



AUSTRALIAN NETWORK for PLANT  
CONSERVATION INC

# Rebranding Benefits and Challenges: Supporting Document for ANPC Member Survey on a proposed brand name change to Plant Conservation Australia

## Benefits of a name change to "Plant Conservation Australia"

- 1. Broader Appeal:** "Plant Conservation Australia" is more straightforward and immediately communicates the organisation's core focus on plant conservation, making it easier for the general public and potential supporters to understand the mission. This, in turn, will facilitate the broader community identifying us as a peak body. Further, for some people, the use of the term 'network' could potentially have a connotation of exclusivity. Questions that could arise include: 'Is that a network of agencies? Am I part of that network? Am I included or even eligible to be in it?'
- 2. Clearer Geographic Identity:** Retaining the name "Australia" explicitly identifies the organisation's national focus, which is important for engaging the Australian public and stakeholders specifically concerned with local and national plant conservation issues.
- 3. Simplification:** "Plant Conservation Australia" is more concise and easier to remember (less of a mouthful), which could help in marketing, fundraising, and advocacy efforts.
- 4. Modernisation:** The name change and associated rebranding could signal a fresh, updated approach, appealing to younger generations or a wider audience who may not connect with the current name. A brand relaunch creates a terrific opportunity to get our work recognised by many more people and organisations.
- 5. Breadth of focus:** The new name better reflects our organisation's broad focus on all plant species, not just threatened species, but common native plant species and invasive species that impact on plant conservation. This could attract more supporters, funding, and collaborators who are focused on global plant conservation but within an Australian context.
- 6. Alignment with Other Organisations:** There are many similar organisations globally that use the term "Plant Conservation" in their name, making it easier to align with international efforts and collaborate on global conservation projects. For example; Botanic

Gardens Conservation International (BGCI), the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), and the Center for Plant Conservation (CPC)

**7. Improved Searchability:** The name change could improve the organisation's searchability online by clearly linking our name with our mission "plant conservation" and through retaining "Australia" in the name, not only make it easier for Australians to find the organisation and its resources, but connects us to global conservation initiatives.

**8. Clarity of Mission:** The word "conservation" clearly indicates the organisation's purpose, so the new name would remove any ambiguity about its objectives, which may be beneficial in grant applications and public relations efforts.

**9. Broader Audience Reach:** "Plant Conservation Australia" could resonate with a wider audience, including those interested in sustainable agriculture, horticulture, education and environmental management.

**10. Perception of Growth and Relevance:** A more inclusive and modern name can reflect the growing importance of plant conservation as a national issue, potentially enhancing the organisation's reputation and relevance in addressing biodiversity challenges.

**11. Increased brand awareness and, ideally, brand recall.**

All of the above can be summed up as building up brand awareness. This consists of:

- ❖ Brand recognition - when stakeholders easily recognise our name and logo, and
- ❖ Brand recall – when stakeholders recall our name when asked 'What is the leading organisation in Australia for plant conservation?' For this, the brand must clearly communicate its meaning.

## **Challenges that may occur with a name change to "Plant Conservation Australia" and mitigation approaches**

- 1. Loss of Brand Recognition:** "The Australian Network for Plant Conservation" (ANPC) has established brand recognition, and changing the name could risk losing the goodwill and trust built over years with current supporters, partners, and stakeholders. The new name might confuse existing members, donors, and partners, especially those who are familiar with the current name and its emphasis on networking and collaboration. The original name conveys a sense of history and purpose, especially the term "network," which reflects the organisation's role in bringing together diverse groups for plant conservation. "Plant Conservation Australia" loses that nuance. Mitigation for this point includes bringing all of the membership along on the branding journey and keeping ANPC as the trading name.

2. **Reduction in Specificity:** "Plant Conservation Australia" might lack the specificity of "Network," which emphasises the organisation's role in connecting various stakeholders, research groups, and practitioners. Here, keeping ANPC in the tagline becomes important.
3. **Branding Complications:** Rebranding can be expensive, involving logo redesigns, updating websites, reprinting materials, and modifying marketing campaigns. This could be a significant cost for our non-profit organisation. To mitigate this issue, much of the work will be done in-house (url procurement is not expensive) and a logo refresh is needed in any case as the current graphics are not supported by modern production platforms (e.g. not scalable or able to be customised for different platforms and media types).
4. **Undermines the "Network" Concept:** The word "network" in the original name emphasises the organisation's collaborative nature and its ability to connect people, resources, and ideas. "Plant Conservation Australia" could make it seem more like an authority rather than a collaborative, community-based group. However, this is mitigated with maintaining network in our vision, by-line, trading name etc and with the a re-branding communications strategy.
5. **Lack of Alignment with Current Membership:** Current members and stakeholders may be more attached to the existing name, and changing it could alienate or disenfranchise long-standing supporters who feel the new name doesn't reflect the organisation's networked, community-driven mission. This can be tested with the survey in the 1<sup>st</sup> instance and tested with a general resolution in the 2<sup>nd</sup> instance and then if the name is to go ahead it can be mitigated with an effective communication strategy during the transition.