Impact of Illegal Logging on Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erwinsyah, Natural Resources Management (NRM) Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vanda Meuthia Dewi, Greenomics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Talk Shows on TVRI</td>
<td>July 1, 2004</td>
<td>The 2004 General Elections and People’s Hope for Illegal Logging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HS Dillon, United Nations Development Program (UNDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emmy Hafild, Transparency International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indro Tjahjono, SKEPHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August 20, 2004</td>
<td>Women and Illegal Logging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Vitalaya, Bogor Agricultural University (IPB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mita Noveria, LIPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vanda Meuthia Dewi, Greenomics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 4. SMALL GRANTS

Grantees

The following are brief descriptions of the organizations that were awarded small grants by GreenCOM:

The **Congress of Indigenous Peoples of the Archipelago (AMAN)** is a national secretariat for indigenous peoples that addresses illegal logging in addition to many other issues.

**Hakiki** is an organization that deals with natural resource management and indigenous peoples.

**Madanika’s** mission is to strengthen civil society in West Kalimantan.

**Tatar Sunda** is dedicated to mobilizing West Javan communities and policymakers to stop forest destruction and preserve resources for communities located in and around forests.

**Ulayat** was established in 2000 to strengthen participatory natural resource management for communities in and around national parks and protected areas.

**YALHIMO** was established by students at Universitas Cenderawasih Manokwari in 1999 to assist local communities in Papua in managing their natural resources independently, democratically, and sustainably.

**YLL** was established in 1989 to promote community-based natural resource management in South Sumatra.

The **Natural Resources Law Institute (IHSA)** works with law enforcement officials and policymakers to enhance their understanding of legal issues related to illegal logging.
**Program Descriptions for Each Grantee**

**Organization:** Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara Secretariat (AMAN)

**Project Name & Objectives:** Support for Indigenous Peoples in Fighting Illegal Logging

- Disseminate information on impact of illegal logging on indigenous peoples throughout Indonesia using electronic and printed media.
- Support, strengthen, and broaden the indigenous role in protecting and conserving forests from illegal logging.

**Location of Organization:** Jakarta

**Location of Project:** Sumatra, Kalimantan, Papua, and Sulawesi

**Total Budget:** Rp 211,075,600

**Activities Implemented:**

- Media campaign by producing and distributing community service ads on radio.
- Talk show on TVRI emphasizing the initiatives of indigenous people in fighting illegal logging.
- Facilitate a regional meeting for indigenous peoples to encourage initiatives to overcome illegal logging in traditional forest territories in Sumatra, Sulawesi, Papua, and Kalimantan.
- Distribute information on illegal logging practices to AMAN members.

**Deliverables:**

- TV talk show held on TVRI Bengkulu in June 2004.
- Radio talk show held on RRI Bengkulu in June 2004.
- Indigenous people regional meeting to encourage initiatives on illegal logging in traditional forest territories attended by representatives from Sumatra, Papua, Sulawesi, and Kalimantan in June 2004.
- Information related to illegal logging activity disseminated to members of AMAN (January–May 2004).
**Organization:** Yayasan Hakiki

**Project Name & Objectives:** Anti–Illegal Logging Campaign to Save Riau’s Forests

- To mobilize public opinion for saving Riau’s forests.
- To build anti–illegal logging community networks.

**Location of Organization:** Pekanbaru, Riau

**Location of Project:** Province of Riau (5 regencies)

**Total Budget:** Rp. 212,000,000

**Activities Implemented:**

- Manage data and information for effective anti–illegal logging campaign.
- Data collection, documentary film production, and other campaign products (stickers and calendars).
- Multiple stakeholder dialogues on forestry through talk shows.
- Indigenous peoples workshop.

**Deliverables:**

- Campaign materials produced: posters, stickers, T-shirts (“Save Riau Forests”), VCD (last remaining forest).
- Radio talk shows were conducted to gain public support for good forest policies. The talk shows were hosted by RRI Pekanbaru in March and May 2004.
- Workshop held in May 2004 to build anti–illegal logging community networks in Riau (6 regencies). Participants agreed to use Riau Indigenous Community Network as their forum to combat illegal logging.
- Dialogue and discussion in 3 districts (Kampar in March, Indragili Hulu in April, and Pelalawan in May 2004). An anti–illegal logging team was formed consisting of government, police, local community representatives, and NGOs.
- Some materials given to AMAN to be distributed among indigenous communities for reference.
- Hakiki distributed stickers and leaflets to passers by in the middle of the city in Pekanbaru on World Environment Day in June 2004.
Organization: Yayasan Madanika

Project Name & Objectives: Anti–Illegal Logging Campaign to Support Religious Figures and Institutions in West Kalimantan

• To build the capacity of religious leaders and institutions to preach and educate against illegal logging.

Location of Organization: Pontianak, West Kalimantan

Location of Project: West Kalimantan

Total Budget: Rp. 182,300,000

Activities Implemented:

• Prepared informational materials on illegal logging for religious leaders.
• Build anti-logging networks for religious leaders/institutions.
• Help religious leaders develop media campaigns against illegal logging.
• Workshop on illegal logging for religious leaders.

Deliverables:

• 2000 copies of Perspectives of West Kalimantan Religious Leaders: Essays on Religion and Environment and 2500 copies of Friday Sermons: Let Us Save the Forest.
• 12 advertisements on problems related to illegal logging in Pontianak Post.
• 6000 copies of Illegal Logging, a publication addressing various forest-related issues (3 editions)
• 12 radio talk shows in Pontianak and Ketapang
• Public service advertisement to broadcast the “Religious Leaders’ Declaration on Environmental Problems in West Kalimantan.” (Declaration resulted from a 2-day meeting organized by Madanika.)
Organization: Yayasan Pemerhati Kehutanan dan Lingkungan Tatar Sunda (YPKLTS)

Project Name & Objectives: Strengthening Communities’ and Journalists’ Capacity to Take Action Against Illegal Logging in West Java
- Build public officials’ awareness of illegal logging.
- Support sustainable forest management.
- Build local communities’ capacity for forest conservation.
- Improve management of forest resources database.

Location of Organization: Bandung, West Java

Location of Project: Sukabami, Cianjur, Bandung, Garut, Tasikmalaya, and Ciamis

Total Budget: Rp. 208,900,000

Activities Implemented:
- Campaign to mobilize communities and policymakers against illegal logging in West Java.
- Institutional development training for local communities.
- Strengthen mass media for reporting on environmental issues.

Deliverables:
- Conference for the West Javan legislature opened by vice governor of West Java.
- Forum on illegal logging and landslides attended by more than 300 people.
- Cotton bags and other items reading “No forest, no water, no future.” (Distributed to community leaders, political party leaders, governmental officials, and NGOs.)
- “Environment and Political Parties” workshop in February 2004 in Bandung.
- 6 workshops to train more than 150 community leaders on reforestation.
Organization: Yayasan Ulayat Bengkulu

Project Name & Objectives: Media Campaign Against Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Kerinci Seblat National Park

- Support the Lubuk Pinang community movement against illegal logging in the park and surrounding areas through information management.

Location of Organization: Bengkulu

Location of Project: Lubuk Pinang Mukomuko Regency

Total Budget: Rp. 200,510,000

Activities Implemented:
- Media campaign products created on theme “Stop illegal logging” (video, bulletins, fact sheets, posters, T-shirts).
- Information dissemination and policy dialogues.

Deliverables:
- Media campaign materials: 13-minute documentary video Derita Air Petani Lubuk Pinang; bulletin called Air Majunto (3 editions); fact sheet (3 editions); T-shirts reading “Stop Forest Destruction in Majunto Watersheds and Kerinci Seblat National Park.
- Media campaign launch event attended by more than 120 people and covered by TVRI Bengkulu.
- Hearings with district officials in March and May 2004 to discuss illegal logging in the park and allow community members to express concerns in a public forum.
Organization: Yayasan Lingkungan Hidup Humeibou Manokwari (YALHIMO)

Project Name & Objectives: Indigenous Peoples’ Advocacy for Forest Management in Manokwari, Teluk Bintuni, and Teluk Wondama Regencies

- Revitalize indigenous peoples’ role in natural resource management.
- Study community-based forest management systems.
- Facilitate community forestry development in Papua.
- Identify causes of conflict over natural resources between government officials and local communities.

Location of Organization: Manokwari

Location of Project: Manokwari, Teluk Bintuni, and Teluk Wondama

Total Budget: Rp. 208,503,500

Activities Implemented:
- Training for indigenous peoples groups on research and monitoring and reporting forest degradation.
- Advocacy for sound policies in traditional forest areas.
- Communication campaign (posters, brochures, village dialogues, publications, cultural arts, documentary films, seminar on illegal logging).

Deliverables:
- 450 leaflets titled *Illegal Logging: The Way to Create a Barren Region*.
- Cultural arts show with illegal logging theme attended by more than 200 people.
- Radio show on illegal logging on RRI Manokwari. Listeners urged to report illegal logging in their communities. (Broadcast 9 times in January and February 2004.)
- 12 articles by Cahaya Papua and Media Papua on illegal logging in bird areas of Papua.
- Training for more than 60 indigenous community leaders in Wondama and Bintuni Bays.
Organization: Yayasan Leuser Lestari (YLL)

Project Name & Objectives: Anti–Illegal Logging Campaign for North Sumatra

- Reduce illegal logging in Gunung Leuser National Park (Langkat) and Taman Hutan Raya Bukit Barisan (Karo).
- Increase awareness of illegal logging among community residents around parks.
- Gain support from government officials, universities, and journalists in fighting illegal logging.

Location of Organization: Medan

Location of Project: North Sumatra

Total Budget: Rp. 198,860,000

Activities Implemented:
- Collection of updated data on illegal logging.
- Production of a video and posters.
- Securing commitment of policymakers and community leaders to combat illegal logging.

Deliverables:
- 2 videos: Menuai bencana (Yielding to Disaster) and Kesejukan yang terusik (Disturbed Peace).
- 2 articles published in Intip Hutan and Terobos (February 2004).
- 2 posters reading “Stop illegal logging in Tahura Bukit Barisan” and “Don’t lie to the public! Stop illegal logging in Leuser National Park.”
- The “Rainbow Declaration,” a commitment from a community near Leuser National Park, NGOs, media, and others to combat illegal logging.
- A media launch even in Medan in May 2004.
Organization: Institut Hukum Sumberdaya Alam (IHSA)

Project Name & Objectives: Information and Data Collection to Improve Constituencies’ Understanding of Legal Issues and Law Enforcement Related to Illegal Logging

- Achieve sustainable forest management with less conflict.
- Provide case studies and data on illegal logging practices and law enforcement for future illegal logging litigation.
- Increase knowledge of key constituencies on legal issues related to illegal logging, especially as a criminal activity.
- Establish coordination between policymakers and law enforcement officials at community, regional, and national levels.

Location of Organization: Jakarta

Location of Project: Jakarta and West Kalimantan

Total Budget: Rp. 209,641,500

Activities Implemented:
- Data collection and dissemination.
- Training on legal issues.
- Forums for government officials, including law enforcement officials, on illegal logging as a criminal activity.

Deliverables:
- 1500 copies of LEBAH bulletin.
- 2 focus group discussions in Samarinda in March 2004 and Jakarta in May 2004.
- 200 copies of Legal Compendium of Laws and Legal Cases on Illegal Logging.
- Bibliography of illegal logging legal resources.
- 100 CDs and 90 copy hard copies of legal code on illegal logging.
- 2000 copies of Victim and Witness Protection.
ANNEX 5. TRAINING WORKSHOPS

Course Outlines

Environmental Communication for NGOs

- Introduction to Environmental Communication
- Understanding How Mass Media Work I
- Understanding How Mass Media Work II: Group Discussion
- Understanding Mass Media in Indonesia
- Means of Communication I: Interviews, Press Conferences, and Press Briefings
- Means of Communication II: Interview Simulation
- Means of Communication III: Media Kits, Press Releases, Letters to the Editor, and Op-Eds
- Means of Communication IV: Practice in Writing Press Releases
- Means of Communication V: Practice in Convening Press Conferences
- Means of Communication VI: Campaign Communications
- Designing Communication Strategies I: Applying the 4 P’s (Problem, Public, Product, and Plan)
- Designing Communication Strategies II: Media Campaign Simulation
- Handling Negative Reporting
- Using the Internet as a Campaign Tool
- Media Monitoring

Environmental Journalism

- Introduction to Environmental Journalism
- Group Discussion
- Environmental Coverage I: Journalistic Standards
- Environmental Coverage II: Idea Generation
- Environmental Coverage III: Group Discussion
- Understanding Forestry and Biological Diversity Issues I
- Understanding Forestry and Biological Diversity Issues II
- Field Trip
- Environmental Writing I: Importance of Personal Observation
- Environmental Writing II: Journalistic Standards
## ANNEX 6. GREENCOM STAFF AND CONSULTANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Period of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Staff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leigh Ann Hurt</td>
<td>Chief of Party</td>
<td>May 2002–April 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Jessup</td>
<td>Chief of Party</td>
<td>July 2003–September 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henny Buftheim</td>
<td>Environmental Communication</td>
<td>February 2002–January 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timur Budi Setyowati</td>
<td>Finance Administrator</td>
<td>April 2002–September 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erwina Darmajanti</td>
<td>Environmental Communication</td>
<td>April 2002–September 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training Specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debora W. Setiawarman</td>
<td>Office Administrator</td>
<td>May 2002–September 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Surjadi</td>
<td>Journalist Trainer and Writer</td>
<td>September 2003–September 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Alwi</td>
<td>Public Relations Advisor</td>
<td>January 2003–September 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marius Gunawan</td>
<td>Media Facilitator</td>
<td>November 2003–January 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Viandrito</td>
<td>Media Facilitator</td>
<td>February 2003–September 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izefri Caniago</td>
<td>Small Grants Coordinator</td>
<td>October 2003–January 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anny Andaryati</td>
<td>Small Grants Coordinator</td>
<td>February 2004–September 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>