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Executive Summary

Brook Lyndhurst was commissioned by Defra to support the Greener Living Fund (GLF), a Third Sector\(^1\) Fund involving eight projects that received a total of £4.5 million across two years. Brook Lyndhurst had three specific roles:

(a) To establish an overarching review framework for the GLF (requiring the gathering and submission of data in relation to the project’s inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts);
(b) To support the projects as they undertook their own evaluations; and
(c) To conduct a review and synthesis of the reports that the projects’ were required to submit to Defra, and produce a final evidence review of the Fund as a whole.

This Executive Summary outlines the background to GLF, its outputs, outcomes and key learning, and the implications for policy.

Introduction

The objective of GLF was to “help individuals and communities in England live more sustainably” by working with Civil Society Organisations (CSOrgs) which had the ability and capacity to:

- Implement programmes and projects on a **national scale**;
- Develop **partnerships** with other CSOrgs, business and public sector organisations (including smaller regional bodies);
- Deliver behavioural change at a grass roots levels via their **networks, membership base** and through active **community involvement**;
- Demonstrate an ability to **scale up/roll out** ideas that had already been trialled or tested on a smaller scale elsewhere; and
- **Evaluate** their impacts.

The Fund was designed in response to the learning and evaluation from three previous grant programmes across 2005-9: **Every Action Counts** (EAC), the **Environmental Action Fund** (EAF) and the **Climate Challenge Fund** (CCF). It was deployed strategically at a relatively small group of CSOrgs, rather than spread across a larger number of smaller local groups. A total of eight projects were funded (Table S1). In particular, Defra was seeking to achieve scale in activities that would encourage pro-environmental behaviours in a cost-effective way. The Greener Living Fund was intended to achieve this objective by partnering with organisations with national reach and by building on positive evidence about ‘cascading’ models from the EAF evaluation.

The GLF programme complemented other activities which were happening in Defra at that time to encourage pro-environmental behaviours and implement the policies of the previous government to advance sustainable development\(^2\).

---

1 The Third Sector is now known as Civil Society Organisations (CSOrgs). For further information see Office for Civil Society at [http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/resource-library/office-civil-society-structure-finalised](http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/resource-library/office-civil-society-structure-finalised)

2 For example, to support commitments made in the 2005 UK Sustainable Development Strategy.
Notably, Defra published a Framework for Environmental Behaviours in 2008, which identified headline behaviours of interest, and it developed a segmentation model to support social marketing activities (such as the Act on CO₂ campaign), both of which were designed to help effective targeting of communications and engagement programmes. The headline behaviours and the customer segmentation model both shaped the content of the GLF and its associated monitoring and evaluation activities (as set out in detail in the Annex).

### Table S1. The GLF projects at a glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Project outline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustrans</td>
<td>Broadening the Reach of TravelSmart – doorstep engagement in two locations - Broxbourne and Ipswich – to deliver advice and information on sustainable transport, energy and waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUS</td>
<td>Degrees Cooler - increasing the pro-environmental behaviours of 90,000 staff and students across 20 participating universities in England.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Trust</td>
<td>Eat into Green Living – encouraging visitors and members to (i) eat more sustainably produced local food in season; and (ii) grow their own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-op Marine Stewardship Council</td>
<td>Greening Together – a project to help members tackle climate change through their behaviour in three areas: energy, waste and transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSC on the Menu - a supply chain initiative aimed at: (a) increasing the availability of MSC-certified seafood in the foodservice sector (particularly from English fisheries); and (b) promoting this availability to consumers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterwise Global Action Plan</td>
<td>Tap into Savings (TiS) - home visits and the retrofit of simple water saving technologies to encourage residents to think about how they use water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EcoTeams - Scaling up the EcoTeams concept to engage EDFE employees and the public through the Team Great Britain campaign. Mass training events were delivered alongside online support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COIN</td>
<td>Climate Solidarity - Using trade unions as a means to mobilise their membership to set up action groups and take practical steps to cut carbon emissions at home and at work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last two projects – COIN’s Climate Solidarity and Global Action Plan’s EcoTeams – Both experienced significant delivery issues which impacted on their ability to generate meaningful learnings. As such a decision was taken to close them down before completion.

### Data and evidence in the review

The research undertaken to generate the evidence for the GLF review was lengthy, broad ranging and complex (as set out in detail in the Annex). The research team had continuous involvement with the projects and Defra for more than two years. It involved examining a wide array of social research methods used by the projects, (e.g. event diaries, to qualitative and quantitative fieldwork, etc.); to a desk review of projects’ evaluation reports and secondary analysis of their statistical data.

The research approach was designed to generate ‘bottom up’ evidence from projects’ own evaluations while at the same time to ensure rigour and consistency across the Fund as a whole. This was achieved by providing extensive support for self-evaluation to the projects (via one-to-one advice and a range of guidance materials and templates) plus detailed
checking of the data and evidence received before it was used in the research team’s review of the Fund overall. With input from Defra, the research team filtered the data and evidence for robustness, created detailed ‘deep dive’ case studies based on the evidence, then developed a synthesis of cross-cutting themes through both structured analysis and workshop discussions.

In synthesising and interpreting the evidence, the team were able to benchmark the GLF findings against their wider knowledge from the evaluation and review of similar programmes (such as the Scottish Climate Challenge Fund and NESTA’s Big Green Challenge as well as Defra’s Environmental Action Fund and Climate Challenge Fund).

In the view of the research team, the significant investment made in supporting the projects’ own evaluations resulted in better quality data than in the previous EAF and of at least comparable quality to other similar programmes. Limitations and gaps remain, however. Key limitations relate to survey data, where there is a risk of self-selection bias in survey samples, and where behaviour impacts are not always adequately captured (further detail and mitigating actions are described in the Annex). The nature and diversity of the data generated precludes a robust calculation of value for money for the Fund as a whole with respect to influencing behaviours, although good indicators are provided for the scale of reach achieved.

**Outputs**

GLF was about achieving scale in the delivery of pro-environmental initiatives. It has comfortably delivered against this objective and achieved scale. Overall, it had a potential outreach of **close to 4 million people** (including two million National Trust members, 600,000 Co-Operatives UK members, 160,000 businesses in the fish supply chain and 90,000 university staff and students).

The projects rolled out a range of work packages through their various networks, memberships and communities; and delivered an extensive mix of interventions, activities and communications. Several tools were developed including an online networking and pledge system (Co-operatives UK), audit tools (NUS) and a range of communications and engagement materials. In many cases the intended outputs were in line with initial expectations; although in some instances targets were not met. A summary of the key targets and outputs selected by the projects’ are summarised below (with additional detail provided in the main report).
### Selected key outputs from GLF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Sustrans** | - 10,074 Sustainable Travel Information packs (target: 11,250)  
- 3,530 discount cards for local cycling/walking retailers (target: 6,550)  
- 704 eco-driving packs (target: 1,200)  
- 375,000 iTravelSmart website users (target: 240,000)  
- 514 LivingSmart waste info packs (target: 500)  
- 414 energy info packs (target: 650) |
| **NUS** | - Website plus branding materials including: 10,000 flyers (target: 10,000), 3,000 post-its (target: 3,000), 3,000 pens (target: 3,000), 750 desk-top calendars (target: 750), 750 thermometers (target: 750).  
- 16% of students signed up as ‘Eco-Power Rangers’ in Year 1; 18% in Year 2 (target: 10%/year). This equated to 14,117 students in total  
- Distribution of Ben & Jerry’s merchandise - 300 vouchers, 5,000 stickers, 1,000 freezer bags, 200 T-shirts (targets: none), plus 4 Ben & Jerry’s ‘ice cream parties’ (target: none)  
- SSO Photo Competition (744 photos submitted Year 1, 596 Year 2)  
- Film screenings - 872 attendees in Year 1; 410 in Year 2 (target: 400/year)  
- Climate change quiz - 2,287 participants in Y1; 2,913 in Y2 (target: 1,000/yr)  
- Average of twenty staff teams per university - 14,606 staff in Y1; 23,667 in Y2. 1,375 departmental audits  
- Green League 2010 & 11.  
- Go Green Week 2010 & 2011 - estimated reach: 25,916 students/year. |
| **National Trust** | - 1,716,129 visitors to the 20 properties (target: 2,000,000)  
- Infrastructure (kitchens and gardens), e.g. a Keder Greenhouse, 3 seating benches, 24 potments, a kitchen garden, 3 veg stalls, 40 raised growing beds; a baking demonstration kitchen.  
- Displays and information – e.g. 15 displays for ‘how to grow in containers’, 15,750 ‘how to grow’ leaflets, 2,500 ‘how to make compost’ info sheets, 17,540 recipe cards, 1,250 recipe books.  
- Activities - Riverford Organic activity day (reach – 5,000); bread making (reach – 1,000); recipe competition (250 entries); food trails (reach - 4,000); Sow & Grow demonstrations (reach – 26,324); ‘How to Bake’ workshops (reach – 3,600); cooking demos (reach – 2,515); Strawberry fields planting (reach – 400)  
- 341 new growing spaces plots and 4 community areas created at 12 sites (target: 10).  
- A total of 1,366 people growing on these spaces (target: 1,000)  
- 492 National Trust staff and volunteers trained  
- Big Harvest Conference – 138 staff and volunteers |
| **Co-op** | - 59 behavioural actions with associated CO2 and waste metrics (target: 20)  
- Greener Together brand and website, with forum and online messaging  
- 43 Eco-operators recruited (target: 50)  
- 974 participants making pledges (target: 3,600).  
- A range of ‘collective actions’ undertaken by cooperatives (e.g. swap shop, seed shop, film showings, litter picking days). Estimates of attendance: 30 - 70  
- A large volume of online media articles with potential reach over 800,000 |
| **MSC** | - 4,000 MSC on the Menu training DVDs (target: 2,000)  
- 750 ‘Before certification’ restaurant packs, distribution on-going (target: 1,500)  
- A new website section on certification for restaurants, with an online assessment tool  
- A new MSC Sustainability Award at the Fish and Chip Shop of the Year awards  
- 8 Good Catch events with 160 chefs and restaurant owners  
- 6 events (122 attendees) from local councils, food groups, fishing organisations and coastal partnerships.  
- 3,000 consumer leaflets about MSC, distribution on-going (target: 7,500)  
- 354 Fish and Kids education resource packs, large-scale distribution pending (target: up to 10,000)  
- 3,562 Sustainable Seafood lunch kits (target: 3,562)  
- Sustainable Seafood Lunch (estimated reach: 67,500 school children) |
| **Waterwise** | - 3,496 home visits (target: 7,600) (NB. 2,155 residents are still awaiting visits in Braintree)  
- 8,127 water efficiency devices, e.g. tap inserts (no target)  
- 2,226 energy efficiency devices, e.g. standby plug savers (no target)  
- 3,029+ thermometer cards (target: 7,000)  
- 3,529+ home visit booklets (target: 7,000)  
- 27 Ecoteams, with 182 participants attending at least two events (target: 380) |
Outcomes & Impacts

Subject to some conditions and caveats (see the GLF methodology note provided in the Annex) there is evidence that some GLF projects were successful in changing behaviours. Rather than any instances of widespread and/or transformational change, the projects typically succeeded in encouraging a large number of people to undertake small shifts in their behaviour. For example, NUS’ SSO led to a 7-8% reduction in energy consumption in halls of residence. However, other GLF projects did not appear - on the basis of the available evidence - to demonstrably change behaviours.

The predominant impact of GLF appears to have been reinforcement and/or stretching of existing behaviours, rather than initiating new behaviours. For example, participants in National Trust’s Growing Spaces work package were already growing on a small scale and their involvement enabled them to expand the frequency and scale of their efforts.

One specific change that was detected across several GLF projects was an increased sense of personal agency, which suggests that CSOrgs are particularly effective in challenging this particular barrier to pro-environmental behaviour (e.g. through promoting a sense of collective action).

Key learning

The GLF evidence review provides valuable learning for Defra and future schemes of this nature. The learning is synthesised and grouped around the following two areas:

- Learning about delivery in terms of what worked well and what didn’t; and
- Learning about behaviour change from the projects’ experiences.

Learning about Delivery

GLF Projects’ experiences flag six key delivery issues:

1. **Decentralised delivery:** this was a defining feature of several projects, whereby the central project team engaged a group of local intermediaries who went on to engage with the wider membership. GLF has demonstrated that, in certain circumstances, such a model can be an effective means of engaging a large audience, particularly via organisations with existing large membership bases (e.g. National Trust). However, the level of support for intermediaries is critical, and the projects all highlight the importance of dedicated central support functions (e.g. communications materials and expertise). Where GLF projects were unable to provide this support function to their intermediaries in the way they had intended (e.g. Co-operatives UK and its eco-operators) this appears to have significantly hindered delivery.

2. **Partnership working:** this was a key and necessary feature of most projects, with partners providing a range of both financial and non-financial support. Nonetheless, projects also noted that partnership working requires time and effort, particularly when engaging large and complex organisations. Data Protection also acted as a specific barrier (often because of a lack of forethought by projects and partners, but could be overcome by good practice). The development of personal relationships was considered a key success factor with significant importance attached to face-to-face meetings.
3. **Project development time and adaptability:** Differences in the maturity of an initiative had a significant bearing on delivery. Many projects underestimated set-up times, and some went through a rapid (and painful) learning curve. More broadly, adaptability was a key characteristic that underpinned the success of several projects (e.g. MSC).

4. **Technical capability:** there were several instances where a project lacked technical capability to deliver particular elements of their work programme. For example, both Co-operatives UK and Global Action Plan suffered problems with their online platforms. Sustrans, in contrast, experienced few difficulties in delivering its online iTravelSmart tool, which the project team attributed to existing in-house expertise.

5. **Accessing local networks:** GLF highlights the benefits of, and in some cases fundamental need to, engage local groups and networks. For example, MSC were able to tap into local knowledge through coastal partnerships, local food groups and fishing organisations. Likewise, Waterwise noted that their TiS EcoTeams worked better in one area (Coventry) because the Council promoted the initiative locally prior to launch.

6. **Staff turnover:** The issue of staff turnover did not present a challenge to many of the projects, in contrast to other Evaluation Funds which frequently cite this as a key barrier. The exception was Co-operatives UK, which faced the departure of the project manager twice. Furthermore, key project staff from both Sustrans and NUS have since moved on which could likely present a challenge for legacy, scale up and replication.

**Learning about behaviour change**

GLF projects adopted a number of different approaches to behaviour change. Our mapping of the approaches used shows that some focused largely on the **personal norms and identity** of individual households and adopted a service-based model of delivery (e.g. Sustrans). In contrast, others had a much greater focus on **social norms and identity** (e.g. NUS built their student-focused work package around group activities and social events that were intended to be fun and inspire peer competition). In general, the projects based on social models of change appear to have had a greater impact.

The Defra 4Es model was used by the research team to map the range of approaches adopted the projects. It was not used to provide a critical appraisal, rather to observe the range and extent of coverage of the 4Es. Some projects, for example, focused on one particular area (e.g. ‘Engage’); whereas others targeted multiple areas. This overview shows that, when mapped against Defra’s 4Es model, the complete range of GLF approaches spans a wide spectrum of interventions.
GLF projects’ experiences flag five key lessons:

1. **Audience understanding, targeting and tailoring:** Several GLF projects stood out for their ability to understand and engage their audience. For example, NUS’ project involved a stream of outputs (e.g. film screenings, photo competitions) that were engaging and ensured the project retained a continual presence and momentum. Their incentives (e.g. cinema tickets) were also tailored to a student audience. Likewise, National Trust developed their visitor activities on the basis of hands-on, sensory and ‘fun’ experiences. In contrast, some projects were less successful at engaging their membership, raising a wider point that it cannot be assumed that CSOrgs necessarily are best placed to engage their members on pro-environmental behaviour change.

2. **Tools:** GLF provides a useful contribution to the evidence base concerning specific behaviour change tools. For example, *Feedback and competition* both played an important role in NUS’ project, which used regular feedback on energy performance (as well as a prize incentive) to foster competition between halls of residence. However, the experience of Co-operatives UK demonstrates that feedback and competition have the potential to demotivate participants if it serves to highlight on-going problems/lack of progress. Likewise, several GLF projects used *champions* to engage a wider audience and/or to cascade information, and in most cases their success in engaging *existing* champions was tempered by difficulties appointing *new* champions.

3. **Spill over:** In some instances (e.g. MSC, NUS) there were some indications that behaviours were spilling over between the domains of work and home, but no robust or systematic evidence to support these observations. The one exception where spill over was detected was National Trust’s *Growing Spaces* project, where food growing appears to have acted as a behavioural ‘gateway’ to a wider repertoire of behaviours that includes composting, water butts and food waste reduction. This is also being investigated further in Groundwork’s project as part of Defra’s Inspiring Sustainable Living Fund³.

³ [http://sd.defra.gov.uk/2011/03/london-2012-inspires-sustainable-living/]
4. **Synergies between environmental issues**: Several of the GLF projects flagged the potential for synergistic impacts by bringing together a more targeted and joined-up offering. For example, Sustrans’ LivingSmart pilot was a particularly interesting test case in that it integrated waste, energy and transport advice into a single package.

**Potential for legacy**

Some projects have gone on to expand and add value. The legacies from GLF are multiple and varied:

- **Fostering and embedding long term change and commitment** – e.g. National Trust contends that cultural change within the organisation has been one of the most significant outcomes from the project (and on a par with their work to influence behaviours of visitors and members).

- **Physical infrastructure** – e.g. installing kitchen gardens at National Trust properties.

- **Staff** – a number of posts that were created through GLF will be retained and some roles have been extended or made permanent (National Trust, NUS & Waterwise).

- **Materials** - engagement materials have been created across the projects.

- **On-going expansion / replication** – e.g. universities will pay NUS for the Degrees Cooler package; there is potential to adapt both the NUS and National Trust models to other organisations (e.g. in multi-location organisations).

**Discussion and implications for policy**

Drawing on the findings from GLF, as well as our wider knowledge of many similar initiatives (e.g. Defra’s Environmental Action Fund, Nesta’s Big Green Challenge), Brook Lyndhurst has identified the following insights and policy implications:

- **Funding projects like this can lead to the scaled-up delivery of pro-environmental projects that, in some instances, are capable of bringing about changes in behaviour (whether in terms of individuals or organisations).** Social models of behaviour change – either by influencing social norms, promoting peer-to-peer learning and/or triggering competition – appear to have been more effective in the context of GLF than initiatives that target individuals in isolation and adopt a ‘service-based’ model of delivery.

- **However, GLF also highlights projects where there is little substantive evidence that behaviour change occurred. Furthermore, only in a few cases (e.g. MSC) is there evidence of transformational changes - and even here in relation to one or two key organisations across the supply chain as opposed to consumers en masse. Further detail is provided in the report.**

- **The central premise of using membership-based organisations to deliver behaviour influencing programmes appears sound and can – in some circumstances - be very successful at cascading information and/or delivering initiatives via a tier of intermediaries. One of the key success factors of GLF projects in enabling change was their ‘license to speak’ to the target audience. NUS, for example, had a license to speak to participating universities and their students and staff; National Trust had a license to speak to its membership; and MSC had the professional standing and respect to speak to the different parts of the fish supply chain.**
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• However, GLF also highlights that this is by no means a fait accompli and, in doing so, offers a more nuanced picture. Quality and competence in delivery is a key consideration, which some CSOrgs may lack. There was a notable difference in the skills sets of some projects in relation to a number of key facets, including: their capacity to undertake partnership work, their ‘in-house’ technical skills (e.g. website development, social marketing) and - where projects had adopted a decentralised delivery model - the level of support provided to intermediaries. The latter in particular is critical, and it has an immediate implication for other initiatives such as the Government’s Green Deal (i.e. those initiatives that will rely on intermediaries as a means of delivery).

• GLF supports the contention that ‘local’ plays a critical part in delivery in terms of knowledge, access to local networks and trust (and the GLF evidence indeed suggests that some pro-environmental initiatives cannot be delivered effectively without them). However, GLF also cautions against underestimating the role of partners like local authorities or central Government, who provide, variously, a badge of legitimacy in the eyes of participants, a range of financial and non-financial resources, and the means to set local initiatives in the context of a wider, and collective, effort.

GLF also has a number of implications for the relationship between Defra and CSOrgs. The insights provided by GLF are, of course, highly context-specific in that it involved a very particular form of relationship with the CSOrgs and focused on pro-environmental behaviour change.

CSOrgs in the GLF evidently performed different roles and achieved different kinds of outcomes, providing useful case study examples of the different roles such organisations could and do perform. For example, they demonstrated they can:

• deliver a behaviour change ‘service’ (e.g. Sustrans);
• provide a ‘test bed’ for new/alternative models of delivery (e.g. Waterwise); or
• influence the broader framework/the ‘conditions’ that will be required for the shift to a low carbon economy and society (e.g. National Trust).

The key question that Defra policy teams thinking of working with CSOrgs in future will need to clearly articulate is: “what is it that we (Defra) want Civil Society Organisations to do?” The answer to this question will, in turn, help frame the ‘rules of engagement’ between Defra and CSOrgs in terms of the nature of the relationship, the types of support that the sector will need and the kinds of outcomes that are anticipated.

GLF was about partnering to achieve policy goals (i.e. influencing behaviours through scale) but, in the process, also generated useful insight about CSOrgs as service deliverers or as capacity builders supporting the long term direction of travel in policy (without delivering policy impacts immediately or directly). Drawing on social innovation theory, for example, CSOrgs could be said to be testing innovation and expanding the scope and scale of cultural niches which, when combined with the right policy conditions, may result in transformational change.

The evidence from GLF suggests that, at this point in time, the strength of CSOrgs is their ability to test new approaches and engender wider cultural and societal changes, rather than
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providing a ready-made and ‘off the shelf’ service. Indeed, the major successes achieved by GLF have involved capacity building, engaging intermediaries and enabling cultural change within organisations, rather than achieving a certain percentage of behaviour change.

The addition of the caveat ‘at this point in time’ is important, since it is likely to change as organisations develop and refine their delivery model to the point where specific services or products are created and/or can be replicated. For example, we note that after two years of GLF funding (and in some cases an additional three years of EAF funding prior to that), several of the organisations appear to be close to this point (NUS’ Degrees Cooler), albeit still grounded in the context of a specific audience (e.g. universities).

If the immediate strengths of CSOrgs lay in testing new approaches and bringing about cultural change, then Defra needs to consider where such relationships with CSorgs are likely to be most effective (e.g. potential scale), and the outcomes that can realistically be anticipated. Aspects that need to be considered include: the potential for a long term commitment to ‘catalyst’ or ‘seed’ funding for the sector; acceptance that failure is a necessary part of testing ‘proof of concept’; the potential cost-benefit of providing advisory support services to CSorgs; and the need for dissemination and peer-to-peer learning so that organisations learn best practice from each other.
1 Introduction

Brook Lyndhurst was commissioned by Defra to support the Greener Living Fund (GLF), a role that had three elements:

a) Establishing an overarching framework for the GLF (requiring the gathering and submission of data in relation to the project’s inputs, outputs, outcomes and impacts);
b) Offering support to projects as they undertook their own evaluations; and
c) Conducting a final review and synthesis of the reports that the projects’ were required to submit to Defra, and produce a final evidence review of the GLF as a whole.

This is the final report of the evidence review, which synthesises the data provided by the projects in the course of their evaluation activities. This introductory chapter outlines:

1. The GLF scope – its aims and policy context
2. The GLF projects at a glance
3. The GLF research design and methodology
4. Structure of this report

1.1 The GLF scope

The Defra Greener Living Fund (GLF) was a Third Sector Fund, involving eight projects that received a total of £4.5 million across two years (April 2009 to March 2011).

GLF was designed to support CSOrg programmes and projects that help individuals and communities in England to live more sustainably, alongside complementary initiatives taken by Government and business sectors under the ‘Act on CO2’ campaign. It was specifically aimed at CSOrgs which had the potential to do five key things:

- Implement programmes and projects on a national scale;
- Develop partnerships with other CSOrgs, business and public sector organisations (including smaller regional bodies);
- Deliver behavioural change at a grass roots levels via their networks, membership base and through active community involvement;
- Demonstrate an ability to scale up/roll out ideas that had already been trialled or tested on a smaller scale elsewhere; and
- Evaluate their impacts.

The Civil Society Sector is diverse, active and passionate. Organisations share common characteristics: non-governmental; value-driven; principally reinvesting any financial surpluses to further social, environmental or cultural objectives. The term encompasses voluntary and community organisations, charities, social enterprises, cooperatives and mutuals both large and small.

---

Footnote: The Third Sector is now known as Civil Society Organisations (CSOrgs). For further information see Office for Civil Society at http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/resource-libraryoffice-civil-society-structure-finalised
The Fund was designed in response to the learning and evaluation from three previous grant programmes across 2005-9: *Every Action Counts* (EAC), the *Environmental Action Fund* (EAF) and the *Climate Challenge Fund* (CCF).

It was intended to be an ambitious programme, and a key criterion in the selection of projects was their reach and their ability to achieve impacts. However, GLF was also designed to build capacity and, in particular, foster a strong relationship between Defra and CSOrgs. The Fund was deployed strategically at a relatively small group of national-level organisations, rather than spread across a larger number of smaller local groups. A total of eight projects were funded (6 delivered) via 15 work packages.

The GLF selection process was based on an innovative two stage approach, as follows:

- Organisations were initially invited to submit a ‘concept note’ - an outline of the project that they would deliver (by December 2008). This was an open call and 112 Concept notes were submitted by eligible organisations. From this, Defra officials and an independent panel drew up a shortlist of 17 projects.

- The shortlisted organisations were offered a development grant of up to £30,000 to support the cost of developing their full proposal into a full application. The full proposals were submitted in May 2009 and, following further evaluation, eight were invited to become Delivery Partners.

The Energy Saving Trust (EST) had a key facilitation and mentoring role, involving facilitating cooperation between delivery partners during the lifetime of the programme (e.g. sharing good practice, identifying synergies and opportunities), facilitating links with ESTs CAFE network of CSOrgs and its energy advice centres, and disseminating information about the Fund’s activities.

As a final introductory remark, it is important to acknowledge the shifting policy backdrop against which GLF was first devised and then delivered. For example, the design of GLF was influenced by the publication of Defra’s Third Sector strategy in 2008, as well as Defra’s Framework for Pro-environmental Behaviours that was published in the same year. However, there was a change of government and some significant changes in policy during the delivery of GLF in terms of Defra’s approach to influencing behaviours, the establishment of the Office for Civil Society and the wider policy narrative around the Big Society.

---

5 This identified 12 headline behaviour goals and segmented the public into 7 clusters based on their values, attitudes and beliefs towards the environment. Defra’s analysis indicated that three of these segments have the most significant potential to do more for the environment (Positive greens; concerned consumers; and sideline supporters, accounting for 48% of the population), and it was these groups that GLF projects were intended to target in the main.
### 1.2 The GLF projects – at a glance

The purpose of this section – and Table 1 that follows – is to set out in brief each of the GLF projects. One of the key characteristics of the projects is their diversity: whether in terms of geography across England, the behaviours they were targeting, the audiences they were engaging and their ‘business model’ for delivering initiatives – often involving intermediaries to engage individuals and communities at a grass roots level.

**Table 1 – The GLF projects at a glance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Project outline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustrans</strong></td>
<td><em>Broadening the Reach of TravelSmart</em> - involving three distinct work packages:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1: <em>TravelSmart ITM</em> - engaging 25,000 households in two locations – Broxbourne and Ipswich – to offer households advice, motivation and information on local sustainable transport options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2: <em>iTravelSmart</em> - upgrading Sustrans’ online mapping facility by adding new datasets and improving functionality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3: <em>LivingSmart</em> - a pilot intervention to extend the core TravelSmart approach to provide households with advice and information on waste and energy behaviours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NUS</strong></td>
<td><em>Degrees Cooler</em> - increasing the pro-environmental behaviours of 90,000 staff and students across 20 participating universities in England. The project involved three work packages:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1: <em>Student Switch Off (SSO)</em> - encouraging energy-saving behaviours amongst students living in halls of residence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2: <em>Green Impact Universities (GIU)</em> - an environmental accreditation scheme for universities to enable departments to reduce energy consumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3: <em>People &amp; Planet Going Greener (P&amp;P GG)</em> campaign - the campaign aimed to engage 3,350 students and staff to develop their own responses to climate change. It also aimed to bring about large-scale institutional change through the <em>Green League</em> (an environmental ranking system for universities).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Trust</strong></td>
<td><em>Eat into Green Living</em> – encouraging visitors and members to (i) eat more sustainably produced local food in season; and (ii) grow their own. These objectives were targeted via three work packages:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1: Engaging family visitors - 20 National Trust properties were funded to develop a diverse range of visitor-facing activities alongside new infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2: Growing spaces - the aim was to create 10 new growing spaces for 1,000 local people at National Trust properties, featuring allotments, community supported agriculture schemes, and community plots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3: Training staff and volunteers - staff and volunteers at the properties received training on sustainable food and how to engage visitors to equip them with skills and knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-op</strong></td>
<td><em>Greening Together</em> – a project to help members tackle climate change through their behaviour in three areas: energy, waste and transport. The project involved two work packages:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1: Actions for a sustainable future – working closely with 50 co-operatives to directly engage 3,600 members. The project was built around an online networking and pledge system.  
2: Knowledge for a sustainable future - disseminating behaviour change and other pro-environmental information – using a range of media and co-operative events - to a wider audience. |
| **Marine Stewardship Council** |
| **MSC on the Menu** - a supply chain-focused initiative aimed at: (a) increasing the availability of MSC-certified seafood in the foodservice sector (particularly seafood from English fisheries); and (b) promoting this availability to consumers. These twin aims were delivered by two associated work packages:  
1: Supply chain – a co-ordinated plan of engagement with a range of fisheries and foodservice supply chain partners.  
2: Consumers – a consumer-facing campaign using the certified sites targeted by work package 1 as conduits to the consumer (e.g. work place canteen campaigns as Sodexo sites). |
| **Waterwise** |
| **Tap into Savings** (TiS) - using home visits and the retrofit of simple water saving technologies as a means of encouraging residents to think about how they use water and to encourage behavioural changes. It involved two work packages:  
1: Home visits - 7,600 home visits with residents in social housing in three areas: Merstham/Redhill (SE London), Coventry and Braintree. During the home visit a range of simple water efficiency devices were installed, including dual flush conversions, tap inserts, and low flow showerheads. Installers were also trained to engage with residents and give them advice and support.  
2: TiS EcoTeams – establishing a number of EcoTeams to involve 380 residents (who had previously had a home visit). |
| **COIN** |
| **Climate Solidarity** - Using trade unions as a means to mobilise their membership to set up action groups. The groups would take practical steps to cut carbon emissions at home and at work. |
| **Global Action Plan** |
| **EcoTeams** - Scaling up the EcoTeams concept to engage EDFE employees and the public through the Team Great Britain (TGB) campaign. Mass training events were delivered alongside online support. |

Two of the projects – COIN’s *Climate Solidarity* and Global Action Plan’s *EcoTeams* – failed to deliver as anticipated. Progress on both projects was insufficient and they were unlikely to meet the targets they set out to achieve. After review and several discussions, the projects closed down early. The learning about why they didn’t work is reflected in the overall findings presented in this report.
1.3 The GLF research design & methodology

A detailed account of the GLF research methodology is provided in the Annex, which sets out: the factors which influenced the research design; the strategic approach; the detailed research tasks, metrics and tools; the approach to analysis; research challenges and data limitations. A key influence on the design of the approach was the policy context in 2008, when Defra was spearheading work to encourage the widespread adoption of pro-environmental behaviours. In particular, the design incorporated Defra’s (then) new pro-environmental segmentation model and standard questions for tracking the incidence of pro-environmental behaviours.

The GLF was designed to have a twin focus to determine both impacts (i.e. against one or more of the 12 headline behaviour goals in Defra’s Framework for Pro-environmental Behaviours) as well as learning about processes, delivery and the relationship between Defra and CSOrgs. This included the following specific research questions:

- What measurable impact have GLF projects had on changing the behaviour of individuals, households or business?
- Which kinds of projects and engagement models are more successful at delivering behaviour change on sustainable consumption?
- What are the lessons from the GLF about critical success factors and barriers involved in delivering effective behaviour change projects in community based projects?
- Can successful initiatives in one location, or with a particular target group (e.g. those already receptive to sustainable behaviours), be replicated on a wider scale?
- What are the implications for future funding streams and policy developments?

The first two of these can be consolidated into an overarching objective to learning about behaviour change; the third and fourth can likewise be consolidated into an overarching objective learning about delivery, while the fifth is focused on legacy, scope for scale up and replication. These are the three objectives that form the basis for this report’s central structure throughout.

The research programme was both extensive in its scope and innovative in its design. The methodology adopted for the GLF was designed to address the principal weaknesses identified in the EAF by introducing new approaches, most notably extensive support for self-evaluation in the funded projects. The aim was to generate ‘bottom up’ evidence from projects’ own experience and evaluations while at the same time to ensure rigour and consistency across the Fund as a whole. This in part reflected the fact that GLF projects were quite different from each other (either in terms of their thematic focus on e.g. transport, energy, or in terms of their approaches), and in part a desire to build capacity of CSOrgs and encourage forms of ‘self-evaluation’.

In addition to Defra’s desire to support self-evaluation, there was also a parallel need to ensure a level of consistency across projects, in order to assess impacts on a level playing field. Therefore, and in response, the provision of central support was a core part of the research design, involving the following:
Each project, as part of its funding from Defra, was required to commission an evaluation partner and, in the early stages prior to project launch, received financial and advisory support to create an individual evaluation plan.

The projects were supplied with an evaluation handbook written specifically for the GLF fund by Brook Lyndhurst.

Ad-hoc research and advisory support was available through the life of the project from Brook Lyndhurst and Kathryn Rathouse Social Research.

Each project delivered baseline and follow up surveys to evaluate behaviour change impacts. Surveys included a combination of mandatory questions, standardised behaviour questions, and bespoke questions chosen by the project. In addition, projects used qualitative techniques such as interviews and focus groups to collect other evidence around their project successes. These are outlined in full for each project in Part B of this report.

Each project, as part of its feedback to Defra, was required to produce a Report for Defra. The projects also provided Brook Lyndhurst with the anonymised raw data from their evaluation activities.

As well as the research advisory support provided to projects throughout the GLF programme, their data and evidence were thoroughly checked by the research team and then used in the review of the GLF overall.

These evaluation activities were supplemented by Brook Lyndhurst with additional activities. These included workshops, a peer visit and review process, and site visits with project managers. In addition, in the case of the two projects which did not complete their delivery (COIN and GAP), interviews with partners and stakeholders were carried out to further understand the reasons behind this.

With input from Defra, the research team filtered the extensive data and evidence for robustness, created detailed ‘deep dive’ case studies based on the evidence (part 1 of this report), then developed a synthesis of cross-cutting themes through both structured analysis and workshop discussions (part 2 of the report). In synthesising and interpreting the evidence, the team were able to benchmark the GLF findings against their wider knowledge from the evaluation and review of similar programmes (such as the Scottish Climate Challenge Fund and NESTA’s Big Green Challenge as well as Defra’s Environmental Action Fund and Climate Challenge Fund).

In the view of the research team, the significant investment made in supporting the projects’ own evaluations resulted in better quality data than in the previous EAF and of at least comparable quality to other similar programmes. Limitations and gaps remain, however. Key limitations relate to survey data, where there is a risk of self-selection bias in survey samples, and where behaviour impacts are not always adequately captured (further detail about limitations and mitigating actions is set out in the Annex).

The term ‘statistically significant’, when used to describe the data produced from projects, refers to those results where statistically significant differences are observed at the 95% confidence level. This is used as a standard convention throughout and therefore P values are not cited for every individual result.
1.4 Structure of this report

The evidence is presented in two main parts, which present the information in different ways and with a different audience in mind:

**Part A – ‘Deep Dive’ Case Studies**
This section presents individual case studies for each project in turn, according to a common structure (i.e. outputs, impacts, reflections for delivering projects ‘like this’, and key lessons for behaviour change). It is designed for the reader who has a specific interest in any of the individual projects or greener living themes/behaviours covered by a particular project.

**Part B - Synthesis**
This section, looking across the full set of GLF projects, focuses on cross-cutting issues, drawing out comparisons and contrasts between projects and focusing on the collective learning as a whole. It is designed for the reader who has a broader interest in the delivery of behaviour change interventions by Civil Society Organisations.
Part A: Deep dive case studies

This part of the report focuses on each of the individual GLF projects, presenting each of them as a series of ‘Deep Dive’ case studies that drill down in detail to explore the approach, the key success factors and the challenges. The deep dives are presented as follows:

- Broadening the Reach of TravelSmart - Sustain
- Degrees Cooler – National Union of Students
- Eat into Greener Living – National Trust
- Greener Together – Co-operatives UK
- MSC on the Menu – Marine Stewardship Council
- Tap into Savings (TiS) - Waterwise

Each Deep Dive case study follows a common structure, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 1: Background and approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aims and Objectives for each project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Work Packages,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key delivery partners, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches to changing behaviour.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 2: Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key outputs delivered by the project in terms of tools and facilities created, activities undertaken, training provided, and media coverage);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key learning points about the outputs and their delivery.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 3: Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The evaluation methods used by the project;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key impacts, covering attitudinal and behaviour change, community cohesion, organisational capacity, longevity of impact and behavioural spill-over;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ‘what next’ questions, in terms of the anticipated legacy of the project; the potential for scale up, and the potential for replication.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 4: Lessons for behaviour change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A summary of the key lessons for pro-environmental behaviour change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 5: The project’s key advice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commentary from the project team on the key advice that they would give to other projects doing something similar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To make the case studies as accessible as possible some of the specific detail – for example the quantity of each output or detailed comparisons between the baseline and follow up surveys in terms of percentages – is included in table format and then summarised in the corresponding text. The reader can then decide what level of detail they would like, and whether they require a key summary in narrative form or the underlying data itself.
SECTION 1: BACKGROUND & APPROACH

Sustrans is a registered charity providing practical solutions to transport challenges, with more than 10 years’ experience delivering TravelSmart, an Individualised Travel Marketing (ITM) initiative to offer households advice, motivation and information on local sustainable transport options. TravelSmart and LivingSmart (see below) are delivered in partnership with Transport and Infrastructure Research Institute Socialdata, who pioneered the ITM approach and who have delivered over 400 Individualised Marketing campaigns worldwide targeting over five million people. Sustrans delivered the Broadening the Reach of TravelSmart project, which involved three distinct work packages: one delivering the core TravelSmart project; one extending the TravelSmart project approach to engage households on a wider suite of pro-environmental issues; and a third work package to develop an online mapping functionality for travel planning.

Work Package 1 - TravelSmart ITM
This work package targeted 25,000 households in two locations – Broxbourne, Hertfordshire (8,000) and Ipswich (17,000) – in order to achieve a 10% reduction in car-as-driver trips; a 25% increase in cycling trips; a 15% increase in walking trips; and a 15% increase in public transport trips across target populations.

Work Package 2 – iTTravelSmart
This work package involved an upgrade to Sustrans’ online mapping facility by adding new datasets and improving functionality. As well as the development of the mapping itself, Sustrans used its funding to promote the facility widely, primarily through an expansion of their annual Change Your World (CYW) and ongoing Free Your Bike (FYB) campaigns. The aim was to achieve 240,000 users per year.

Work package 3 – LivingSmart
This was a pilot intervention building upon the core TravelSmart approach to target a variety of pro-environmental behaviours, beyond transport alone. The objective was to contact – via telephone - 1,000 households in Ipswich who had already taken part in TravelSmart. Those expressing interest were then sent an information pack on either energy or waste. A small number of home energy monitors and home energy audits were also available.

The three work packages above involved a number of partners who played a key role in terms of both financial and ‘hands on’ support, including the local authorities (Broxbourne Borough Council, Hertfordshire County Council, Ipswich Borough Council, Suffolk County Council), the Energy Savings Trust (EST) and British Gas.
SECTION 2: OUTPUTS

This section assesses:

- **Key outputs** delivered by the project (i.e. the tools and facilities created, activities undertaken, training provided, and media coverage);

- **Key learning points**, as well as commentary from the project team on the key advice that they would give to other projects doing something similar.

2.1 SUMMARY OF OUTPUTS

The main outputs are outlined in Table 1 and summarised as follows:

- The core outputs from Work Package 1 (TravelSmart) were doorstep visits and telephone calls that led to the distribution of sustainable travel packs and local sustainable travel maps. A total of 17,647 households were visited (representing 71% of the target population), with large numbers of information packs deployed (e.g. 10,074 Sustainable Travel Information packs and 11,074 local sustainable travel maps). In both instances the project achieved a wide reach, with outputs in line with the original targets. However, what is also evident is that specific outputs, such as the bus test tickets and pedometers, only played a small part in the project (a total of 17 and 14, respectively, were deployed). Furthermore, the number of follow up in-home advice sessions – potentially providing a deeper and more sustained engagement (as opposed to one-off doorstep discussions) - was also low (72 in total, representing 0.4% of those canvassed). TravelSmart discount cards for local cycling and walking retailers, while playing a more significant role (i.e. 3,530 were circulated), also failed to meet the initial targets set (6,000).

- The core output from Work Package 2 (iTravelSmart) was the online tool itself, which had a total of 375,000 users in 2010 (exceeding the original target of 240,000 annual users). Other, largely promotional, tools were also created to raise awareness/direct traffic to the website, and in all cases the initial targets were met.

- Turning to Work Package 3 (LivingSmart), outputs were largely in line with expectations and, just like Work Package 1, were focused on breadth rather than depth. Socialdata and Sustrans successfully re-contacted 915 TravelSmart participants in Ipswich (target: 1,000). Of these, 780 participants – or 85% - expressed an interest in LivingSmart and were sent an information pack on either energy or waste. There was marginally higher demand for the waste information (514 requests) compared to energy (414 requests). While the number of in-home energy audits (and associated home energy displays) exceeded expectations (66 households vs. a target of 50), this represents a small minority of participants overall.
Table 2 – Summary of outputs by work package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP1: TravelSmart</th>
<th>WP2: iTravelSmart</th>
<th>WP3: LivingSmart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tools &amp; facilities created/deployed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tools &amp; facilities created/deployed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tools &amp; facilities created/deployed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,074 Sustainable Travel Information packs (target: 11,250)</td>
<td>20,000 postcard flyers for iTravelSmart (target: 20,000)</td>
<td>514 waste information packs (target: 500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,047 Local sustainable travel maps (target: 12,250)</td>
<td>1 online iTravelSmart User Guide (target: 1)</td>
<td>414 energy information packs (target: 650)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311 bus stop timetables, 12,723 copies (target: 311 timetables, 12,723 copies)</td>
<td>300,000 Free Your Bike info request cards (target: 300,000)</td>
<td>900 waste ‘freebies’, i.e. 300 freezer bag clips, 300 food measures, 300 reusable can lids (target: 900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,530 TravelSmart discount cards for local cycling and walking retailers (target: 6,550)</td>
<td>100,000 Change Your World postcards (target: 100,000) and 5,000 posters (target: 5,000)</td>
<td>66 home energy monitors – for anyone receiving the home energy audit (target: 100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000 discount card promotional flyers (target: 6,000)</td>
<td>20,000 promotional inserts for the Lush Cyclists’ repair kit (target: 20,000)</td>
<td><strong>Activities undertaken</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704 eco-driving packs (target: 1,200)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Phone canvassing of 915 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Pedometres (target: 20)</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>66 home energy audits (original estimate: 50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 bus test tickets (target: 25)</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities undertaken</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delivering home energy audits – 4 staff members (delivered by EST)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17,647 households canvassed (71% of total)</td>
<td>Online news stories with a readership of 1,273,896 (based on unique visits to that website)</td>
<td>Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 home advice sessions (0.4% of those canvassed)</td>
<td>4 million page impressions recorded as part of an online banner ad for Free Your Bike (leading to 909 clicks)</td>
<td>News story in the local newspapers with a circulation of 15,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training</strong></td>
<td>Consumer press news stories with a readership of 3,676,921</td>
<td>Online news story at Usswitch.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Officer training for 3 staff members</td>
<td>Bikeability (cycling proficiency training) for 5 staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household canvassing for 30 staff members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Entry for 19 staff members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home visit advisor training for 4 staff members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikeability (cycling proficiency training) for 5 staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 local newspapers - combined circulation 19,205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 **KEY LEARNING ABOUT THE OUTPUTS AND THEIR DELIVERY**

The TravelSmart method is a package that comprises multiple elements (postal, face-to-face and telephone communications; information; rewards and incentives). Considering the impact of the suite of tools in combination, the project reports four key learning points:

1. **Face to face contact**
The qualitative depth interviews, undertaken as part of the evaluation research (set out in more detail under ‘Impacts’), found that respondents were positive about the one-to-one nature of the contact with both the TravelSmart advisors and the LivingSmart home advisors. Indeed, the project notes that - in relation to LivingSmart - the home energy audits and advisors were a particular success, even though this was only available to a relatively small number (66) of participating households.

2. **Website design**
Unlike some of the other GLF projects which struggled to create and maintain website platforms to deliver their projects, the delivery of the iTravelSmart tool (Work Package 2) was notably smooth. The project attributes this to the existing in-house expertise (in the form of Sustrans’ GIS team) that allowed the team to specify the development work very tightly and ensure that they achieved the results they had anticipated on the web browsers that were specified. Nonetheless, the project team still reported some unanticipated problems with the tool when it was accessed via alternative browsers (e.g. Google Chrome), which required additional work.

Turning to the user experience, two aspects of the tool were highlighted as critical:

- **Functionality of the tool** - investing time to source an extensive range of datasets (that were both fun and functional) helped to establish iTravelSmart as a ‘one-click’ option for travel planning.

- **‘Save and share’** – the qualitative depth interviews suggest that this function was used by some users to encourage others to consider sustainable travel options. For example, two respondents - who were both already keen cyclists - highlighted how they had used it as a way of encouraging work colleagues to take up cycling.

3. **Partnership working**
One of the key delivery learning themes to emerge from the project is partnership working, both in terms of financial and non-financial support as well as, more broadly, the value of existing relationships in being able to ‘hit the ground running’. Four lessons are evident:

- **Partnerships with local authorities** – Sustrans acknowledge that the project would not have been possible without the support of the local authorities who provided both cash funding and in-kind contributions (including use of local authority branding for project communications, e.g. letters sent to households, which was found to be useful in providing legitimacy to the project and therefore maximising participation rates).

- **The value of existing relationships** – the project asserts that it was helpful, given the relatively short timeframe to deliver GLF, to work with authorities which needed little
introduction to TravelSmart. It would have taken other local authorities longer to
develop an understanding of TravelSmart and the process.

- **Drawing on external expertise and advice** – the LivingSmart project was only possible
  with the support of EST, which provided materials and training for Sustrans fieldwork
  staff. The EST was also instrumental in securing home energy monitors (from British
  Gas) which were offered to participants who received the home energy audit.

- **Working with a large energy utility** – Sustrans believes that British Gas’s contribution
  enhanced the LivingSmart offer (i.e. the monitors were a good incentive for people to
  take up home energy audits and an excellent tool for providing feedback on behaviour),
  however the relationship took more staff time than expected. A specific issue was Data
  Protection, since British Gas requested contact details of households which received
  monitors but passing on personal data to a third party complicated engagement with
  project participants.

4. **Finding printed resources on energy and waste**
Sustrans notes that, for LivingSmart, it would have been desirable to provide participants
with a more comprehensive set of materials on energy and waste to choose from, but much
of the available material was only available online. The depth interviews found that there
was some criticism of the generality of materials provided, which did not always provide
households with the level of detail they needed to take action and install e.g. energy saving
measures.
SECTION 3: IMPACTS

This section outlines:

- A summary of the evaluation methods used by the project;
- The project’s key impacts, drawing on quantitative and qualitative evaluation research and exploring attitudinal and behaviour change, community cohesion, organisational capacity, longevity of impact and spillover from one pro-environmental behaviour to another.
- This section also explores the ‘what next’ questions for the project, focusing on three key issues – the anticipated legacy of the project; the potential for further scale up of the project (i.e. focusing on the same audience/locations but expanding the reach); and the potential for replication (adapting the approach for different audience/locations).

3.1 EVALUATION METHODS

The project deployed a range of quantitative and qualitative research methods across the three work packages, as set out in Table 2.

Table 2 – Evaluation methodologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Package 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel diary surveys</strong> - This is Sustrans’ preferred evaluation methodology, devised and conducted by partners Socialdata, (but not the ‘official’ evaluation approach under GLF). Respondents were selected across the target populations in Broxbourne and Ipswich, including both participants and non-participants. Each respondent completed a detailed one-day travel diary and, with the samples split into seven days, this provided a picture of weekly travel patterns. The sample sizes were 846 (baseline) and 824 (follow up) in Broxbourne, and 1,135 and 1,035, respectively, in Ipswich.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone surveys</strong> (commissioned by Defra) – a total of 800 interviews were carried out in Broxbourne (400 at baseline; 400 at follow up) and 1,600 in Ipswich (800 and 800). The sample was drawn across the wards in which TravelSmart was delivered. Because the samples were simply drawn from geographical areas rather than from the specific target populations, only a small proportion of respondents in the follow up survey had participated in the TravelSmart programme (i.e. only 10% of respondents in Broxbourne and 22.5% in Ipswich). This significantly hindered the ability of the evaluation to track change in response to the intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defra segmentation</strong> - Self-completion paper questionnaires were left with project participants following the doorstep visits. 318 completed responses were received, representing a response rate of approximately 3%. The results are therefore likely to be skewed by the low sample size and the high degree of self-selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depth interviews</strong> – a series of semi-structured interviews were conducted with TravelSmart participants (42 from Ipswich, three from Broxbourne).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Package 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online survey</strong> - Users of iTripleSmart were met with a survey pop-up window at both baseline and follow up. The site usage statistics show a response rate of 3% at baseline and 7% at follow-up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defra segmentation</strong> - the pop-up technique was used to administer the Defra segmentation questions survey. The survey ran from June - July 2010, with a response rate of 4%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualitative depth interviews</strong> – 35 interviews with users were undertaken.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work Package 3

- Telephone survey - All 1,000 households in the target population were telephoned after they had completed TravelSmart to gauge their interest in LivingSmart. If they expressed an interest they were asked to complete the baseline survey. A total of 780 people completed the baseline survey, and at follow-up they were all re-contacted. 354 completed the follow-up survey (a response rate of 45%). The results reported below are from only these 354 respondents who participated in both the baseline and follow-up surveys.

3.2 Key Impacts

The project’s key impacts are summarised in Table 3. This demonstrates the following:

Defra segmentation profile: The profile of Sustrans’ target audience varied by work package. Both TravelSmart and LivingSmart, by virtue of engaging a broad cross section of households, had a relatively balanced profile according to the Defra segmentation – with a mix of Concerned Consumers (24%), Positive Greens (22%), Honestly Disengaged (20%) and Waste Watchers (14%). iTripleSmart users, on the other hand, were heavily skewed in favour of Positive Greens (47%), followed by Concerned Consumers (22%) and Cautious Participants (13%).

Attitudes: There is little evidence of attitudinal change across any of the three work packages. In the case of iTripleSmart this is likely because attitudes were already ‘green’ and remained so, e.g. 79% at baseline disagreed with the statement “it’s not worth me doing things to help the environment if others don’t do the same” (compared to 81% at follow up). For TravelSmart some relatively modest shifts were seen in Broxbourne (with the proportion of survey respondents who said that they encourage others to be environmentally friendly increasing from 51 to 59%), but these were not replicated by the survey in Ipswich. Sustrans note, in their report, that the TravelSmart approach deliberately avoids overt pro-environmental messaging and instead targets specific travel behaviours rather than attitudes.

Behaviours: The evidence for behaviour change in respect of TravelSmart varied according to the evaluation methodology. On the one hand, the Travel Diary data points to significant changes in travel behaviours, with a c.10% relative reduction in car-as-driver trips alongside corresponding increases in sustainable travel modes (even though the impact on overall modal share was more modest). However, the telephone survey suggests no changes in travel patterns, other than an increase in cycle trips in Broxbourne (whereas the travel diary data suggests a decrease). The qualitative research (i.e. depth interviews), in line with the telephone survey results, found that there were few respondents who had made any significant changes in response to TravelSmart. Furthermore, it suggests that where people indicated that they had changed their travel behaviour, it tended to be a change related to employment, such as changing jobs or retiring.

Turning to Work Package 2, the survey reveals a marginal increase in reported cycling – with 73% of users saying at follow up that they use a bike at least once a week, compared to 70% at baseline. Once again, the extent to which cycling behaviours could be changed was likely limited by high levels of existing behaviours prior to iTripleSmart (indeed, the premise of the website was to attract existing cyclists). The focus of this Work Package, therefore, was
about supporting existing behaviours (allowing cyclists to find new or safer routes) rather than recruiting ‘new’ cyclists.

By contrast, Work Package 3 (LivingSmart) recorded several significant changes in reported behaviours, including a large increase in the proportion who say they ‘always’ wash clothes at 40 degrees or lower, ‘always’ turn off lights when not in the room, and ‘never’ boil the kettle with more water than they are going to use. Significant change was also reported for in-home waste behaviours, such as recycling and food waste minimisation. In most instances the changes recorded represent an extension of existing behaviour, rather than a new behaviour. For example, the increase in participants ‘always’ washing at 40 degrees or less can largely be explained by a decrease in the proportion who said at baseline that they were doing this ‘often’. A caveat to these results needs to be applied in that the original LivingSmart sample (i.e. 1,000 participants who had already participated in TravelSmart) was already self-selected to a degree by virtue of their participation in that project (which may have accentuated the magnitude of the reported change).

**Longevity of impact:** While there is no further follow-up data relating directly to TravelSmart in either Ipswich or Broxbourne, Socialdata and Sustrans have carried out multiple follow-up surveys in other areas (using the travel diary method) to assess longevity of impact. In Peterborough, for example, the immediate impact was a relative reduction of 13% for car-as-driver trips, compared to a 9% relative reduction after three years. There was, therefore, some attrition over this period, although a substantial reduction in car use compared to the baseline was maintained over the three year period. There is no evidence on which to assess the longevity of iTTravelSmart or LivingSmart.

**Behavioural spill over:** There is no evidence of any spill-over impacts because the evaluation focused only the specific behaviours targeted by this intervention.

**Community cohesion:** The project did not set explicit community cohesion objectives, and none were recorded.

**Skills & capacity:** The project considers internal capacity building as one of the great successes of the project given that – via LivingSmart - staff are now equipped with the knowledge and skills to deliver projects that draw together multiple environmental issues and deliver joined up behaviour change programmes. This offers important lessons in terms of the potential for integration and CSOrgs ‘brand stretching’ to incorporate additional behaviours.
Table 3– Headline impacts at a glance

**Work Package 1 – TravelSmart**

**TRAVEL DIARY DATA**

Ipswich
- The travel diary results point to a significant increase in bicycle and bus trips per person per year (relative changes of +55% and +31%, respectively). A modest change of +2% in walking was below the target of a +15% change.
- Car as driver trips declined by -11%.
- These relative changes had a modest impact on overall modal share, with bicycle trips increasing from 2% to 3% and bus trips from 5% to 7%.
- Car as driver trips declined from 41% to 37% in terms of total modal share.

Broxbourne
- The travel diary results point to a significant increase in walking and bus trips per person per year (relative changes of +21% and +21%, respectively). There was a pronounced decline in bicycle trips (-25%, against a target of +25%).
- Car as driver trips declined by -10%, in line with the target.
- These relative changes had a modest impact on overall modal share, with walking trips increasing from 19% to 23% of total modal share and bus trips from 5% to 6%.
- Car as driver trips declined from 45% to 42% in terms of total modal share.

**SURVEY DATA**
- The telephone survey data presents some conflicts with the travel diary results, in that Ipswich shows no relative changes in travel patterns according to the survey.
- Furthermore, in Broxbourne the survey records an increase in Bicycle trips (+4%), in contrast to the travel diary findings which showed a pronounced decline.

Sustrans assert that the telephone survey method of assessing the project’s impact is not as effective as their own travel diary method. Furthermore, we note again that only a small proportion of survey respondents were actually TravelSmart participants. Therefore, and in order to assess whether there were any differences between survey respondents who were TravelSmart participants and those who were not, additional analysis was undertaken. This demonstrates some statistically significant differences. At follow up, TravelSmart participants were more likely to be using buses and cycling once or more a week than those who had not participated (39% vs. 25% for buses and 18% vs. 11% for cycle trips, respectively). However, and because it is not possible to trace these individuals back to the baseline survey and compare their behaviour against non-participant at that point, it is not possible to confidently attribute these findings to the project (since it is possible that e.g. TravelSmart participants self-selected themselves to be part of the project on the basis that they were already more likely to be using sustainable modes of travel).

**Work Package 2 – iTriTravelSmart**

- Responses to the Defra Segmentation questions, while based on a small and self-selected sample, suggest that the profile of iTriTravelSmart users is heavily skewed in favour of Positive Greens (47%), followed by Concerned Consumers (22%) and Cautious Participants (13%).
- There was no change in reported environmental attitudes. However, attitudes were already ‘green’ and remained so, e.g. 79% at baseline disagreed with the statement “it’s
not worth me doing things to help the environment if others don’t do the same”, compared to 81% at follow up.

- The survey reveals a moderate, but statistically significant, increase in reported cycle use – with 73% of users saying at follow up that they use a bike at least once a week, compared to 70% at baseline. Likewise, 49% said at follow up that they used their bike more than they did a year ago (up from 45% at baseline).

### Work Package 3 – LivingSmart

#### Impact of LivingSmart on in-home energy behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline (324)</th>
<th>Follow up (324)</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How frequently do you personally wash clothes at 40 degrees or less [% ‘always’]</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>+25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you personally turn off lights when you are not in the room [% ‘always’]</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>+17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you personally boil the kettle with more water than you are going to use? [% ‘never’]</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>+13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you personally leave your TV or PC on standby for long periods of time [% ‘never’]</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% who have ‘all (100%)’, ‘the majority (90%)’ or ‘most (75%)’ lights in the home as energy efficient</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Impact of LivingSmart on in-home waste behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline (324)</th>
<th>Follow up (324)</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I recycle everything that can be recycled</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>+17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking about the food waste for your household, overall how much uneaten food would you say you throw away in general? [% quite a lot/a reasonable amount/some]</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much effort do you and others in the household go to in order to minimise the amount of food thrown away? [% ‘a great deal’]</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>+29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 WHAT NEXT?

**Legacy:** The legacy for the project is uncertain. In terms of jobs, none of those created under the auspices of the project will continue. The TravelSmart and LivingSmart fieldwork staff who were taken on in project areas were employed for the duration of the fieldwork only. The one central role created by the project (Online Mapping Promotions Officer) also ended at the end of the funding period. In terms of individual work packages, the prospects for each vary according to its ‘fit’ with Sustrans core work. For example, iTriavleSmart will continue to be available on the Sustrans website, although development and promotion will be less intensive than it was during the GLF funding period when there was a dedicated officer in post. In contrast, a great deal of effort has been, and continues to be, made to secure further funding for the TravelSmart team, which survives solely on project income. There are no immediate plans to replicate LivingSmart unless it can again be attached to other project work which supports Sustrans’ core focus on transport, or it can be funded for partners Socialdata to deliver independently.

**Scaling up & replication:** Both TravelSmart ITM and LivingSmart are, in principle, very scalable and replicable. For example, TravelSmart in the UK has already delivered projects that have ranged in size from 1,500 to 50,000 households, all delivered by a core team that has varied between four and six full-time staff. iTriavleSmart could be ‘scaled up’ by upgrading the usability and functionality of the mapping itself, including improving the current printing function. Integrating the service with an automated route planner such as Transport Direct would also substantially increase the scope of the resource. Furthermore, development work is currently underway to increase the usability of the mapping via mobile applications.
SECTION 4: LESSONS FOR BEHAVIOUR CHANGE

TravelSmart is a tried and tested project and the evidence suggests that it ‘does what it says on the tin’ – it focuses on a single issue (transport), involves contact with households in a geographically concentrated area, and aspires to small, rather than radical, changes in travel behaviour. By GLF standards the reach of the project is in the mid-range (engaging 10,000+ households), and the nature of the engagement is relatively light touch. It does, however, involve face to face contact which – according to the qualitative evidence – appears important in motivating change. The low number of incentives (e.g. pedometers, test bus tickets) and follow up in-home advice sessions limits any assessment of how these ‘deeper engagement’ elements add to TravelSmart’s appeal. Both would be interesting elements to test further.

Overall, and in spite of the inconsistencies between the two evaluation methodologies (i.e. the Travel Diaries and the telephone survey), TravelSmart does appear to have led to a number of changes in travel choices, albeit with a minor impact on overall modal share (although these changes appear to be sustained over time, with only a small level of attrition). The project team itself notes that the success of TravelSmart is, to some extent, dependent on how supportive – or inhibiting - the local infrastructure and services are (e.g. cycle routes, road crossings, bus services).

“There was a Connect2 project in Broxbourne – a new crossing over the A10, with schools on one side of it and the town centre on the other side. The fact that GLF funded us to work in Broxbourne provided a great opportunity to exploit the synergies there. Our argument is that you will maximize the benefit if you deliver good quality infrastructure alongside behaviour change measures to promote that infrastructure and to lock in the change as well. We’ve noticed that our impact is variable depending on local contexts, so some places have particularly good cycling infrastructure or particularly good public transport and where that’s the case you tend to see bigger rises in cycling or in public transport use”. Sustrans GLF Project Manager

In these circumstances, the evidence suggests that this type of intervention is best suited to a specific set of circumstances where local services and/or households are in a state of flux (e.g. a new housing development, or an area where services and infrastructure are in transition). Given this and the literature surrounding behavioural ‘moments of change’, we judge that TravelSmart seems better suited to these circumstances than, for example, an area where there is little change in either services or households. However, according to Sustrans and Socialdata extensive evidence (not included as part of the GLF process), suggests that TravelSmart has been effective in a variety of settings.

The LivingSmart pilot is a particularly interesting test case in that it integrated a range of pro-environmental behaviours into a single package, and therefore lends itself to a study of the potential synergies between behaviours. The evaluation suggests that it has been successful, with a number of energy and waste behaviour changes evident. These were predominantly households scaling up and/or improving the consistency of their existing pro-environmental behaviours, rather than initiating new behaviours. As with TravelSmart, only a small number of participants were subject to deeper forms of support and engagement in the form of in-
home energy assessments and energy monitors. While the qualitative feedback suggests that this element of the project was popular and influential with households, the numbers are insufficient to evaluate the impact of this element. It would be an interesting aspect of the initiative to test further.

Finally, and in respect of the iTri­velSmart tool, this was quite unlike the other two work packages in that its focus was about creating an online tool, rather than a direct intervention, and the target audience were already notably pro-environmental in their outlook and engaged in a target behaviour (i.e. cycling). As such, the reported attitudinal and behaviour changes are limited. However, the work has demonstrated – in contrast to some of the other GLF projects – how to create effective online tools to support, consolidate and sustain existing behaviours.
SECTION 5: THE PROJECT’S KEY ADVICE

The following is taken from Sustrans’ own Final Report, and represents the advice that they would offer projects trying to undertake similar projects.

Work Package 1 – TravelSmart

- **Materials development** - these should be developed based on evidence of what has worked well in past projects and is likely to be engaging and useful to the target audience. If there is no similar experience to draw on, we would suggest running focus groups with members of the target audience to test responses to draft materials. The TravelSmart method is based on offering people a range of resources so that they can choose those most interesting and relevant to them. We find this individualisation to be a useful approach.

- **Committed Staff** - engaging with the public to promote behaviour change can be very challenging work, and the motivation provided by a sense of mission is very important. These and many other TravelSmart projects illustrate the importance of having the right team with the right leadership. These frontline delivery staff are crucial to a project’s success. Frontline staff must also be supported by robust project management systems, and by management colleagues who understand the pressures of this type of work and who can be hands-on with fieldwork assistance when required.

- **Start small** - it is advisable to start running projects of this type on a smaller scale than the many thousands of households targeted in Ipswich and Broxbourne, so that the necessary systems and skills can be developed with minimal risk. The first TravelSmart projects had target populations of fewer than 1,000 households.

- **Build strong relationships** - the TravelSmart delivery model is reliant on good partnerships with the local authorities and public transport operators. It is advisable to develop these partnerships as early as possible in the project planning stage to be clear about the benefits to stakeholders of their involvement and what is required of them.

Work Package 2 – iTriTravelSmart

- **Quality and accuracy of data** - this is critical to attract and retain visitors to an online resource such as iTriTravelSmart. A certain level of technical resource is therefore a prerequisite to achieve the service standards required. A contact point for users who encounter problems is also valuable. In Sustrans’ case, we were able to share mapping enquiries across the existing Information Team and the dedicated Mapping Promotions Officer. This enabled us to respond effectively to questions about iTriTravelSmart as they arrived.

- **Capture audience contact details** - ensuring there are robust processes in place to capture contact details from the target audience is very important. Interventions can then be used as an opportunity for further interaction or cross-promotion as appropriate. We have found that this creates a legacy, with a significant number of participants in Free Your Bike and Change Your World choosing to stay in touch with Sustrans after their initial point of contact. Normally this means signing up for e-bulletins, but this can lead to financial donations or volunteering.

- **Build relationships with external contributors** – these can help to populate the resource with interesting features. For example, we worked with partners including the National Trust, YHA and the Caravan Club. Reciprocal marketing opportunities with these
organisations then provided a cost-effective way of promoting the resource to new potential users. These relationships were typically developed specifically as a result of our GLF funding and the fact that we could employ a dedicated Mapping Promotions Officer. She was able to spend a significant proportion of her time contacting potential partners and explaining the mutual benefits of working together. We would not have been able to develop these partnerships without this funded post.

Work Package 3 – LivingSmart

- **Partners** - the excellent working relationships we had with our local authority partners undoubtedly helped the project to run smoothly, and the Energy Saving Trust (EST) provided valuable input in terms of training and resources. Start discussions with British Gas (BG) early in the project if including BG resources in the project offer. Liaison with BG to secure their resources was hugely time-consuming and a number of errors had to be corrected. It is worth noting, however, that the BG home energy monitors we offered as part of the home energy advice service were well received.

- **Tailor materials according to your audience** - We found that there was a need for information about specific areas of waste reduction (for example, the most requested item was ‘How many different types of plastic are in your home?’) whereas the relatively low levels of awareness around energy use resulted in an interest in general information on energy saving, with less interest in the more specific items on offer. Furthermore, be prepared to develop your own materials. The range of information offered for the energy element was perhaps not as diverse as the waste element due to the relative scarcity of suitable printed materials.

- **Include a home energy audit component** – This was successful: take-up was considerably higher than home visits on similarly-sized TravelSmart projects. We would recommend the training carried out by the EST. It was comprehensive and included a shadowing element with an EST advisor on the final day so that we could be confident that the team had the required level of knowledge.

- **The team on the ground** – Employ a flexible local team with genuine enthusiasm for sustainability issues. We were fortunate to find an excellent team of home energy advisors who were able to fit around people’s availability and who had a real passion for the work.
SECTION 1: BACKGROUND & APPROACH

National Union of Students (NUS) is one of the largest student organisations in the world, representing the interests of 7 million students in the UK. They delivered the Degrees Cooler project with the aim of increasing the pro-environmental behaviours of 90,000 staff and students across 20 participating universities in England.

The project involved three distinct work packages, brought together under the umbrella Degrees Cooler programme branding, and two separate cohorts of students across the two years of the project. The work packages were also supported by 20 ‘Greener Living Assistants’ (GLAs), recent graduates employed and trained by Change Agents UK (previously Studentforce for Sustainability) who each spent a six month placement at a number of universities to help support the project in situ.

Work package 1 – Student Switch Off (SSO)
SSO is a programme designed to encourage energy-saving behaviours amongst students living in halls of residence, working with 10 of the participating Universities. The aim was to sign up 10% of students living in halls of residence as local advocates for the campaign (called Eco-Power Rangers) who pledge to use their energy carefully and encourage others to do the same. Halls of residence competed against one another to save the most, and were engaged through events and rewards (such as film screenings, quizzes, photo competitions and training events). SSO also linked up with local Lush cosmetic stores, nightclubs and cinemas to provide a greater number and variety of incentives, while at a national level it was sponsored by Ben & Jerry’s.

Work package 2 – Green Impact Universities (GIU)
GIU is an environmental accreditation and awards scheme for universities. A bespoke workbook of actions staff and students could undertake to improve their environmental performance was developed at 19 of the participating Universities. Staff and students were then encouraged to form teams and implement the actions outlined in the workbook. Teams of student volunteer auditors were then recruited and trained in each institution to verify the responses in the workbooks, with teams receiving feedback on their performance and, depending on their actions, a Bronze, Silver or Gold award. Local awards events were held to bring together all teams at each University and celebrate their achievements, usually involving senior managers from the institution.

Work package 3 – People & Planet Going Greener (P&P GG) campaign
The campaign aimed to engage and support 3,350 students and staff to develop their own responses to climate change. P&P provided training, resources and support to existing groups to develop practical carbon-cutting projects and run campaigns. Key objectives included: coordinating a national week of student action on climate change called Go Green Week; delivering Going Greener training to 10 of the participating universities; and supporting student groups at 18 of the participating universities to run Going Greener campaigns or projects. The Work Package also aimed to bring about large-scale institutional change through the publication of the Green League (an environmental rating and ranking system for universities).
Given that each work package was run across a single academic year, two sets of outputs and impacts were generated across the two year GLF period – referred to as ‘Year 1’ and ‘Year 2’.

SECTION 2: OUTPUTS

This section assesses:

- **Key outputs** delivered by the project (i.e. the tools and facilities created, activities undertaken, training provided, and media coverage);

- **Key learning points** about the outputs and their delivery, as well as commentary from the project team on the key advice that they would give to other projects doing something similar.

2.1 SUMMARY OF OUTPUTS

The project has an array of outputs across each of the three work packages, as well as through the umbrella Degrees Cooler campaign. These are outlined in Table 1 and summarised as follows:

- **Degrees Cooler** - the outputs created were focused on bringing together the three component work packages into one umbrella campaign, rather than achieving attitudinal or behaviour change in their own right. Key outputs included a Degrees Cooler website, a large number of branded materials (e.g. 10,000 flyers, 300 post-its, 3,000 pens, 750 desk-top calendars, 750 thermometers), a photo competition and a number of events for Environmental Managers, GLAs and staff to review progress. All outputs were delivered in line with targets (outlined in Table 1).

- **Work Package 1 (SSO)** - the main outputs were the sign up of the Eco Power Rangers at 14 of the participating Universities (four more than planned) alongside supporting communications, events and incentives. In many instances the outputs exceeded the original target. For example, the sign up rate for Eco Power Rangers (target: 10%) was 16% in Year 1 (6,396 students) and 18% in Year 2 (7,298 students); the film screenings (target: 400/year) were attended by 872 students in Year 1 and 410 in Year 2; and the climate change quizzes (target: 1,000/year) attracted 2,287 participants in Year 1 and 2,913 in Year 2.

- **Work Package 2 (GIU)** – the main outputs were the development of bespoke workbooks for each of the 19 participating Universities (four more than planned), followed by 275 submitted workbooks (and thus full audit reports). It also included drop in support sessions, run by the Greener Living Assistants, and events to celebrate success. There was an average of twenty teams per university, involving and 14,606 staff in Year 1 and 23,667 in Year 2.

- **Work Package 3 (P&P Going Greener)** – the outputs from this project were the publication of the Green League and materials and support to local P&P groups (including Action Guides, Campaign Guides, a Pledge card and Carbon Speed Dating packs, etc.) Much of the activity was focused on Go Green Week and specific initiatives like Meat-Free Mondays.
Table 1 – Summary of outputs by work package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools &amp; facilities created/deployed by the project</th>
<th>WP1: Student Switch Off</th>
<th>WP2: Green Impact Universities</th>
<th>WP3: P&amp;P Going Greener</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Cooler website, online forum and 2 films (only 1 film intended originally)</td>
<td>Tools &amp; facilities created by the project</td>
<td>19 Green Impact workbooks (target: 15)</td>
<td>Tools &amp; facilities created by the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 Degrees Cooler flyers (target: 10,000)</td>
<td>Updated SSO website</td>
<td>Workbook resources (e.g. template lighting and equipment responsibility plans, audit checklists)</td>
<td>300 Action Guides (plus online version), 200 Campaign Guides and Workbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branding materials including: 3000 postcards (target: 3,000), 3000 pens (target: 3,000), 750 desk-top calendars (target: 750), 750 thermometers (target: 750)</td>
<td>14 facebook groups (one for each University which signed up – compared to 10 intended)</td>
<td>275 Audit reports (225 originally planned)</td>
<td>Project Planning Template, campaign workshop &amp; slideshow (both online)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 USB sticks with supporting materials for Greener Living Assistants (target: 10)</td>
<td>15 emails in Year 2 to approximately 7,000 students each time</td>
<td>Green Impact page on NUS site, and 14 webpages on individual university websites (target: 19)</td>
<td>Go Green Week 2011 Pledge Card (downloadable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Degrees Cooler Year 1 summary reports (sent to GI environmental managers and union staff) (target: 20)</td>
<td>7000 Energy savings tips posters (8000 intended)</td>
<td>Green Impact forum on Degrees Cooler website</td>
<td>40 Carbon Speed Dating packs 2010 (online/downloadable 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 Year 1 senior staff emails (target: 80)</td>
<td>5,000 coasters Year 1 and 41,000 in Year 2 (5,000 intended)</td>
<td>Activities undertaken</td>
<td>Videos: Introduction to Going Greener, “What a difference a year makes”, Go Green Week 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities undertaken</strong></td>
<td>6,000 SSO branded cotton bags per year (5,000 intended), 500 fair-trade T-shirts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transition Universities Facebook page, Transition Universities Twitter channel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Cooler photo competition (160 entries)</td>
<td><strong>Activities undertaken</strong></td>
<td><strong>Activities undertaken</strong></td>
<td>Going Greener and Degrees Cooler web pages, E-communications (monthly html emails)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 GLA Review and Feedback day to discuss lessons across the first delivery year</td>
<td>Distribution of Ben &amp; Jerry’s merchandise (300 vouchers, 5,000 stickers, 1,000 freezer bags, 200 T-shirts)</td>
<td>2,461 Pledges</td>
<td>Green League Guide Methodology &amp; FAQs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Cooler Away Day overnight team building session for all Degrees Cooler Partners</td>
<td>4 Ben &amp; Jerry’s ice cream parties</td>
<td>1,375 Audits</td>
<td>Green League Degree Award Web Badges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees Cooler Year 1 Review day for 31 University Environment Managers, staff,</td>
<td>Eco-Power Ranger sign up and pledge scheme (signed up 6,396 in Year 1 and 7,723 in Year 2)</td>
<td>Launch events (368 attendees)</td>
<td>Template Press Releases for Go Green Week and Green League</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSO Photo Competition (744 photos submitted Year 1, 596 Year 2)</td>
<td>Drop in sessions (79 across 17 universities) and departmental visits (198 across 9 universities)</td>
<td><strong>Activities undertaken</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Awards ceremonies (1,460 attendees)</td>
<td>Green League 2010 &amp; 11, Shared Planet 2009 &amp; 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green Impact lecture at Southbank University (40 students attending)</td>
<td>Go Green Week 2010 (estimated reach: 25,916 students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Go Green Week 2011: Meat-Free Monday activities (estimated reach: 4,924 students); Travel-Light Tuesday activities (3,230); Waste-Not Wednesday activities (3,235); Switch-Off Thursday (4,800); behaviour pledge collection (525)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental film screenings (70 P&amp;P participants)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | | | Carbon Speed Dating Events (63 students, 3 universities), Can Film Festivals (360 students at 18 events); Swap shops (7,200 participants total at 9 universities), Low-carbon diet activities (estimated 1,600 participants); Allotment projects (estimated 122 students at 7 different universities); Veg box/food co-op (average 1,506 weekly customers), Composting activities (214
students, GLAs on changes to the approach for year 2 and best practice exchange
Year 2 GLA Review and Feedback day

Training
Year 1 & 2 training for Greener Living Assistants (20) Year 2 GLA mid-point training (10) External Change Agents UK (previously StudentForce for Sustainability) training (5)

Media
Mention on BBC radio 4 show Appearance on 16 environmental websites Appearance on website of a number of Degrees Cooler participant Universities Presentation or debate at conferences with total 1000 delegates Two articles in ‘spotlight’ magazine

Film screenings (872 in Year 1, 410 in Year 2) Climate change quiz (2,287 Year 1, 2,913 Year 2)

Training
Facilitating Green Impact on a Local Level – 22 GLAs trained, 24 Environmental Managers Student auditor training – 700 students trained Workshops in programme facilitation (485 attendees across 16 universities) Workshops in raising awareness and changing behaviours (274 attendees across 10 universities)

Media
3 articles in University newspapers at each of the 14 participating Universities Article in P&P annual 2010

Training
Volunteer Training (18 students total) Shared Planet Workshops (48 students 2009, 57 students 2010) Regional Training Weekends (11 groups 2009, 7 groups 2010) Going Greener workshops to individual universities (204 participants 2009/210, 38 participants 2010/11) Summer Gathering 2010 including Degrees Cooler feedback day (17) Transition Universities Open Space 2010 (17) Greener Living Assistant training (12 GLAs) London Universities Environmental Group Meeting (11 attendees)

Media
2.2 KEY LEARNING ABOUT THE OUTPUTS AND THEIR DELIVERY

The project reports six key learning points

1. Understanding the audience and how to engage
One of the defining features of the project was its ability to understand and engage its target audience. For example:

- **Selecting the right tools** - feedback from the evaluation focus groups (outlined in more detail under ‘Impacts’) suggests that the photo competitions and climate change quizzes were successful engagement tools. Furthermore, the penetration of the communications materials was high – in Year 1, 61% reported noticing *Degrees Cooler* posters in their halls of residence, followed by email reminders and updates (48%), Go Green Week (36%) and a debate about an environmental issue (28%). Likewise, a significant proportion of staff – as part of GIU - reported noticing ‘newsletters, posters and stickers in my workplace’ (79%), ‘people emailing me’ (67%), ‘Go Green week’ (48%), and staff verbally encouraging one another (47%).

- **Incentives** - freebies such as cotton bags and Ben & Jerry’s products proved to be very important hooks to gain the initial interest of this particular (student) audience.

- **Competition** - this was encouraged both within and between universities, for example by posting inter-hall of residence energy league tables on the SSO website. Students at the winning hall of residence (Manchester Metropolitan University) consciously decided at the beginning of the year that they were going to ‘beat’ all of the other halls of residence, thereby winning the end of year party/meal for their hall.

- **Award schemes & feedback** – formally recognising achievement was a successful way of encouraging new participants, motivating existing ones, and demonstrating senior commitment. In contrast, in Year 1 there were delays feeding back the energy data from halls of residence to students which may have acted as a barrier.

2. Face-to-face contact
One of the recurring themes across the project was the importance of face-to-face contact. Among students and staff it played an important engagement role, e.g. face-to-face events in halls of residence were a successful means of engaging students, while launch events and visits were both important in overcoming initial difficulties recruiting staff to the project. Furthermore, it was also critical in the development of strong working relationships between the NUS and each of the participating Universities, with the project team noting how much time they spent travelling to each university to build relationships.

3. Social context and a sense of community
The project was more successful on campus universities where engagement was easier. The project notes that it was particularly difficult to engage with some universities where there was low student engagement levels overall, particularly London-based universities. Furthermore, and for Work Package 3, existing P&P groups were much easier to engage as they were more familiar with its methods, campaign model, and communication channels. In universities without established groups, much more effort was needed to set up student campaign groups and familiarise them with events like Go Green Week.

4. Adaptability
One of the project’s key characteristics was its ability to adapt and improve its approach, taking advantage of the fact that the project ran across two academic years. The programme
of events and feedback sessions (e.g. with the Environment Managers at each University) were considered invaluable. Specific adaptations were as follows:

- **GLA recruitment** – delays to the recruitment of GLAs in Year 1 caused a number of difficulties, and so in Year 2 the GLAs were recruited earlier, all together, and they were also given more structured and frequent training.

- **Outputs and training** – training sessions were adapted to suit the local student population (e.g. in universities with many marketing students, this was a larger focus).

- **User friendly workbooks** – the layout of GIU workbooks in Year 1 was considered inaccessible, and so in Year 2 they were reformatted into a web-based system.

- **HTML emails** - the project team learnt to use html format emails, which helped them to link e-mails being opened with event attendance.

5. **Champions**
A key lesson from GIU concerns environmental ‘champions’ at different levels of the organisation. Firstly, participants found it easier to act with the support of champions higher up in the organisation (and so, in response, personalised letters of thanks summarising university and programme level achievements were sent to all Vice-Chancellors, union General Managers and Presidents). Furthermore, individual champions within each team had more success when they had support from colleagues, as opposed to ‘battling it alone’. It is noteworthy that it was administrative staff who were generally forming and leading teams, whereas engaging both academic staff and non-office staff was more difficult.

6. **Central Support**
The project was predicated on a decentralised model of delivery (i.e. a centrally defined programme of initiatives that were delivered locally at participating universities) which made the balance between central support and local delivery an important consideration. The project notes several successes in this respect, for example:

- Some universities found it difficult to communicate the project to potential participants, and so programme-level materials were created in Year 2 to strengthen understanding of the programme and promote the target behaviours.

- Centrally developed guides and tools for Work Package 3 were considered particularly important to enable P&P groups to run events and activities at their university in support of Go Green Week.

- In Year 1 participants expressed a desire for a central hub from which to celebrate and share good practice, and in response a new website and forum were launched in September 2010 for Year 2 of the programme.
SECTION 3: IMPACTS

This section outlines:

- A summary of the **evaluation methods** used by the project;
- The project’s **key impacts**, drawing on quantitative and qualitative evaluation research and exploring attitudinal and behaviour change, community cohesion, organisational capacity, longevity of impact and spill-over across pro-environmental behaviours;
- The ‘what next’ questions for the project, focusing on three key issues – the anticipated **legacy** of the project; the potential for further **scale up** of the project (i.e. focusing on the same audience/locations but expanding the reach); and the potential for **replication** (adapting the approach for different audience/locations).

3.1 EVALUATION METHODS

The project deployed a range of quantitative and qualitative research methods across the three work packages, as set out in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2 – Evaluation methodologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Degrees Cooler – umbrella campaign**
- As the overarching umbrella brand, Degrees Cooler was not itself evaluated.

**Work package 1 – Student Switch Off (SSO)**
- *Six focus groups* were conducted with students in participating halls of residence: two with first year Eco-Power Rangers; two with first years not signed up; and two with second years who had also not signed up.
- *Quantitative surveys* were conducted with students in halls of residence. Matched survey response sample sizes of 1,555 were achieved in Year 1 and 1,056 in Year 2 (response rates varied from 18-28%).
- *Interviews* were conducted with key members of staff at five of the Universities.
- *Electricity consumption data* – historical meter data from months of full occupancy (Oct, Nov, Feb, May) were used as a baseline, then compared to electricity usage during the intervention. The data was also adjusted according to any infrastructural changes and temperature data.

**Work package 2 - Green Impact Universities (GIU)**
- *Four focus groups* were conducted: one with student auditors, one with staff auditors, and two for participating staff team members.
- *Questionnaire surveys* were conducted with staff, leading to 822 matched baseline and follow-up surveys.
- *Interviews* were undertaken with key members of staff at five of the Degrees Cooler Universities to ascertain the perceived impact of the GIU project.
- *Workbook data* – data was collected from the workbooks of every participating team, showing what actions have been implemented and whether this was a direct result of the GIU project.

**Work package 3 – People & Planet Going Greener**
- *Two focus groups* were undertaken with students actively engaged in interventions, and one with students engaged but not directly involved in the projects.
- *Questionnaire surveys* – baseline and follow up surveys were undertaken with students who signed up to P&P. There were 265 (Y1) and 117 (Y2) participants with matched baseline and follow-up surveys.
- *Senior Manager Interviews* – with key members of staff at five Universities.
- *People & Planet Green League Questionnaire* – completed by all participating universities and compiled with independent performance data from the HEFCE (Higher Education Funding Council for England) and HESA (Higher Education Statistics Agency).
3.2 KEY IMPACTS

The project’s key impacts – across both the Year 1 and the Year 2 cohorts - are summarised in Table 3. This demonstrates the following:

Defra segmentation profile: The segmentation profile varied across each of the three work packages, with greater diversity evident among SSO participants (Work Package 1) in comparison to GIU members of staff (Work Package 2) and P&P groups (Work Package 3) who were more pro-environmental from the outset. Furthermore, there were some notable shifts across the two academic years. For example, in Year 2 the profile of SSO participants became more receptive to pro-environmental issues (with the proportion of Positive Greens increasing from 29% to 37%) as did the profile of P&P participants (67% were Positive Greens in Year 2 compared to 41% in Year 1).

Attitudes: SSO and GIU both had a demonstrable impact on attitudes. Among SSO participants, over half said that they were more aware of what they could do to be more environmentally friendly, while there was also an increase from baseline to follow up in the proportion who said that they will be doing more for the environment in a year’s time. An increase in general awareness was also a feature of GIU, with 27% of staff saying that they were ‘much more aware’ of things that they can do to be more environmentally friendly in the workplace, and a further 53% ‘a little more aware’. One of the key changes – in both SSO and GIU – was the proportion who disagreed with the statement ‘it’s not worth me doing things to help the environment if others don’t do the same’ (measuring a sense of personal agency). In contrast, the proportion who agreed with the statement ‘I find it hard to change my habits to be environmentally friendly’ decreased only marginally among both cohorts.

The pattern for Work Package 3 (P&P groups) is less clear and hindered by small sample sizes. However, and tentatively, it appears that the Year 1 intake were less pro-environmental at the start but did go on to record some small positive attitudinal shifts; whereas the Year 2 intake was significantly more pro-environmental at the outset but actually became less pro-environmental. For example, in Year 1 there was a modest increase in the proportion who agreed with the statement ‘I try to persuade people I know to be more environmentally friendly (from 68% to 72%) whereas in the Year 2 cohort the reverse trend is apparent (with 86% agreeing at baseline compared to 74% at follow up).

Behaviours: SSO aimed to deliver savings of 870 tonnes of CO2 each year, measured through analysis of pre- and post-intervention electricity meter data. This figure was surpassed, with 1,275 tonnes of CO2 saved in Year 1 and 562 tonnes in the first half of Year 2 (full year’s data pending). Furthermore, work book data from GIU indicates that the 362 departments involved took a total of 10,620 actions (even though no further analysis is available to ascertain the relative level of difficulty or impacts of the different actions chosen).

Turning to the surveys, the evidence from SSO is subject to some contradictory findings. For example, there was no recorded change in the proportion who said that they were environmentally friendly in ‘most things/everything’ they do (22% at baseline; 20% at follow up). However, and in response to the question ‘as a result of any of these SSO activities have you become more environmentally friendly?’ a small minority (5% in Year 1; 8% in Year 2) said ‘yes, in lots of ways’, while a larger proportion said ‘yes, in a few ways’ (39% and 39%, respectively). In terms of specific behaviours the survey recorded little change (e.g. there
was no change in the proportion who said that they turn lights off when not in the room, or leave PCs/TVs on standby for long periods of time. However, the notable exception - with an increase recorded in both the proportion who said that they ‘always/very often’ wash at 40 degrees or less and the proportion who said that they wait for a full load before putting the washing on. On the latter, there was an even more pronounced shift in the proportion who said they ‘always’ do these things, suggesting both an overall increase in participation as well as a reinforcement/improvement of existing behaviours.

GIU likewise recorded some significant shifts in self-reported behaviour, with an increase in the proportion who said that they are environmentally friendly in most things/everything they do (from 34% to 40%), and an increase in the proportion who said they had become more environmentally friendly (14% said ‘in lots of ways’ and 57% ‘in a few ways’). The survey also detected some significant changes in respect of specific behaviours, including a significant increase in the proportion who ‘always/very often’ turn lights off, print double-sided, read documents on screen rather than printing them, and recycle. There was, however, no change in the proportion who said that they leave their PC or laptop on standby for long periods of time.

The results for P&P are, once again, hindered by small sample sizes. However, and tentatively, the same pattern is evident whereby some positive increases among the Year 1 cohort were countered by decreases in Year 2. For example, while in Year 1 there was no significant change in the proportion who said that they ‘always/very often’ wash at 40 degrees or lower, Year 2 recorded a decrease. Likewise, while in Year 1 there was a significant increase in the proportion who said that they went to a ‘great deal/fair amount’ of effort to minimise the amount of food they throw away (from 69% to 77%); the reverse was evident in Year 2 (falling from 74% to 65%).

It is also not possible to assess the impact of the pledge elements of the programme. More than 3,000 visits were made to the Green Impact pledge site during the project, and over 7,000 pledges made across the four target behaviours. As only 6% of those who made pledges responded to follow-up contact, the project can only confirm that 240 pledges were completed. The pledge scheme itself was deemed as popular in some institutions (where higher numbers of pledge completion were seen) and indeed some asked for it to be kept ‘live’ beyond the remit of the programme. Anecdotal evidence shows that it was an easy action for individuals to complete, therefore an easy starting place, and by linking behaviours at work to those at home, beneficial to wider environmental awareness. Other feedback, however, was that the pledge scheme was seen as superficial and despite following-up with participants, there was no verification process therefore claiming any effective change is impossible. Similarly the low numbers of follow-up participants means the same size is low given the number of people reached across the whole work package.

Furthermore, records of the activities of individual P&P groups (Work Package 3) enabled project managers to estimate, relatively crudely, the carbon savings achieved by the activities. These figures suggest that around 238 tonnes of CO₂ were saved through sustainable food initiatives, 185 tonnes through recycling and reuse projects, and 813 tonnes through sustainable travel. However, many of these calculations are based on assumptions and a lack of data on actual follow through (e.g. more than 700 tonnes associated with the sustainable travel calculation are based on all those who pledged to reduce their flying by one European flight per year, which was unverified).
Behavioural spill over: There were some anecdotal reports of spill-over. For example, among staff, there is tentative evidence of spill over behaviours between work and the home.

Community cohesion: This was not a stated aim or measured outcome of the Degrees Cooler programme. However, over the span of the project it became clear that networks and community cohesion were important factors in the delivery and success of the programme (among both students and staff). Each of the work packages were based around similar groups working together – whether it was students living together in halls, colleagues working together in their department, or more engaged students getting involved in the Greener Together campaign. Qualitative interviews suggested the SSO helped to improve community cohesion by providing a common goal for students to work towards in hall, and creating a “positive sense of being part of a group”.

Skills & capacity: This was a clear outcome for both the NUS and delivery partner staff. It was also an outcome for some of the participants, e.g. the staff delivering SSO were all trained in project management, marketing, website management, html software, communications skills and social marketing; Eco-Power Rangers also received specific training in communications and social marketing; and P&P also built capacity through 200 students who were trained in campaigning, lobbying, media facilitation, creative communications and event planning. All of the Year 1 GLA’s continued in the sustainability sector, undertaking higher degrees or next-level paid roles, while nine of the 12 GLAs from Year 2 either found new roles or had their contract extended.
Table 3 – Headline impacts at a glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attitudes:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attitudes:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1: Positive Greens (29%), Concerned Consumers (25%), Honestly Disengaged (14%), Cautious Participants (13%). Year 2: Positive Greens (37%); Honestly Disengaged (9%).</td>
<td>Positive Greens (45%), Concerned Consumers (25%), Honestly Disengaged (11%).</td>
<td>Year 1: Positive Greens (41%), Concerned Consumers (25%), Cautious Participants (14%). Year 2: Positive Greens (67%), Concerned Consumers (20%), Cautious Participants (7%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52% in Year 1 stated that they were more aware of what they could do to be more environmentally friendly (9% who said that they were ‘much more aware’ and 42% who said that they were ‘a little more aware’), while in Year 2 results were similar (59% said that they more aware - 17% ‘much more’; 42% ‘a little more’).</td>
<td>A significant increase – from 38% to 53% - in the proportion of staff who strongly disagreed with the statement ‘it’s not worth me doing things to help the environment if others don’t do the same’.</td>
<td>In Year 1, the survey reveals a modest and statistically insignificant increase in the proportion who agreed with the statement ‘I try to persuade people I know to be more environmentally friendly’ (from 68% to 72%). However, in Year 2, at baseline 86% already agreed with this statement, actually decreasing to 74% by the follow up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was a significant increase in the proportion who disagreed with the statement ‘it’s not worth me doing things to help the environment if others don’t do the same’ (63% to 71% in Year 1; 69% to 73% in Year 2).</td>
<td>There was an increase in those who agreed with the statement ‘I try to persuade people I know to be more environmentally friendly’, from 59% to 66%.</td>
<td><strong>Behaviours:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was a significant increase in the proportion disagreeing with the statement ‘I find it hard to change my habits to be environmentally friendly’ (from 48% to 60%).</td>
<td>There was a smaller increase in those who disagreed that they find it hard to change their habits to be more environmentally friendly, from 60% to 64%.</td>
<td>In Year 1 there was no significant change in the proportion who said that they ‘always’ or ‘very often’ wash at 40 degrees or lower (61% at baseline; 63% at follow up); Year 2 recorded a decrease from 76% at baseline to 67% at follow up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was a moderate decrease in the proportion who agreed with the statement ‘I find it hard to change my habits to be environmentally friendly’ (from 48% to 60%).</td>
<td>27% of staff said that they are now ‘much more aware’ of things that they can do to be more environmentally friendly in the workplace, while a further 53% said they are ‘a little more aware’.</td>
<td>There was no change, in either Year 1 or 2, in the proportion of respondents who said that they recycle ‘everything that can be recycled’ (41% vs. 39% in Year 1; 41% vs. 40% in Year 2).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Behaviours:**

In Year 1 there was a significant increase in the proportion who said that they went to ‘a great deal’ or a ‘fair amount’ of effort to minimise the amount of food they throw away (from 69% to 71%).
45% in Year 1 and from 53% to 49% in Year 2.

**Behaviours:**

In Year 1, 22% of participants at baseline said that they were environmentally friendly in most things/everything they do, compared to 20% at follow up. However, and in response to the question ‘as a result of any of these SSO activities have you become more environmentally friendly?’ a small minority (5% in Year 1; 8% in Year 2) said ‘yes, in lots of ways’, while a larger proportion said ‘yes, in a few ways’ (39% and 39%, respectively).

There was no change in the proportion who said that they ‘always/very often’ turn lights off when not in the room (e.g. in Y2 this was 84% at baseline and 83% at follow up) or who ‘always/very often’ leave PCs/TVs on standby for long periods (16% and 17%, respectively).

There was a significant increase in the proportion who said that they ‘always/very often’ wash at 40 degrees or less (56% to 61% in Year 1; 53% to 57% in Year 2) and who said that they wait for a full load (83% to 88% in Year 1; 82% to 86% in Year 2). On the latter, there was a shift in the ‘always’ category, which increased from 54% to 66% in Year 1 and from 59% to 67% in Year 2.

**Hard data:**

There was a significant reduction in those claiming they ‘always’ or ‘very often’ leave appliances such as printers and projectors on standby for long periods of time - from 20% at baseline to 15% at follow up. Likewise, there was a significant increase in the proportion who ‘always’ or ‘very often’ turn lights off – from 64% to 73%. There was, however, no change in the proportion who say that they leave their PC or laptop on standby for long periods of time.

There was a significant increase in those who said they ‘always/very often’ print double sided (from 53% to 64%) as well as a significant increase in those who ‘always/very often’ read documents electronically rather than printing them (from 56% to 64%).

There was a small increase in the proportion of staff who say that they ‘recycle everything that can be recycled (from 43% to 47%).

14% of staff said that they have become more environmentally friendly in ‘lots of ways’, whereas a larger proportion – 57% - said that they have become more environmentally friendly in ‘a few ways’.

**Other data:**

Work book data indicates that the 362 departments involved took a total of 10,620 actions across the 17 themes in the workbooks. However, there is no further

77%); whereas in Year 2 the reverse was evident (74% to 65%).

Both Year 1 and Year 2 cohorts reported that they had become more aware of things they could do for the environment and, as a result, had undertaken new behaviours. In Year 1, for example, 12% said they were ‘much more aware’ and 48% ‘a little more aware (15% and 47%, respectively, in Year 2). Likewise, in Year 1 7% said that they had become environmentally friendly ‘in lots of ways and 41% ‘in a few ways’ (compared to 1% and 35%, respectively in Year 2).

**Hard data:**

Records of the activities of individual P&P groups enabled project managers to estimate, relatively crudely, the carbon savings achieved by the activities. These figures suggest that around 238 tonnes of CO₂ were saved through sustainable food initiatives, 185 tonnes through recycling and reuse projects, and 813 tonnes through sustainable travel. However, many of these calculations are based on assumptions and a lack of data on actual follow through (e.g. more than 700 tonnes associated with the sustainable travel calculation are based on all those who pledged to fly less by reducing their flying by one European flight per year, which was unverified).
SSO aimed to deliver savings of 870 tonnes of CO₂ each year, measured through analysis of pre- and post-intervention electricity meter data. This figure was surpassed, with 1,275 tonnes of CO₂ saved in Y1 and 562 tonnes in the first half of Y2 (full year’s data pending).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Baseline usage (kWh)</th>
<th>Intervention usage (kWh)</th>
<th>% change</th>
<th>Tonnes of CO₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>33,919,918</td>
<td>31,557,269</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>13,301,551</td>
<td>12,270,550</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(first 6 months)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than 3,000 visits were made to the Greener Impact pledge site during the project, and over 7,000 pledges made across the four target behaviours. As only 6% of those who made pledges responded to follow-up contact, the project can only confirm that 240 pledges were completed.
3.3 WHAT NEXT?

Legacy: The legacy prospects for Degrees Cooler are very strong, with all aspects of the programme likely to continue (and in many cases expand). The success of the project has raised the profile of the programme and will help it to continue to attract new Universities. The project will now continue on a self-funding structure, with Universities paying for the service on their campuses. Furthermore, 12 of the GLAs have had their positions extended or made permanent (self-funded by the individual institutions) while, due to the popularity of the scheme, GIU has been able to roll-out to a further eighteen universities and colleges on a self-funded basis whilst Degrees Cooler has been running.

Scaling up & replication: The project contends that Degrees Cooler could easily be scaled up to cover more participants at existing universities and/or participants at others. A programme coordinator role would need to be maintained and funded, and additional funding would be required for the adaptation of university-specific brand materials and provision of programme-wide materials.

Furthermore, the project believes that a similar programme could easily be adapted for other organisations within the education sector, providing that different audiences and different settings are suitably engaged and targeted. For example, the SSO concept is replicable and the project is currently working with P&P to pilot a version whereby schools in a local area will compete against each other to see which one can achieve the largest reduction in energy use. The project also sees scope to deploy the Green Impact project in other large multi-location organisations where people naturally work in units, and the project team are currently looking to work with other organisations such as local authorities, NHS trusts or Government Departments.
SECTION 4: LESSONS FOR BEHAVIOUR CHANGE

*Degrees Cooler* has delivered on a wide scale to thousands of students and staff across 20 Universities. It was notable that this project was one of few in the GLF family which explicitly built its model around behaviour change theory (i.e. the 4Es), and the project stands out in particular for the way in which it understood and engaged its target audiences, and for how it has used activities, incentives and a healthy sense of competition to create a sense of momentum and normalise pro-environmental behaviour.

Students in halls of residence, for example, were subject to a near constant stream of activities (e.g. film screenings, photo competitions) to ensure a continual presence and involvement on campus. The activities themselves were intentionally fun and engaging, while incentives like Ben & Jerry’s ice cream and cinema tickets were tailored to appeal to the audience. Inter-hall competition with the prize of a collective reward was fostered through regular feedback on performance. This work level of activity and feedback ensured the project monitored momentum.

Turning to staff (as part of GIU), the project highlights the power of identifying and then empowering existing champions, helping them to do more. The focus was not solely upon trying to manufacture new champions as some initiatives have attempted to do, and the learning suggests that support from higher up in the organisation, as well as encouraging a collaborative, team-based approach, are two critical enabling factors. The project also appeared to overcome initial cynicism about the project through a series of face-to-face, on site events to help establish it early on.

Looking specifically at the behaviour changes achieved, the meter data points to a substantial (c7-8%) reduction in energy consumption from SSO, although there is no further data to pinpoint how this reduction was achieved. The survey data suggests that, among students, awareness did increase but did not always translate into behavioural changes. One notable exception was washing behaviours (i.e. washing at 40 degrees or less; waiting for a full load) which did appear to undergo notable shifts both in terms of more students practicing these behaviours as well as students practicing them more regularly. It would be intriguing to understand if these potential savings were included in the electricity consumption monitoring or not. Turning to the GIU Work package, several changes in behaviour were evident, across a range of ‘simple’ behaviours like printing double sided and turning off equipment when not in use. One aspect of the project which appears not to have worked as well as anticipated (as with other GLF projects) is the use of a pledge system with no inbuilt system for checking on and validating progress.

Finally, the project offers important lessons for designing projects like this. *Degrees Cooler*, like some of the other GLF projects, was based on a decentralised model of delivery. While this evidently presented delivery challenges to other GLF projects, it has been a notable success here - which appears to be a result of (a) the project team’s decision to devote significant management time to build strong, face-to-face relationships with each of the 20 participating Universities; (b) the project team’s provision of hands on support and training for intermediaries delivering the project on its behalf (i.e. the Greener Living Assistants); and (c) the development of a central brand and materials via the Degrees Cooler umbrella.

---

6 Although the focus was not solely upon trying to manufacture new champions, NUS believe that this was achieved in that teams and team members often took part having not previously been involved in the champions network.
campaign, which increased visibility and exemplification as well as provided Universities with a ready-made and professionally designed set of materials. This also helped them to see it as a sectoral change which helped gain kudos and further support from self-funding universities.

SECTION 5: THE PROJECT’S KEY ADVICE

The following is taken from NUS’ own Final Report, and represents the advice that they would offer projects trying to undertake similar projects.

The project’s key advice for similar projects (taken from NUS’ Final Report)

- **Project management and relationship management** - employ a programme level manager with clear responsibilities for coordination, communication, internal and external partnership development, monitoring and evaluation and budgeting. Make a concerted effort to develop strong and open relationships between all delivery partners through various communication channels, including regular work package specific- and programme-level face to face meetings.

- **Understand and engage your audience** - Develop appropriate messages and incentives that are deployed by an appropriate messenger (as with the student-friendly marketing approach adopted by the Student Switch Off Team).

- **Understand the behaviours you’re targeting** - map the programme against a suitable framework, such as Defra’s ‘4 Es Model’ or the National Centre for Social Marketing’s Benchmark, to ensure that the project is (a) grounded in good insights about the target audience and (b) that the mix of methods is suitable and sufficient. While it is not necessary to constantly refer to it, once delivery has started reflecting back occasionally provides a clear view on how behavioural change is being woven into the programme.

- **Ensure that the programme has high level support from the outset**

- **Design for measurement** - create interventions where impacts can be tangibly quantified where possible.

- **Provide facilities that make the more sustainable choice the easy choice** (e.g. place recycling bins closer to people’s desks than rubbish bins).

- **Visibility** - develop a central portal (such as a website) to provide a united front that will: attract diverse audiences; let participants know they are part of a wider programme; and communicate successes.

- **Range** - provide a variety of interventions that people can get involved with on different levels, from small ‘easy to do’ actions to more on-going and meaningful participation.

- **Feedback** - to celebrate successes, reinforce behaviours, and let participants know how they are performing in comparison to others and that their individual efforts are making a collective difference.

- **Positive** - develop a programme that people are genuinely proud to be part of.

- **Use a varied approach** - including ambassadors/advocates, peer-to-peer encouragement, regular feedback of performance, appropriate communication channels for the audience, and an element of competition where possible.

- **Fun** - make it memorable and enjoyable to keep awareness high over the duration of the project.
**Eat into Green Living – National Trust**

**SECTION 1: BACKGROUND & APPROACH**

National Trust is an independent charity working to preserve and protect the buildings, countryside and coastline of England, Wales and Northern Ireland through practical conservation, learning and discovery. They delivered the *Eat into Green Living* project, which aimed to encourage visitors and members to (i) eat more sustainably produced local food in season; and (ii) grow their own. The project involved three work packages:

**Work package 1 – Engaging family visitors**
The aim was to reach two million people with local / seasonal food messages; to encourage local/seasonal food purchases among 5% - 20% of those reached; and for 30% to adopt an additional pro-environmental behaviour (e.g. composting/reduced water usage). Individual National Trust properties were invited to submit proposals by the project team, and 20 were funded to develop a range of visitor-facing activities (e.g. information boards, workshops, guided tours) alongside new infrastructure (such as new kitchen gardens, a baking demonstration kitchen etc.)

**Work package 2 – Growing spaces**
The aim was to create 10 new growing spaces for 1,000 people to gain knowledge and experience growing their own food, and for 30% of these to continue to grow food at home after their experience. The new growing spaces involved allotments, community supported agriculture schemes, and community plots.

**Work package 3 – Training staff and volunteers**
Staff and volunteers at the properties received training on sustainable food and how to engage visitors to equip them with the skills and knowledge to carry out the work effectively. Support materials and regular updates (e.g. newsletters) were also provided. The aim was to train 600 staff and volunteers, and for 65% - 85% of those trained to feel confident/have increased skills when engaging with visitors.

A wide array of partners were involved in the project, including both strategic partners with a role advising on the development of the projects and materials (e.g. Sustain, Soil Association, Eden Project), as well as a range of local links developed by individual properties that were used to engage volunteers (e.g. via The Prince’s Trust), develop working relationships (e.g. with local food producers) or develop outreach opportunities (e.g. NHS Local Mental Health Groups, schools).
SECTION 2: OUTPUTS

This section assesses:

- **Key outputs** delivered by the project (i.e. the tools and facilities created, activities undertaken, training provided, and media coverage);

- **Key learning about the outputs and their delivery**, as well as commentary from the project team on the key advice that they would give to other projects doing something similar.

### 2.1 SUMMARY OF OUTPUTS

The main outputs are outlined in Table 1 and summarised as follows:

- The outputs from Work Package 1 (visitors) were *high in number* but *small in scale*, and varied from one property to another. Indeed, the summary in Table 1 is only a selection of the project’s outputs – from new infrastructure (e.g. raised growing beds, a baking demonstration kitchen) through to visitor activities (e.g. food trails, cooking and tasting demos). It is not possible to assess whether the outputs met the original targets, since no targets were formally set for specific outputs. However, one thing that is clear is – for the outputs in combination and across the 20 properties as a whole – is the *scale of engagement* with visitors: across the 20 participating properties the number of visitors was 1,716,129, just short of the initial target of 2,000,000. Press coverage also created a large number of ‘opportunities to hear/read’ about the project (although exposure or recall were not tracked). Engagement, however, was *relatively light touch* and tended to be a single event and/or a single day, with only one or two exceptions (e.g. the Attingham property set up a ‘Food Passport’ whereby visitors were given a passport to collect up to six workshop attendee stamps, and those who collected all the stamps were invited to the property’s ‘Food Feast’ at the end of the season - an event that had almost 200 attendees).

- In contrast, Work Package 2 (*Growing Spaces*) represents a more *targeted intervention* involving much *deeper engagement* with participants in the local community. The outputs achieved exceeded the original targets – 1,366 people growing on 12 new growing spaces (target: 1,000 people growing on 10 new sites). Additional activities included supporting events to foster the social and community elements of project, for example allotment courses, growing competitions and community BBQs.

- Work Package 3 (staff and volunteer training) was a means of supporting both of the previous work packages as opposed to a separate work stream in its own right. In total, 210 staff and volunteers were trained directly, with a further 282 colleagues then trained by the attendees themselves. It is not possible to assess performance against initial targets since none were set. The work package also involved the *Big Harvest Conference*, with 138 staff and volunteers participating in an interactive learning/sharing day to celebrate the projects’ successes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP1: Engaging family visitors</th>
<th>WP2: Growing spaces</th>
<th>WP3: Training staff and volunteers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tools &amp; facilities created/deployed</strong>&lt;br/&gt; <em>Kitchen gardens and infrastructure</em> – e.g. a Keder Greenhouse, 3 seating benches, 24 potments, a kitchen garden, 3 veg stalls, 2 sheds/tool stores, 40 raised growing beds.&lt;br/&gt; <em>Cooking &amp; food generally</em> – e.g. a baking demonstration kitchen, 2 fruit cages and irrigation systems, a Cider exhibition, 17,540 recipe cards, 1,250 recipe books, an outdoor learning space.&lt;br/&gt; <em>Displays and information</em> – e.g. 15 displays for ‘how to grow in containers’, 12 restaurant displays of local producers, 15,750 ‘how to grow’ leaflets, 2,500 ‘how to make compost’ info sheets.&lt;br/&gt; <em>Bees, chickens &amp; pigs</em> – e.g. 1 observation bee hive, 3 pigs, 25 chickens plus coop, feed, fencing etc.&lt;br/&gt; <em>Children’s activities</em> – e.g. 5 ride-on toy tractors, 4 food trails, 1,500 restaurant activity sheets&lt;br/&gt; 12 composters and 3 wormeries&lt;br/&gt; <strong>Activities undertaken</strong>&lt;br/&gt; Riverford Organic activity day (estimated reach – 5,000)&lt;br/&gt; Bread making (estimated reach – 1,000)&lt;br/&gt; Recipe competition (250 entries)&lt;br/&gt; Food trails (estimated reach – 4,000)&lt;br/&gt; Sow &amp; Grow demonstrations (estimated reach – 26,324)&lt;br/&gt; Children’s gardening clubs (estimated reach – 44)&lt;br/&gt; ‘How to Bake’ workshops (estimated reach – 3,600)&lt;br/&gt; Cooking demos (estimated reach – 2,515)&lt;br/&gt; Strawberry fields planting (estimated reach – 400)&lt;br/&gt; <strong>Training</strong>&lt;br/&gt; None&lt;br/&gt; <strong>Media</strong>&lt;br/&gt; Radio features and coverage (national and regional) with a combined listenership of 2,518,000/week.&lt;br/&gt; Press features (national, regional and local publications) with a combined readership of 3,413,714.&lt;br/&gt; Magazine features with a combined readership of 998,825.</td>
<td><strong>Tools &amp; facilities created/deployed</strong>&lt;br/&gt; 341 new plots and 4 community growing areas created at 12 sites (target: 10). This included a number of plots designated specifically for specific audiences (e.g. 4 raised beds and a mini orchard at a centre for adults with learning disabilities, and the same at a hostel for homeless people)&lt;br/&gt; <strong>Activities undertaken</strong>&lt;br/&gt; A total of 1,366 people growing on these spaces (target: 1,000)&lt;br/&gt; Seasonal workshops (no estimate of reach)&lt;br/&gt; Swap shops (no estimate of reach)&lt;br/&gt; Growing competition (no estimate of reach)&lt;br/&gt; Allotment courses (estimated reach: 120)&lt;br/&gt; Community BBQ (estimated reach: 120)&lt;br/&gt; <strong>Training</strong>&lt;br/&gt; None&lt;br/&gt; <strong>Media</strong>&lt;br/&gt; Not documented for this work package</td>
<td><strong>Tools &amp; facilities created/deployed</strong>&lt;br/&gt; N/a&lt;br/&gt; <strong>Activities undertaken</strong>&lt;br/&gt; N/a&lt;br/&gt; <strong>Training</strong>&lt;br/&gt; Inspiring visitors with sustainable food – 210 National Trust staff and volunteers from 76 properties (including the target GLF properties)&lt;br/&gt; Inspiring visitors with sustainable food – 282 staff and volunteers who were trained by colleagues&lt;br/&gt; Big Harvest Conference – 138 staff and volunteers taking part in a celebration of sustainable food with an interactive learning/sharing and networking focus&lt;br/&gt; <strong>Media</strong>&lt;br/&gt; None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 KEY LEARNING ABOUT THE OUTPUTS AND THEIR DELIVERY

Given the sheer number and diversity of tools and activities the project did not explore the impact of any one individual measure – but focused instead upon the overall, combined impact. It provides five key learning points:

1. The provision of interactive, hands on and ‘fun’ activities

Feedback from visitors and staff suggests that this underpinned interest and engagement in the project, and this is supported by the evaluation research (outlined in more detail under ‘Impacts‘). For example, the proportion of respondents who said that they had participated in practical food growing or gardening activity increased from 6% at baseline to 11% at follow up; while the proportion who said that they had tasted produce increased from 12% to 19%. Furthermore, the research also found that the project was successful in developing activities that were fun - 76% of respondents said they found the practical food growing/gardening activities ‘very enjoyable/enjoyable’, as well as visiting a farm or a garden (95%), eating local food in the restaurant (88%) and tasting produce (87%). The availability of staff to spend time talking to visitors played a crucial role in this respect - nearly four in five (78%) staff reported that they had a conversation on food issues with visitors, although this only translated into just over one in five (21%) visitors reporting the same. This does, however, represent a significant increase from the baseline (10%).

2. The importance of central support and co-ordination

Given the decentralised nature of the project, with the actual engagement of visitors undertaken by individual properties, it was crucial for the central project team to promote good communications and information sharing. The project addressed this in three respects:

- One of the most important, and often overlooked, strategies was the central team’s development of personal relationships with each of the individual properties. They had to work out the best means of communication for each (noting the importance of face-to-face, or at least telephone, conversations alongside email communications), as well as understand the role of project leads at the property (e.g. sometimes the nominated site contact was in the gardening team, at other times in catering team, etc.)

- The project successfully drew upon expert, external resources. Because the quality of interpretation materials varied greatly across the properties (either as a result of budgetary pressures, the skills set of staff at the property or simply lack of time) two specialist consultants were recruited who had a background in visitor attractions, sustainable food and learning techniques. Their role was to work with a number of properties to help them develop their own food story and provide inspiring ideas for visitor activities. A specialist trainer was also recruited to design a training course for staff on sustainable food and how to engage visitors with this theme.

- The Cream of the Crop monthly newsletter highlighted examples of good practice and gave contact details so staff could learn from each other (as well as exemplar food projects outside of the Trust).
3. Synergies with other National Trust activities
The project benefitted from, and achieved added value through, working in combination with other activities that helped to reinforce and enhance the food theme. Examples included Greener Gardens (funded by Yorkshire Bank), Bee part of it (40 new beehives created at properties, funded by Innocent smoothies) and the Traditional Orchards project (funded by Natural England).

4. Fostering a sense of community and shared learning
For Growing Spaces, increased community was not simply a side effect of this work package, but a central means of delivering the project successfully, i.e. events, newsletters, celebrations, swaps shops and training cultivated a sense of community which in turn kept people interested and promoted shared learning.

5. Challenges
One of the key challenges reported by the project was the timescales involved. With the benefit of hindsight, the team believe that they ideally needed 2.5 years in order to have more time in between planning, infrastructure and materials development (Year 1), and then ‘live deployment’ at the property (Year 2). In particular, and in relation to the Growing Spaces work package, significantly more time and effort was required to establish, and then support, the groups. For example, the allotment committees took time to establish and agree on the rules (even to the level of detail of whether to allow children and dogs on site), while Community Supported Agriculture schemes took even longer to establish (partly because the model is not widely tried and tested, and partly because there is generally a greater level of financial commitment involved from the members). The Wimpole project leader, for example, reported that the management team met a total of 14 times over an 11 month period simply to establish the plan (i.e. covering the appointment of the grower, deciding what produce to grow, business, marketing, membership, etc.)

Staff resources was also highlighted as an issue, since staff took this work on in addition to their existing workload, and coordinating the initial set up of the Growing Spaces sites and the subsequent plot creation was a lengthy process. In particular, the legalities and planning permission involved emerged as a specific issue - in those cases where the growing space was on NT land, the process of arranging the lease to the parish council or allotment group took a long time (and required legal fees and land agency time). At one property some of the adjoining neighbours were resistant to having the community farm boundary with their property.
SECTION 3: IMPACTS

This section outlines:

- A summary of the evaluation methods used by the project;
- The project’s key impacts, drawing on quantitative and qualitative evaluation research and exploring attitudinal and behaviour change, community cohesion, organisational capacity, longevity of impact and spill-over from one pro-environmental behaviour to another.
- This section also explores the ‘what next’ questions for the project, focusing on three key issues – the anticipated legacy of the project; the potential for further scale up of the project (i.e. focusing on the same audience/locations but expanding the reach); and the potential for replication (adapting the approach for different audience/locations).

3.1 EVALUATION METHODS

The project deployed a range of quantitative and qualitative research methods across the three work packages, as set out in Table 2.

Table 2 – Evaluation methodologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work package 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• On-site quantitative surveys at 10 properties (chosen to be representative in terms of footfall and range of activities). Participants then received a follow up postal/online questionnaire three months later. The Defra segmentation questions were asked at baseline to give a snapshot of the visitor profile, but were not repeated. Between 2500 and 3000 questionnaires were sent out and a total of 888 interviews were achieved at baseline and 840 at follow up (giving a response rate of between 28% – 36%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Control Group surveys at two properties that were not part of the project but which had a similar footfall and visitor profile. Sample sizes were much lower - particularly at follow up (N = 34) – which, unfortunately, substantially hinders the robustness of the control group comparisons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 In depth interviews were conducted by telephone with a selection of visitors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work package 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Quantitative survey – all participants were asked to complete a baseline and follow up questionnaire. 167 questionnaires were completed at baseline and 67 at follow up. It is not possible to calculate response rates since there is no record of how many questionnaires were circulated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 In-depth interviews were conducted by telephone with a selection of participants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work package 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Quantitative survey – staff and volunteers completed a ‘baseline’ questionnaire online and also gave the names of colleagues to whom they intended to pass on training following their own experience (to whom baseline questionnaires were then also sent out to). The follow up survey adopted the same approach. 340 responses were achieved at baseline (a response rate of approximately 85%), and 124 at follow up (c. 31%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 In depth interviews were conducted by telephone with staff and volunteers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 KEY IMPACTS

They project’s key impacts are summarised in Table 3, which demonstrates the following:

**Defra segmentation profile:** Both visitors (Work Package 1) and Growing Spaces participants (Work Package 2) were, according to the Defra Segmentation model, more pro-environmental than average from the outset, with a high proportion of ‘Positive Greens’ and ‘Concerned Consumers’.

**Attitudes:** There is little evidence of attitudinal change among either visitors or Growing Spaces participants. Both audiences already had pro-environmental outlooks from the outset which limited the scope for further change – for example, at the baseline survey 81% of visitors already disagreed with the statement ‘it’s not worth doing things for the environment if others don’t do the same’. The only attitudinal change was a modest increase in the proportion of visitors who said that they ‘try to persuade others to be environmentally friendly’ (from 49% to 54%).

**Behaviours:** there is evidence of behaviour change, notably an increase in the proportion of both visitors and Growing Spaces participants who grow their own food. The increase among visitors needs to be caveated by the fact that the behaviour was already well established among the target audience – even at baseline 66% of visitors said that they were growing their food (increasing to 73% at follow up). Among Growing Spaces participants, the impact has been less about encouraging people to start growing their own, but rather to encourage an increase in the scale of their growing (i.e. many of the participants were already growing before the project but on a small scale, and involvement in the project enabled them to scale up and stretch their activities).

**Behavioural spill over:** The evidence for spill over impacts varies by Work Package. For example, there were no recorded spill-over impacts among visitors, whereas for both Growing Spaces participants and National Trust staff and volunteers behavioural spill over was reported – with increases in composting, food waste reduction and water conservation behaviours (potentially forming a natural repertoire of behaviours, with local food growing acting as a gateway to other pro-environmental behaviours).

**Community cohesion:** the Growing Spaces work package stands out for having a notable impact on community cohesion, with 76% of the growers reporting that they felt more part of the community following the project. Furthermore, a desire to be part of a community was a strong motivation for people to join the project in the first instance. The community impacts associated with visitors are less obvious. However, the project reports a series of intangible impacts at specific properties, e.g. Winchester City Mill trained 14 volunteer bakers and the Mill advised that it is being used frequently by members of the local community. More broadly, across the three work packages as a whole, the project is characterised by the engagement of volunteers to support local properties, potentially offering important insights at a time when volunteering (and the Big Society agenda more broadly) is of such interest to central government policy and thinking.

**Skills & capacity:** The project contends that the culture change that has taken place within the National Trust itself is one of the most important and long lasting impacts, given that the project has demonstrated that sustainable food is a successful vehicle for engaging visitors,
as well as a way for properties to reach out and connect to the local communities around them (both of which are key strategic drivers for the organisation). And, for individual properties, the evaluation notes positive impacts among staff and volunteers in terms of their confidence to engage with visitors and their knowledge of sustainable development issues.
Table 3 – Summary of outputs by work package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working package 1 – family visitors</th>
<th>Working package 2 - Growing spaces</th>
<th>Working package 3 – Staff &amp; volunteer training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitudes:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attitudes:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Skills</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defra segmentation: Positive Greens (40%); Concerned Consumers (27%); Cautious Participants (12%).</td>
<td>Defra segmentation: Positive Greens (45%); Concerned Consumers (29%); Waste Watchers (10%); Honestly Disengaged (10%).</td>
<td>81% felt that they had a greater knowledge and understanding of sustainable food following the training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small and statistically significant increase in the proportion who say that they ‘try to persuade others that they know to be more environmentally friendly’ - from 49% to 54%.</td>
<td>Awareness of the UK growing season for various fresh produce was already high in most instances and did not change significantly over the course of the project.</td>
<td>Significant increase in the proportion who felt ‘very confident’ talking to visitors about the benefits of local and seasonal produce – from 31% to 57% (and overall confidence, i.e. ‘very’ plus ‘fairly’ confident, increased from 82% to 98%). Overall confidence also increased in terms of talking to visitors about the benefits of growing their own food (81% to 98%), the benefits of composting (63% to 87%) and the benefits of food grown with minimum chemicals (73% to 85%).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change in other questions, such as the proportion who disagree ‘it is not worth doing things to help the environment if others don’t do the same’ (81% baseline; 80% follow up).</td>
<td><strong>Behaviours:</strong></td>
<td>Despite small samples that make quantitative analysis difficult, those who were directly trained (as opposed to trained/informed second hand by colleagues who had attended the training) reported the greatest increase in confidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behaviours:</strong></td>
<td>Increase in both the proportion who said that that grow their own food (from 81% to 92%) and the scale of growing - at baseline 39% said they were growing on a small scale e.g. salad/herbs in containers (falling to 14% at follow up), while those growing on a ‘medium scale’ e.g. vegetable or fruit bed had increased from 37% at baseline to 58% at follow up, as did the proportion growing ‘a lot’ (5% at baseline vs. 21% at follow up).</td>
<td><strong>Behaviours:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in the proportion of respondents who said that they were environmentally-friendly in ‘most things’ and ‘all’ that they do – from 30% to 35%.</td>
<td>No statistically significant change in the proportion who said that they purchase food that has been imported long distances.</td>
<td>Interdepartmental working on sustainable local food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A modest but statistically significant increase in the proportion of visitors who grow their own food (from 66% to 73%)</td>
<td>Evidence of spill over - while the sample size of the follow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No statistically significant increase in the proportion who ‘always’ or ‘very often’ buy fresh food that has been grown when it is in season in the country where it is produced – 39% at baseline; 42% at follow up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Skills
81% felt that they had a greater knowledge and understanding of sustainable food following the training.

Significant increase in the proportion who felt ‘very confident’ talking to visitors about the benefits of local and seasonal produce – from 31% to 57% (and overall confidence, i.e. ‘very’ plus ‘fairly’ confident, increased from 82% to 98%). Overall confidence also increased in terms of talking to visitors about the benefits of growing their own food (81% to 98%), the benefits of composting (63% to 87%) and the benefits of food grown with minimum chemicals (73% to 85%).

Despite small samples that make quantitative analysis difficult, those who were directly trained (as opposed to trained/informed second hand by colleagues who had attended the training) reported the greatest increase in confidence.

Behaviours:
Interdepartmental working on sustainable local food
No change in the proportion who purchased foods that have been imported long distance, but a modest and statistically significant shift in where respondents go to buy fresh seasonal food – with an increase recorded for both independent retailers (from 37% to 45%) and farmers markets (from 30% to 36%). However, supermarkets remained the most frequently cited source (68% at baseline; 70% at follow up).

No change in the two overspill behaviours examined (food waste minimisation and installing a water butt):

- 89% of respondents at follow up claimed to go to ‘a great deal’ or ‘a fair amount’ of effort to minimise the amount they throw away (88% at baseline)
- 52% said they had installed a water butt at baseline (53% at follow up).

A follow-up survey (N = 62) makes it difficult to confirm results statistically, there was a notable decrease in the proportion who say they throw away at least ‘some’ uneaten food waste (down to 16% from a baseline of 21%). There was likewise a notable increase in the proportion of respondents who say they compost (74% to 84%) and, while there was no change in the proportion who had installed a water butt (67% at baseline; 68% at follow up), there was an increase in the proportion who ‘always’ or ‘very often’ reuse water from the home to water the garden (26% at baseline; 44% at follow up).

**Community:**
38% mentioned ‘being part of a community’ as a reason why they became involved in the project (second only to the primary reason – an opportunity to grow their own food).

76% said their experience had made them feel more part of the community.
3.3 WHAT NEXT?

**Legacy:** There are a number of reasons to believe that the project will leave an immediate legacy post-GLF. For example, there is both the physical infrastructure that has been put in place at properties as well as the communications and engagement materials that have been created. On staffing, some of the formal paid roles created by the project will continue to be funded by the National Trust - including the sustainable food co-ordinator’s role, some roles at property level, and the majority of the volunteer roles created by the project. These staff members, through Work Package 3, are now better equipped to engage visitors on sustainable food issues. However, in some cases local staff posts will not continue.

There are some examples already of direct continuation of the work at individual properties, for example the Kingston Lacy site has secured money from the National Lottery. The extent to which this is proves to be an exception or an ad hoc example, as opposed to something more widespread, is likely to depend on both the National Trust and access to other funding streams. On this point the project contends that GLF has influenced the National Trust at a strategic level in terms of recognition of sustainable food as a key focus for the organisation. It is not clear whether this will translate into mainstream funding from within the organisation, or whether the project’s legacy will be dependent on accessing external funding.

**Scaling up and replication:** The National Trust project team believe that, with appropriate funding, it would be possible to scale up the project by using the same approach and simply increasing the number of participating properties. The team also feel that a replicated version of the project would be possible within similar organisations or networks which: have an established audience / supporter base; have the potential to operate as a centrally supported network; and who have staff at each of their locations who understand the aims of the project and have the capacity to take on delivery. However, the team also note one caveat about existing capacity – the GLF project was already in line with National Trust’s existing objectives and so staff were able to understand the project’s aims and readily come forward with proposals. More capacity building may be needed within other organisations or networks if this pre-existing knowledge and/or strategic fit is not as strong.
SECTION 4: LESSONS FOR BEHAVIOUR CHANGE

Both work packages involved a target audience that was already pro-environmental in some respect where the challenge was to scale up pre-existing behaviours, rather than creating a new behaviour where it did not exist/was not practiced before.

However, one of the key dimensions of Eat into Greener Living is the contrast between its two main work packages: WP1 (with visitors) was characterised by relatively light touch engagement (i.e. on site, on the day) with a very large reach (i.e. close to two million visitors); whereas, in contrast, WP2 (Growing Spaces) had much less reach (i.e. 1,366 people) but involved deeper/sustained engagement [although, even here, the reach is on a larger scale than other equivalent initiatives from other Funds].

There is evidence of some behaviour change as a result of WP1, and the project has validated their original premise that visitors can be engaged by interactive, hands on and fun activities – a cornerstone of the Work Package.

Turning to Growing Spaces, this has also had a demonstrable impact on behaviours. The evidence suggests that its impact has been less about initiating a behaviour change, but rather about stretching and scaling up an existing behaviour – i.e. participants were typically already growing on a small scale and engagement in the programme enabled them to expand the frequency and scale of their efforts – in some instances considerably so. Moreover, the evaluation suggests that behaviour change has spilled over to associated behaviours like food waste minimisation, composting and water conservation - suggesting that growing activities can act as a ‘gateway’ to a wider repertoire of behaviours. Furthermore, one of the defining aspects of this work package is the importance of community, both as a recruitment tool (i.e. people wanting to join a group activity), a support network (to share learning) and an outcome in and of itself (i.e. people feeling more part of the community).

Finally, and in terms of lessons for delivery, the project offers important insights about the management of any project involving a large organisation (or network) with a decentralised structure where the responsibility for delivery on the ground ultimately does not sit with the central team. In particular, it points to both (i) the need to establish personal relationships with the nominated project managers at each site (often requiring face to face contact or, at least, telephone conversations); and (ii) the need for central support, whether in terms of accessing external expertise in a specific area (in this instances, communications and engagement), forming a learning/peer network for sharing learning and ideas, and/or the development of central support materials on which individual teams can draw.
SECTION 5: THE PROJECT’S KEY ADVICE

The following is taken from National Trust’s own Final Report, and represents the advice that they would offer projects trying to undertake similar projects.

Work package 1 – family visitors

- **The importance of volunteers and the skills sets of volunteers** - the key to strong engagement at the properties was having volunteers on hand to chat to visitors about the activities taking place and sustainable food generally. Some properties wished they had understood this from the outset and recruited more volunteers. However, some volunteers were only happy to work behind the scenes and did not want to engage proactively with visitors, while others were limited in terms of their time and experience in this area. Therefore, it is important to be clear on the skills set required when recruiting volunteers, and ensure that they are well supported.

- **Project Planning** – this aspect of the project took longer than expected. Much was learnt during the first year about how to deliver the messages to visitors as well as what was effective and ineffective. The properties, in an ideal world, really needed 12 months between the point at which they were first invited to be involved and the start of delivery.

- **Interdepartmental working** - without exception our most successful properties were those that worked together effectively across functions. At the bid stage it would be worth ascertaining how successfully properties are doing this, e.g. this could be encouraged by asking properties to name their team and agree between them which roles each of them would take on.

- **Designing Activities** – the quality of interpretation materials varied across the properties, and so as the project progressed we worked with a professional designer who developed interpretation materials for a number of the projects. If we were to do the project again, we would look to develop some key central interpretation materials which would be made available to properties. This would deliver significant cost and time resource savings as well as ensuring first class interpretation materials are in place at properties to support the project.

Work package 2 – growing spaces

- **The legalities** - don’t underestimate the resources required to address these issues as part of establishing the site in the first place (e.g. time and cost of lease agreements and planning permission)

- **Site issues** - work out all of the site requirements (water, parking, shade, communal areas, shed locations) well in advance, and allocate enough time to establish the initial infrastructure.

- **Offer half size plots as the norm** - full size plots are typically overwhelming for beginners and lead to higher drop-out rates. This is a fairly well known piece of advice amongst allotments societies.

- **Provide community activities** – these are the catalysts that make these projects work brilliantly. For example, arranging events, newsletters, a notice board and other initiatives for your growing community will bring everyone together, encouraging best use of produce, knowledge and skills and mutual support.
Greener Together - Co-operatives UK

SECTION 1: BACKGROUND & APPROACH

Co-operatives UK is the national trade body that campaigns for co-operation, working to promote, develop and unite co-operative enterprises. They delivered the Greener Together project. Originating out of a call to action from Co-operative UK’s members at their 2009 Annual General Meeting (AGM) to tackle climate change, the project was designed to work across all sectors of the co-operative movement to enable behaviour change in three areas: energy, waste and transport. The project involved two work packages, as follows:

Work package 1: Actions for a sustainable future
This involved working closely with 50 co-operatives to directly engage 3,600 members. It aimed to provide support to a nominated volunteer from each organisation (‘Eco-operators’) who would take a lead within their co-operative in recruiting and guiding their members (‘Eco-pioneers’). The project was built around an online networking and pledge system, which Eco-operators could signpost their Eco-Pioneers to and use it to track their actions. The project intended to create 20 pledges which Eco-Pioneers could sign up to and work towards over a six month period with the support of the Eco-operators and Greener Together resources. The Eco-operators were also encouraged to lead on/support autonomous activities and events in their cooperative, which were known as ‘collective actions’, to raise awareness and extend the activities of the cooperative into the local community.

Work package 2: Knowledge for a sustainable future
This involved the dissemination of pro-environmental information to a wider audience. The main focus was information provision using a combination of print and online media, publications, events and annual conferences. The target audience included 200,000 consumer co-operative members, 100,000 housing co-operative members, 19,000 from community enterprises, 2,000 from worker co-operatives, and 300,000 workers from other types of co-operatives.

Greener Together was delivered in partnership with the Confederation for Co-operative Housing (CCH) and the Plunkett Foundation (Plunkett).
SECTION 2: OUTPUTS

This section assesses:

- **Key outputs** delivered by the project (i.e. the tools and facilities created, activities undertaken, training provided, and media coverage);

- **Key learning points** about the outputs and their delivery, as well as commentary from the project team on the key advice that they would give to other projects doing something similar.

2.1 SUMMARY OF OUTPUTS

The main outputs are outlined in Table 1 and summarised as follows:

- Work Package 1 produced a basket of 59 behaviour actions with associated CO₂ and waste metrics, which was much higher than originally planned (target: 20). The number of Eco-operators recruited (43) was slightly below target (50), and the number of participants who made pledges (974) was substantially below target (3,600). The project team contends that the ‘collective actions’ helped to strengthen the programme and extend its reach into communities beyond the participants of the organisations. At the level of individual co-ops there may have been substantial numbers of activities, events, and training. However, there is insufficient evidence about the nature of collective actions and other activities, who the audiences were, and whether they were successful.

- Work Package 2 aimed to disseminate behaviour change and other information to an estimated audience of 200,000 people, through an array of co-operative movement publications, events and annual conferences. The main focus of activity for this work package was media activity. Therefore, there has only been limited development of tools and facilities and activities directly with participants, and no training.
### Table 1 – Summary of outputs by work package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP1: Action for a sustainable future</th>
<th>WP2: Knowledge for a sustainable future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tools &amp; facilities created/deployed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tools &amp; facilities created by the project</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basket of 59 behavioural actions with associated CO2 and waste metrics (target of 20)</td>
<td>Automated personalised pledge generator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated online communication system</td>
<td>Integrated social networking platforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greener Together brand and website, with forum and online messaging system</td>
<td><strong>Activities undertaken</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online pledge system with follow-up support email</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online tutorials (in using the online tools)</td>
<td><strong>Training</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting material for developed behavioural actions</td>
<td>Workshops and presentations with project staff (over 270 participants total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greener Together Twitter and Facebook Pages</td>
<td>Workshops and presentations by project partner staff (over 320 participants total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco Operators Handbook</td>
<td>Events and promotions run by individuals cooperatives (12 events with over 600 participants total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Me – Project Newsletter</td>
<td><strong>Media</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Posters and Leaflets (Co-operatives UK)</td>
<td>A large volume of online media articles with potential reach over 800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities undertaken</strong></td>
<td>Articles in Food Ethics Council, Three Counties Cooperative, and Co-operative News Magazines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>974 participants making pledges (target: 3,600).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A range of ‘collective actions’ undertaken by participating cooperatives (e.g. swap shop, seed shop, film showings, litter picking days). Estimates of attendance at events range from 30 to 70 people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer competitions with incentives, running through the ‘Green Me’ project newsletter (e.g. Energy Meters, wormeries, eco-kettles, solar chargers, grow your own veg kits...)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco Operators gatherings – facilitated events for Eco-Operators to share learning and experiences (22 attended)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training through resources from the eco-operators handbook rather than face to face training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local training from eco-operators and local participating organisations for Eco-Pioneers – number of events and participants not known.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online media sources relating directly to the Co-operative UK or Partner websites with a combined potential reach of over 50,000. Other online news sites with a combined potential reach of over 100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print media sources relating to the Co-op UK or partners with a combined readership of roughly 36,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article in the Dereham and Fakenham times (readership around 7,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 KEY LEARNING ABOUT THE OUTPUTS AND THEIR DELIVERY

The project reports four key lessons, as follows:

1. Development of an online system of pledges

   The project offers a number of important lessons, as follows, about the use of online platforms to delivery pro-environmental initiatives, specifically pledges in this instance.

   - Difficulties creating the metrics (and in particular the need to terminate the contractor initially responsible for their development) led to delays. The pledge metrics were finally agreed in March 2010, a delay of three months. The pledge cycle was also shortened from six months to 10 weeks in order to encourage more pledges to be made.

   - A decision was made early in the project to create the website using OpenSource software to ensure future access for member organisations and a rapid development platform. Building the website itself was a technical challenge due to the need to include a user-friendly baseline survey involving over 50 questions, and integrating this survey with an automated system on the website which needed to take the user through sign-in, baseline survey and onto the pledge system. This product required automated systems, back office functions and data retrieval, as well as the creation of individual profiles for each of the pioneers related to their chosen pledges, and personalised reminders for those pioneers. This was complicated to construct and necessitated the involvement of three different suppliers who could provide the technical and design know-how.

   - Although the website was tested prior to launch, unforeseen technical issues arose resulting in a number of potential participants being put off from taking part in the project. Part of the technical issues were centred around the organic way that Open Source programmes are developed as people share, amend and build upon programmes. This meant that small bugs were only identified and dealt with shortly after launch. Other technical challenges involved the complexity of setting up individual passwords, which many original Pioneers had difficulty with.

   - Furthermore, the embedding of the evaluation questionnaires within the online system, and in particular the fact that it came directly prior to the pledge system, led to a lot of confusion – with some participants believing that they had undertaken pledges when in fact they had just completed the survey.

   - Delays in the website being launched, and then technical issues that occurred when it was launched, led to a loss of enthusiasm for the project among Eco-operators. While some of these support issues were subsequently remedied, the loss of momentum among this group early in the project nonetheless hindered delivery.

2. Meeting the needs of the target audience

   The Co-operatives project team notes that many participants felt they were not challenged enough by the original set of 20 pledges and so: (a) the list of pledges was expanded substantially (to 59); and (b) an online pledge generator was created one year into the project (which was frequently visited and used – 747 visits generating 124 pledges). This
meant that the pledge system ended up incorporating a very wide range of pledges - starting from the very basic (e.g. turn down the thermostat) to the more complex and committed (e.g. install micro-generation). The main difference that emerged between the segmentation groups is that those who were less engaged initially found it easier to get on board with the pledges, whereas those already engaged found little to challenge them – apart from installations of new equipment which present significant financial challenges.

3. Supporting and enabling intermediaries

The linchpin to the successful recruitment and engagement of Eco-pioneers was the Eco-operator. Where Eco-operators ‘got’ the project and ran with it, more noteworthy results were produced. Depth interviews with both Eco-operators and Eco-pioneers also suggest that the pledge system worked best alongside some level of face-to-face, or peer-to-peer, support.

Training and support for the Eco-operators was a part of the project’s design. However, the technical and functionality issues with the website distracted the focus of the delivery team and this had a detrimental effect to the level of support given to Eco-operators. For example, no face-to-face training was delivered to Eco-operators (as had been planned). Opportunities for training were given through materials in the Eco-operator handbook and through the ability to attend ‘Eco-operator gatherings’ and exchange experiences with others. However, it is not clear when those gatherings took place and whether the reflections gained were fed back to others or used to influence or develop the project’s approach. The project team note that the final outputs and impacts across participating co-operatives has been largely dependent on Eco-operators being self-motivated and able to operate with limited support.

4. Staffing challenges

The project creator left the organisation in February 2010 and a new senior manager with oversight for the project was appointed in April 2010. This occurred at a time when the project was facing challenges with the technical development and integration of the website, baseline and pledges and time was needed to build understanding and revise the original concept. The impact of these changes meant that the project manager’s capacity was stretched during this period, and that priority had to be given to addressing the technical and development issues rather than the recruitment and engagement of eco-operators. Resources were reviewed in March 2010 and additional part time administrative support secured. However, as this was a short-term role, continuity was an issue and three people have provided the support at different times within the project. Since August 2010 the same person has performed the role, greatly improving its impact on the project’s delivery and enabled a focus to be placed on communication with the project volunteers. Finally, the Project Manager, who was employed on a contract basis, left in February 2011 to take up a permanent job in another organisation. Although she has provided some support, the timing of her departure has created challenges and impacted on the continuity of preparation of the final report.
SECTION 3: IMPACTS

This section outlines:

- A summary of the evaluation methods used by the project;
- The project’s key impacts, drawing on quantitative and qualitative evaluation research and exploring attitudinal and behaviour change, community cohesion, organisational capacity, longevity of impact and spill-over from one pro-environmental behaviour to another.
- This section also explores the ‘what next’ questions for the project, focusing on three key issues – the anticipated legacy of the project; the potential for further scale up of the project (i.e. focusing on the same audience/locations but expanding the reach); and the potential for replication (adapting the approach for different audience/locations).

3.1 EVALUATION METHODS

The project deployed a range of quantitative and qualitative research methods across the two work packages, as set out in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2 – Evaluation methodologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work package 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantitative survey</strong> – 974 baseline surveys with eco-operators and pioneers were completed, although only 230 completed the follow up survey. For some questions the two samples can be matched, leading to a longitudinal sample of 230 participants. It is these results that are presented below. However, it is not possible to match the sample for other questions, notably the mandatory questions, and so the ‘before’ and ‘after’ comparisons are substantially compromised by the fact that the follow up sample is a small subsample of the baseline. For this reason we do not present the data for these questions below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defra segmentation survey</strong> - 347 participants completed the Defra Segmentation questions, which were asked separately to the baseline and follow up surveys. It is therefore not clear how the results relate to the known matched sample which forms the basis for the analysis, and so we do not present the segmentation survey results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depth interviews</strong> – 35 interviews were conducted with Pioneers and Eco-operators at the end of Year 1 and 50 at the end of Year 2. Interviewees were chosen randomly from a stratified sample of: Eco-Operators and Pioneers who registered and made pledges; those who registered but did not complete the baseline survey; and those who made pledges but did not complete the follow-up survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hard data</strong> – Pioneers had the voluntary option to measure and report transport behaviour or energy use and waste behaviour. However, as only 9 participants reported some form of data it is not considered a robust source of evidence and does not appear in the analysis below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work package 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 KEY IMPACTS

**Energy** – there are some indications of changes in energy behaviours. For example, the proportion of respondents who said that they ‘always/very often’ leave their TV or PC on standby for long periods of time decreased from 12% at baseline to 6% at follow up, as did the proportion who say they ‘always/very often’ boil more water in the kettle than they need (from 9% to 4%). Likewise, the proportion who said that they turn off the lights when not in the room increased from 83% to 88%. However, given the small sample sizes, these changes remain within the margin of error and cannot be confirmed statistically. Furthermore, other behaviours showed no change – for example the proportion who said that they wash their clothes at 40°C or less (from 80% at baseline to 82% at follow up). This was particularly true of installations of various forms of energy efficiency measures which also showed no change (supporting the project team’s assertion that many of these are large changes which require a more sustained form of engagement and a longer time horizon than the 10 week pledge cycle).

**Transport** - the proportion who said they only shop where they can get to by public transport increased from 29% to 39% (which is statistically significant, even in light of the small sample size). There was also a significant increase in the proportion of respondents who say they are reducing the number of flights they take and intend to keep this up – whether flights in the UK (35% at baseline vs. 48% at follow up); flights to Europe (40% vs. 51%) and flights outside of Europe (32% vs. 44%). However, there was a steep decrease between baseline and follow up in terms of using public transport instead of cars for regular journeys. Two in five (40%) at baseline said that they were already doing this and intended to keep it up, falling to 8% at follow up. This was matched by a corresponding increase in the proportion who said that ‘I am already doing this but probably won’t keep it up (10% at baseline; 35% at follow up), which suggests that this is a particularly hard behaviour to sustain.

**Waste** – the proportion who said that they already avoid products with too much packaging and intend to keep this up increased from 53% to 63%, which is statistically significant. The proportion who reported that they and their household creates ‘hardly any’ or ‘no’ food waste increased from 42% to 50%, although this remains within the margin of error and not statistically significant.

**Work Package 2** was not subjected to an evidence-based evaluation. This is in part because the target audience was highly dispersed and likely to have only very light touch contact with the project. Evaluation of the work package focused predominantly on process and reach:

- **Process**: Have the programme outputs been achieved in terms of targeted information and advice on greener living aiming to raise awareness through sector publications events and conferences, as well as interactive social networking platforms.

- **Reach**: Have at least 200,000 positive greens, waste-watchers, concerned consumers across the co-operative movement and beyond been reached by the work of work package two?
We lack sufficient evidence to assess either of these two elements. For example, on reach, it would appear from the media outputs that the project has successfully found media exposure in publications with a potential reach that was in fact much higher than the original target. The degree to which this will have translated into the target audience reading the media material, and which types of the audience were most likely to be engaged through this method, is unknown.

**Community cohesion:** Qualitative and anecdotal evidence suggests the *Greener Together* programme has potentially had a positive impact in terms of community cohesion in that participating organisations were encouraged to develop collective actions. These were all unique, local responses to contribute to behaviour change in their organisations, and included parties, community recycling days, promoting local food or products, and swap shops. All these activities were about communities coming together, and Eco-operators reported that events fostered a sense of community. Furthermore, some participating groups developed collective actions and a programme of events and activities - one Eco-Operator, for example, reported that their village now had a green group working together. Because the number and type of events were not formally tracked these impacts cannot be verified.

The project team noted that smaller cooperatives seemed to be able to achieve greater participation and engagement levels with their volunteers. Qualitative themes on this issue suggested that this might be an outcome of:

- Closer connections in these types of organisations providing a trusted source for action;
- The role of friends, family, neighbours and colleagues providing peer support and role models;
- The ability of smaller organisations to mobilise around an idea and take collective actions.
- A strong sense of community and an existing level of community/volunteer involvement – particularly within community shops and smaller housing co-operatives. Both of these types of organisations rely on volunteers in order to function effectively and therefore members have an existing sense of community and loyalty toward their organisation.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that the larger consumer co-operatives were less able to engage their members. This could, in part, be due to needing a longer lead time to integrate such a campaign and the large volume of communications employed by such organisations, meaning that this particular campaign was competing with other campaigns and communications. It could also indicate the difficulties of engaging on a personal level for organisations with such large memberships.

**Skills & capacity:** The building of capacity has been an important element of the *Greener Together* programme. For example:

- The Co-op has developed its online social media and engagement platform using open source software. The learning from this, including capturing analytics, has been adapted for use in the Co-operatives UK’s own website as well as other sites to
support additional initiatives. The online approach has also enabled Co-operatives UK to understand how these could be used to engage with member organisations, providing valuable learning for Co-ops own member communication strategy and channels. They have built an understanding of how different types of co-operatives engage in action linked by a common theme, and how different engagement strategies need to be considered depending on the target audience.

- Evidence from partner interviews suggests there has been an important increase in good practice in how to run behaviour change projects in the housing sector, and within the Confederation of Co-operative Housing (CCH) in particular. Better knowledge of how to recruit, trail and support community based agents of change comes out of their direct involvement with Eco-operators.

**Longevity of impact:** the interviews suggest that some of Pioneers believe that they will maintain the changes that they have made, although there is no hard data to support this assertion. At a community level, some actions involved putting in place infrastructure, for example establishing community orchards.

**Spill over impacts:** There is limited evidence of spill-over effects, aside from anecdotal evidence of food growing by Eco-Pioneers. There has also been a potential spill-over effect in terms of widening the audience, with the collective actions providing a basis for drawing in friends, family, and members of the local community. Some Eco-operators also claim to have used the campaign as a tool to influence customers and other organisations in their supply chain, although we have no evidence around what type of influence they used or whether their efforts were successful.
3.3 WHAT NEXT?

Legacy: Although the *Greener Together* website will be decommissioned as a standalone website, the branding, key components and content will continue to be ‘live’ as part of Co-operatives UK’s own website. It will serve as a hub for people wishing to find out information on sustainable living, draw on the tools and resources and share in social networking on these issues.

Many other outputs produced by the project will continue to be used beyond the life of the project, as organisations have often made positive physical improvements to their premises using the money supplied by *Greener Together*.

Furthermore, and as the project winds down, there has been continued interest in the concept, and while no firm plans are in place it is looking likely that the *Greener Together* branding will continue to be used for other initiatives or organisations to support their green initiatives. There are also indications (but as of yet no solid plans) from key Partners that a number of retrofits and house improvements may be carried out over the long-term as a result of the awareness raised over this programme.

Scaling up & replication: The project team assert that the project could potentially be scaled up, with the branding and core online infrastructure in place, but additional funding would be needed to secure a field office focused on direct recruitment and support for eco-operators. Minimal funding would be need for modify web capability, and funding would instead focus on staffing, support and communications. The method would be refocused to tailor initial engagement more effectively and place a great emphasis on training and direct support for eco-operators, as well as simplifying the user experience for eco-operators and pioneers such as by creating ‘levels’ of pledge action which meet users at their start point.

In order to facilitate similar projects, a toolkit has been produced which is available through the *Greener Together* and Co-operative UK websites, which outlines ideas, initiatives and to do lists for those wishing to run a similar project – whatever their size. This toolkit will remain available beyond the project life. Furthermore, the *Greener Together* concept has been tested with a small number of co-operatives in Europe to consider how they could translate and adapt the concept to engage their own members in behaviour change as part of their climate change agenda.
SECTION 4: LESSONS FOR BEHAVIOUR CHANGE

Greener Together, as a proposition, has a number of strengths. It was built on some key insights from behaviour change theory around collection actions, peer networks and team work. Furthermore, its delivery model – predicated on decentralised, local responses via a cascade from the central project team to a number of intermediaries (Eco-operators) who then recruit others (Eco-pioneers) – has a number of similarities with both NUS’ Degrees Cool and National Trust’s Eat into Greener Living.

However, the project was significantly hindered by operational challenges and delays with the online platform which distracted attention and efforts away from the cascade model and, in particular, the level of support for Eco-operators. As the project team acknowledge in their key learning about the outputs and delivery, Eco-operators were the linchpin of the project in terms of their ability to recruit and engage Eco-pioneers, as well as lead/support the collective actions to engage the wider community. Feedback from the Eco-operators and pioneers also suggest that face-to-face, or peer-to-peer, support was an important factor.

While the project team have been through a number of steep, and at times painful, learning curve, they now have a clear sense of the resources and systems required to support and enable the Eco-operators and ensure that these intermediaries can successfully engage a wider audience. Furthermore, the learning experience has provided a range of important lessons about the challenges of using an online platform as the basis for behaviour change interventions.

Turning to evidence of behaviour change, both the small sample sizes and the lack of information about the collective actions are unfortunate. Taking the evaluation surveys first, there are some tentative indications that behaviours were changing in respect of energy and transport, although it has not been possible to confirm many of these changes statistically by virtue of the small matched sample size. The collective actions are also a particularly interesting aspect of the project and the anecdotal feedback suggests that events were successfully run by some of the Eco-operators. However, details of how many events were run, and how many attended, were not formally tracked.

Work package 2 has little to offer from a behaviour change perspective since it was an information provision/awareness raising initiative.
SECTION 5: THE PROJECT’S KEY ADVICE

The following is taken from Co-operative UK’s own Final Report, and represents the advice that they would offer projects trying to undertake similar projects.

- **Increased training, supporting and resourcing the volunteers who are bringing about a change; in this project this was the Eco-operators. This could ensure that the volunteers are engaged and enthusiastic, leading to more engagement by participants and therefore leading to an increase in the numbers and good success with behaviour change.**

- **Have in place from an early stage a clear, comprehensive and participative engagement and communications strategy. This will ensure the project has a wide reach, communications are tailored to the appropriate audience, and participative engagement is fully exploited. For example, social media (Twitter, Facebook and forum seeding) appeared to be an effective way of directing people to the website and signing up to the project. Once the competitions were launched, social media also directed people to the community pages to enter and to the homepage to check to see if they'd won prizes. Visitor numbers increased following competition launches and e-newsletter distribution.**

- **Developing a website that is user-friendly and easily navigable. We chose a clean design, attractive graphics and a simple home-page with simple menus for easy navigation. The security settings for our project – involving complex password setting – could have been more user-friendly from the start.**

- **Ensure that the project resources are balanced in favour of practical delivery rather than web development.**

- **Researching the current lifestyle of the audience before developing the pledges. For example, thorough research into the audience would feed into a range of more tailored pledges appropriate to the audience and their existing lifestyles.**

- **More understanding of member organisations’ structures and how they communicate with their members. For instance, an assumption was made that most organisations had databases of their members and used electronic email to reach them or other social media. Also, an appreciation that larger consumer retail members have competing priorities in terms of campaigns, and need a longer lead in time to bring on board for campaigns of this nature.**

- **Using an evaluation system that is commensurate with the project and follows the work of the project rather than leading it.**

- **Ensure the source of information is one which is trusted – a range of feedback suggests that one of the key factors for buy in was that the source of information was a trusted organisation. This is an underlying strength of the co-operative movement in creating change, but in this case it was exploited to their advantage within the context of a media programme to influence behaviour.**

- **Incorporate established social marketing methods – for example: social media monitoring tools to identify target networks, advocates & groups; using advocates to tweet, blog and network for Greener Together, utilising awareness weeks.**

- **Enable interactive participation – this work package appears to have worked best where participation was interactive.**
MSC on the Menu – Marine Stewardship Council

SECTION 1: AIMS & OBJECTIVES
The Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) is the world’s leading certification and eco-labelling program for sustainable seafood. They delivered the MSC on the Menu project, a supply chain initiative aimed at: (a) increasing the availability of MSC-certified seafood in the foodservice sector (particularly seafood from English fisheries); and (b) promoting this availability to consumers. These twin aims were delivered by two associated work packages:

Work Package 1: Supply chain
A co-ordinated plan of engagement with a range of fisheries and foodservice supply chain partners to achieve the following targets:

- **UK Fisheries** – to achieve at least 25 fisheries in full assessment
- **Suppliers** – to increase the number of certified foodservice suppliers by two
- **Contract caterers** – to achieve certification at 600 contract catering sites
- **Independent restaurants** – to reach 200 MSC certified restaurants
- **Universities** – to achieve MSC certification at 6 university canteens
- **Schools** – to reach 5,000 MSC certified schools

Work Package 2: Consumers
A consumer-facing awareness raising campaign using the certified sites targeted by Work Package 1 as conduits to the consumer (e.g. workplace canteen campaigns at Sodexo sites). The work involved the development of Point of Sale (POS) communications materials.

In line with the aim of engaging audiences across the foodservice supply chain, the project necessarily involved a wide range of partners and a high degree of engagement work. Key partners included the large contract caterers (e.g. Sodexo, Compass, Baxter, Storey, Aramark), seafood suppliers (e.g. Brakes, M&J Seafood), and restaurants (e.g. Fifteen, Moshi Moshi, Webbe’s, Ondine).
SECTION 2: OUTPUTS

This section assesses:

- **Key outputs** delivered by the project (i.e. the tools and facilities created, activities undertaken, training provided, and media coverage);

- **Key learning points** about the outputs and their delivery, as well as commentary from the project team on the key advice that they would give to other projects doing something similar.

2.2 SUMMARY OF OUTPUTS

The main outputs are outlined in Table 1 and summarised as follows:

- **Work Package 1** involved the creation – and subsequent deployment - of a wide range of tools and facilities (from training DVDs and information packs to a new online assessment), alongside a large number of events with different audiences. The outputs achieved are either in line with, or have exceeded, the original targets (e.g. double the number of MSC on the Menu training DVDs have been deployed - 4,000 vs. a target of 2,000). One exception, however, is the ‘Before Certification’ restaurant packs which have not yet reached the target (750 against a target of 1,500), although distribution remains on-going.

- **Work Package 2**, by contrast, focused largely on the creation of Point Of Sale (POS) materials alongside consumer leaflets and freebies (e.g. trolley tokens, lunch kits). The tools and facilities deployed by the project are also lower than anticipated, in some cases significantly so (e.g. the ‘After certification’ POS materials pack, of which 100 have been deployed against a target of 500). However, in all cases distribution remains on-going.
### Table 1 – Summary of outputs by work package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP1: Supply chain</th>
<th>WP2: Consumers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tools &amp; facilities created/deployed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tools &amp; facilities created/deployed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000 MSC on the Menu training DVDs (target: 2,000)</td>
<td>100 ‘After certification’ POS materials pack, distribution on-going (target: 500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750 ‘Before certification’ restaurant packs, distribution on-going (target: 1,500)</td>
<td>3,000 consumer leaflets about MSC, distribution on-going (target: 7,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A new website section on certification for restaurants</td>
<td>354 Fish and Kids education resource packs, large-scale distribution pending (target: up to 10,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An online assessment tool for restaurants</td>
<td>3,562 Sustainable Seafood lunch kits (target: 3,562)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Get Certified! Fisheries booklets (no specific target)</td>
<td>Marketing materials for Sodexo UK campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities undertaken</strong></td>
<td><strong>Activities undertaken</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A new MSC Sustainability Award at the Fish and Chip Shop of the Year awards</td>
<td>Consumer events with contract caterers, e.g. Compass event at Bank of England (estimated reach: 1,600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A stand and cooking demonstrations at Hotelympia (the UK’s largest trade event for catering and hospitality)</td>
<td>Sustainable Seafood Lunch (estimated reach: 95,600, including 67,500 school children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Good Catch events with 160 chefs and restaurant owners</td>
<td>Sodexo promotional campaign for MSC in certified sites (estimated reach: 800,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker slots at 7 M&amp;J Seafood sustainability Roadshow events with 400 chefs and restaurant managers</td>
<td><strong>Training</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 MSC on the Menu events with 122 attendees drawn across local councils, local food groups, local fishing organisations and coastal partnerships.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School visits involving 20 school catering staff, 1,407 children, 120 teachers and 180 parents</td>
<td><strong>Media</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training</strong></td>
<td>News articles in various regional and local press with a combined circulation of 505,488, alongside national coverage (e.g. Guardian, Telegraph, Independent) with a readership/listenership of 1,455,687.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MSC (certification for restaurants), with c.60 M&amp;J Seafood field reps and Depot manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MSC (certification for restaurants), with c.65 M&amp;J Seafood telephone sales staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MSC (focusing on CoC for schools), with c.12 Brakes National account managers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MSC’s fishery certification programme, with c.1000 Sodexo site managers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features, articles and adverts across nine publications (e.g. Fry Magazine, Caterer and Hotelkeeper) with a combined circulation of approximately 160,000.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 KEY LEARNING ABOUT THE OUTPUTS AND THEIR DELIVERY

The project reports three key lessons, as follows:

1. Lessons about Engagement
   The project has had some notable successes, as well as some challenges, in respect of engaging key audiences – both of which have helped shape the organisation’s thinking on future activities. For example:

   - **MSC on the Menu** events - these events, providing a forum for engagement with a wide range of businesses across the supply chain, received positive feedback in the evaluation surveys (reported in more detail under ‘Impacts’). For example, 90% rated the events as ‘excellent’ or ‘good’ in terms of providing an opportunity to learn something new; and 87% reported that they were ‘very likely’ or ‘likely’ to investigate MSC certification for their business.

   - **Engagement of fisherman** – while this audience was initially difficult to engage because MSC certification was perceived as a secondary priority to other issues (i.e. CFP reform, transition to IFCA’s quotas, implementation of Marine Protected Areas, etc.), the events were well received and demonstrated the audience’s interest in sustainability. A significant outcome was the MSC identifying the need for an English Fisheries outreach officer.

   - **The Good Catch stand at Hotelympia** – while this was well attended and MSC’s cooking demonstrations attracted large crowds, follow up opportunities to promote certification were limited. This was an interesting learning point for the project since the event had previously been viewed as key to accessing foodservice companies in the UK.

   - **Difficulties of relying on second order engagement via intermediaries and champions** - MSC trained depot managers with the anticipation that they would then repeat the training for their telesales staff. However, this method has proved ineffective, which the project attributes to pressure on time/resources in busy depots/sales offices.

   - **The Sustainable Seafood Lunch** – this event, as part of Work Package 2 (consumers), worked well in terms of reach (with many LEAs and Caterers signing up thousands of participating outlets) but achieved no media coverage due to low grass-roots engagement. This has prompted MSC to consider adapting the event in future years to be more people-based and media-friendly.

As an overarching point, the outputs have worked well in combination. For example, the development of restaurant training materials, the website, information pack and multilingual training film has created a defined process for engaging with this sector and a ‘pathway’ to certification.

2. Adaptability
   One of the key characteristics of the project, more so than some of the other GLF projects, was its ability to adapt. For example:
The project took advantage of opportunities that emerged during the lifespan of the project to work with additional partners – including ‘piggybacking’ on a series of sustainability workshops that were being run by M&J Seafoods for their customers, and forming new partnerships with high profile/opinion forming restaurants (e.g. Moshi Moshi, Webbe’s Rock-a-Nore).

The project adapted its approach when it became clear that the project was not succeeding with independent restaurants, shifting the focus to restaurants in general (and in particular restaurant chains where MSC judge that larger net gains could be achieved by undertaking similar levels of effort but focused on fewer organisations). Likewise, the project became aware of a disconnect between activity in school canteens and classrooms as part of its Fish and Kids programme (with classroom resources not being as widely used as anticipated) and so created a database of named teachers at every school involved in the project, and developed clearer signposts about how the educational resources integrate with the curriculum.

3. Understanding, and taking advantage of, external factors
The project has benefited from, or taken advantage of, several external factors:

- It has actively fostered competitive market pressure. For example, Sodexo’s certification for all of its restaurants and cafes has set the standard, and the press surrounding Sodexo’s certification prompted meetings with other caterers. Furthermore, McDonald’s recent announcement that their filet-o-fish will be MSC-certified across Europe - whilst not an outcome that can be attributed directly to the GLF project – was influenced by their recognition of competitor activity.

- The Government Buying Standards (GBS) and the London 2012 Olympic commitment to sustainable sourcing both reference MSC fish as the recognised standard for wild-capture seafood and, consequently, have both been catalysts for MSC’s on-going work with some of the large foodservice providers.

In contrast, not all external influences have been positive. For example, the economic recession impacted on the ability of some key partners to engage with MSC on the Menu, e.g. progress with Compass slowed because of personnel cuts and budgetary constraints.
**SECTION 3: IMPACTS**

This section outlines:

- A summary of the evaluation methods used by the project;
- The project’s key impacts, drawing on quantitative and qualitative evaluation research and exploring attitudinal and behaviour change, community cohesion, organisational capacity, longevity of impact and spill-over from one pro-environmental behaviour to another.
- This section also explores the ‘what next’ questions for the project, focusing on three key issues – the anticipated legacy of the project; the potential for further scale up of the project (i.e. focusing on the same audience/locations but expanding the reach); and the potential for replication (adapting the approach for different audience/locations).

### 3.1 EVALUATION METHODS

The project deployed a range of quantitative and qualitative research methods across the two work packages, as set out in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3 – Evaluation methodologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work package 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective, quantitative measures</strong> – e.g. number of certified fisheries/caterers/outlets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantitative survey</strong> - undertaken amongst three supply chain audiences: Independent restaurants (a telephone survey with 250 respondents at both baseline and follow-up); Site managers in contract caterer sites (34 at baseline, 98 at follow-up) and sales force in certified suppliers (67 at baseline, 47 at follow-up). The small sample sizes require heavy caveats to be applied to the analysis that follows in section 3.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-depth telephone interviews</strong> – 27 interviews were conducted with decision-makers in key parts of the supply chain - 8 with heads of the Sea Fishery Committees, 8 with key executives within contract caterers/suppliers, and 11 with front line sales staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post event evaluation forms</strong> – feedback forms were completed by attendees after each event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work package 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantitative survey</strong> – A paper-based self-completion questionnaire was completed on site by diners using the restaurant facilities at some of Sodexo’s large commercial and academic sites. Professional researchers managed the distribution of the questionnaires and consumers were given a £2 or £3 cash incentive on completion. The baseline sample was 675, and the follow up was 689.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2 KEY IMPACTS

The project’s key impacts are outlined below and summarised in Table 3.

**Objective impacts**

The project reports a range of successes against its objective measures. For example: MSC have 39 UK fisheries in full assessment (set against a target of 25); there are 34 MSC-certified university canteens (target: 6); and 630 certified contract catering sites (target: 600). However, not all targets have been met – notably with restaurants (21 certified against a
target of 200). Furthermore, it is difficult to establish what impacts were directly the results of *MSC on the Menu* and which may have happened as a result of MSC’s core work with the sector. MSC contend that the GLF project enabled them to build on the partnerships that were already in place and scale up its activities within the foodservice sector. As a result, and even though it is impossible to quantify what progress would have been made without GLF funding, they assert that GLF has increased MSC’s profile over and above the ‘business-as-usual’ activities, and accelerated the pace of change in this market.

**Survey results**

As a general remark, and to repeat the comment in Table 2, the small survey sample sizes - that apply to all of the work packages - require heavy caveats to be applied to the analysis that follows (and the reader is referred to the GLF methodology note provided in the Annex).

**Awareness of MSC:** Both Sodexo site managers and M&J sales staff had high level of awareness about MSC from the outset which limited the scope for further change (e.g. awareness of MSC among Sodexo site managers was 82% at baseline and 91% at follow up). In contrast, prompted awareness of MSC among independent restaurants was both much lower and did not change notably across the project (32% baseline, 28% follow up), whereas among consumers there was a moderate increase in prompted recognition (18% baseline; 25% follow up) but from a low starting point.

**Attitudes:** There has been no material change in *high-level buy in* to seafood sustainability issues, largely because the key audiences already recognised the importance of such issues at the outset. So, for example, at both the baseline and follow up 100% of Sodexo site managers considered ‘over fishing of cod and other species’ either ‘very’ or ‘quite’ important, while among consumers over 90% at both baseline and follow up rated this as ‘very’ or ‘somewhat important’. Likewise, among M&J sales staff, a strong majority at baseline (88%) already considered ‘selling sustainable seafood’ to be very important to the business (increasing to 96% at follow up). There were, however, some notable changes among Sodexo site managers in respect of specific attitudes to sustainable seafood. For example, at follow up fewer site managers felt that *‘the price makes it too expensive to buy’* (17% vs. 32% at baseline), and fewer said that they *‘don’t know enough about it’* (4% vs. 24%). However, this was not matched by independent restaurants. For example, price remained a significant barrier with 43% at follow up stating that ‘the price makes it too expensive to buy’ (down only marginally from 48% at baseline), while information presented a significant barrier that was only partially addressed - 33% stated that ‘I don’t know enough about it’ (compared to 48% at baseline).

**Training:** 85% of M&J sales staff had received training on sustainability by the end of the project (vs. 39% at baseline). There was significantly increased understanding of chain of custody, the majority said that they know how a customer could go about getting certified, and there was an increase in awareness about online assessment.

**Behaviours:** Attitudes fed through to purchase behaviours among Sodexo site managers, with 91% purchasing MSC-certified fish at follow up (vs. 44% at baseline). Furthermore, 60% say that MSC-certified products represent half or more of all the fish they now buy (vs. 15% at baseline). However, among M&J sales staff there was no significant change, with around two thirds of the sample believing that less than half of their customers consider it (64% at baseline; 68% at follow-up). Information about MSC-certified products was filtering through
to consumers – with a large increase in the proportion of Sodexo site managers who said that they provide information on sustainable seafood to customers via posters/leaflets in the restaurant (67% vs. 36% at baseline) and via the MSC logo on the menu (77%, vs. 27% at baseline). Among consumers themselves, however, there was only a marginal increase in the proportion claiming to have purchased an MSC product – from 13% at baseline to 17% at follow up.

**Behavioural spill over:** the surveys suggest that there has been a spill over of behaviours among interviewees from their commercial roles into their personal lives. For example, and among the Sodexo site managers, 49% now ‘always/very often’ buy fish from sustainable sources (compared to 26% at baseline). A similar, although less marked, trend is evident among independent restaurants. Turning to consumers eating at Sodexo sites, the purchase of sustainable fish at work for lunch does appear to have some spill over into personal consumer choices – for example, within the subset of consumers at Sodexo sites who recognise the MSC logo, 24% say that they had personally purchased an MSC product in the past four weeks outside of the work canteen. However, this shows little change from the baseline and so the project itself did not stimulate additional spill over.

**Community cohesion:** There is no hard data on the community cohesion impacts of the project. However, one anecdotal insight from the project concerns positive impacts within the communities of fishermen that were engaged. Given that the UK inshore fishing industry is typically highly fragmented with its members often working in isolation, the events created an opportunity for fishermen to communicate and establish relationships with suppliers and other stakeholders (e.g. at the Whitehaven event the fishermen were concerned about the cost of certification and a local council representative offered to help out with funding applications).

**Skills & capacity:** MSC report that the GLF project has built organisational capacity. For example, it has developed the skills of individual project team members - specifically the development of the training materials (pack and film), and the events have required the development of new and specialised skills which the MSC will continue to benefit from beyond the life of the project. The POS consumer-facing materials also represent a resource and experience that MSC will continue to draw upon.

**Longevity of impact:** Since attaining certification across all UK sites, Sodexo – as a result of GLF - has signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the MSC to progress their commitment to MSC across their global business. This forms part of their ‘Better Tomorrow’ commitment and illustrates how MSC is embedded in the company CSR policy. Similar activity (although not as formalised as an MoU) can be seen across all large certified businesses. Through achieving MSC certification, the processes and policies become embedded in the organisation and are likely to be sustained, especially in the midst of growing pressure to source sustainably through initiatives such as the development of the Olympics Food Vision, government buying standards etc.
## Table 3 – Headline impacts at a glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective measures</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK Fisheries</td>
<td>At least 25 fisheries in full assessment</td>
<td>39 in total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSC products in foodservice</td>
<td>At least 250 certified products available to restaurants</td>
<td>192 product lines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSC products in foodservice</td>
<td>20% increase in the number of certified products</td>
<td>15% (from 167 to 192 products)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppliers</td>
<td>Increase number of certified foodservice suppliers by 2</td>
<td>Increase of 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract caterers</td>
<td>600 contract catering sites certified</td>
<td>630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>200 MSC certified restaurants by</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>6 MSC certified university canteens</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>5,000 MSC certified schools</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Survey results

#### Sodexo site managers

Notwithstanding small sample sizes (N = 34 at baseline; 98 at follow up) and self-selection (online, self-completion), the survey highlights some important impacts:

- At both the baseline and follow up 100% of respondents considered ‘over fishing of cod and other species’ either ‘very’ or ‘quite’ important.
- Awareness of the MSC itself increased by only a modest amount - 82% at baseline; 91% now.
- At follow up fewer site managers felt ‘the price makes it too expensive to buy’ (17%, vs. 32% at baseline), and fewer said that they ‘don’t know enough about it’ (4% vs. 24% at baseline).
- 91% of the sample now purchase MSC-certified fish (vs. 44% at the baseline).

#### Independent restaurants

- Spontaneous recognition of MSC showed little change between baseline and follow up (6% vs. 8%, respectively). Likewise, prompted awareness remained relatively unchanged across the project (32% at baseline, 28% at follow up).
- At baseline 98% rated ‘over fishing of cod and other species’ as either ‘very’ or ‘quite’ important, falling to 82% at follow up.
- The proportion who claim that they consider the sustainability of fish sources ‘a lot’ or ‘to some extent’ increased marginally from 71% to 74%.
- 52% at baseline reported that ‘more than half’ of their purchases were MSC-certified stock, down to 22% at follow up.
Furthermore, 60% say that MSC-certified products represent half or more of all the fish they now buy (vs. 15% at baseline).

- There was a large increase in the proportion of site managers who said that they provide information on sustainable seafood to customers via posters/leaflets in the restaurant (67% vs. 36% at baseline) and via the MSC logo on the menu (77%, vs. 27% at baseline). The majority did not, however, believe that consumer demand has increased over the past year or so – 53% at baseline and 56% at follow up said it had remained about the same.

49% now personally ‘always’ or ‘very often’ buy fish from sustainable sources, compared to 26% at baseline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M&amp;J Sales Force</th>
<th>Survey with consumers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This survey also involved small sample sizes (N = 67 at baseline; 47 at follow up) and self-selection, and was undertaken using a self-completion paper questionnaires:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 88% at baseline considered that ‘selling sustainable seafood’ was very important to the business, increasing to 96%.</td>
<td>- Price was perceived to be a significant barrier with 43% at follow up stating that ‘the price makes it too expensive to buy’ (vs. 48% at baseline); and 30% that ‘my customers would not pay for it’ (vs. 29% at baseline). On Information, 33% stated ‘I don’t know enough about it’ (vs. 48% at baseline).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- While awareness of MSC had reached 100% of respondents at follow up, it was already high (96%) at baseline.</td>
<td>- At baseline 32% reported that their customers ‘often’ or ‘sometimes’ ask about where their seafood comes from, increasing to 37% at follow-up. 43% felt that customer concern about provenance and sustainability has increased in the past 12 months (vs. 42% at baseline). 52% at follow up that they put a statement on the menu (vs. 41% at baseline), and 65% said they are motivated by being able to display the MSC logo (vs. 68% at baseline).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 85% of respondents had received training on sustainability at follow up (vs. 39% at baseline). There was also significantly increased understanding of chain of custody - 85% of respondents said that they understand the need for customer certification (vs. 52% at baseline). 80% said that they know how a customer could go about getting certified, lower than at baseline (94%). There was, however, an increase in awareness about online assessment (70% vs. 51% at baseline).</td>
<td>- 49% at baseline and 46% at follow up agree with the statement ‘I don’t think about sustainability when deciding what seafood to buy’. However, there was an increase in the proportion who disagreed with this statement, from 22% at baseline to 27% at follow up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64% at baseline believed that less than half of their customers consider it, compared to 68% at follow-up.</td>
<td>- 13% correctly identified the MSC logo at baseline, compared to 14% at follow up. Prompted recognition saw a small increase – 18% vs. 25%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28% say they personally ‘always’ or ‘very often’ buy fish from sustainable sources (compared to 20% at baseline).
## Depth interviews

### Suppliers

- Training has been very positively received and management now believe their sales teams are much more knowledgeable and effective as a result.

- The ‘big players’ are perceived to be making significant progress, in contrast to the independent restaurant sector where progress has been slow - despite chefs and restaurateurs having high levels of concern about and interest in seafood sustainability and a desire, especially at the upper end of the market, to source responsibly. Key barriers include:
  - An on-going lack of clarity about exactly what is involved in certification, which is still regarded by many outlets as burdensome and expensive.
  - Availability of UK certified fresh product is still a big issue – one supplier said that there are 9 certified UK fisheries but many are small and it is unlikely that more than 3 species would be available to his customers at any one time.
  - Many chefs are reluctant to use the logo for one seafood item on their menu because it may raise negative concerns about non-certified items.

### Sea Fisheries Committees

- This group as a whole are knowledgeable about the MSC and supportive of its aims. However, over the period of the project the SFC managers have been pre-occupied with the establishment of IFCA’s and this has limited the resource available to participate in the project. The establishment of Marine Protected Areas has also been a priority during this period.

- In the longer term, however, the introduction of IFCAS will broaden the SFC role from regulation / enforcement, increasing focus on conservation, sustainability, environmental impacts and management and thus potentially providing a framework that will support interest in MSC.

- It is perceived that MSC faces particular challenges in terms of engaging with the smaller fisheries:
  - Little or no organisation into cohesive groups, few leaders or champions
  - Lack of a clear understanding about the process
  - Microbusinesses facing many commercial and regulatory pressures
  - Concern about cost and time / resource needs, both for certification and on-going
  - If not involved in supplying retailers, there seems to be little or no requirement / demand for certification coming up the supply chain
  - Lack of understanding of the supply chain, and scepticism about any business benefits in terms of higher demand / higher prices

### M&J customers (from the sustainability roadshows)

- Recall of the Sustainability Roadshows was high, and the events were seen as positive, fun and engaging. The Roadshows succeeded in informing attendees about MSC, but none subsequently chose to seek accreditation which is still seen as complex, time consuming and expensive.

- Customer preferences – interviewees spoke of an initial switch to try certified products, but in the main this was not sustained because the species were unfamiliar to customers and unpopular. Consumers’ perceived reluctance to change from well planned and popular menus meant that new species are often featured only as ‘specials’.

- Mixed responses on pricing – some felt that sustainable fish is premium priced, although others felt that it is not that expensive. However cost price and margins are crucial, and interviewees believed that price offers on uncertified product will drive switching.

- Lack of availability / continuity of certified species is a problem in the UK supply chain.

- Provenance, and particularly local sourcing, appeals strongly to caterers and their customers, and ‘local’ is often assumed to imply sustainable.

Perceived complex and conflicting messages, together with some scepticism about the credibility of claims, can act as an excuse for inaction. Furthermore, and because M&J have established a reputation for responsible sourcing, many rely on the company to address seafood sustainability.
3.3 WHAT NEXT?

**Legacy:** Because the GLF project is so closely aligned with MSC’s core work, it is likely that the outputs developed as part of MSC on the Menu will continue to be used in their on-going work. Furthermore, the relationships developed over the last 18 months with partners should continue to flourish (allowing further expansion within this market with more certified products and outlets) and a number of businesses that the MSC have been working with over the length of the project are close to announcing their certification and this will be a direct consequence of the project. There will also be legacy in terms of the influence on staff members – it is likely that the Project manager and the Commercial Officer managing the Fish and Kids project will be employed by the MSC in a full time, permanent capacity after the project and, furthermore, the MSC on the Menu events provided MSC with a clear rationale for appointing an English Fisheries Outreach officer.

**Scaling up and replication:** The project has shown what can be achieved in this sector by scaling up and accelerating engagement work. In the future, there may be potential for the MSC to work with other sectors to continue to raise awareness about MSC certification (e.g. Government employees stationed at landing ports or with the newly-formed IFCA staff). There is also opportunity to scale up the engagement work with independent restaurants, for example with continued development of the consumer section of the MSC website (e.g. consumer map of restaurants) and exploring partnerships with restaurant guides e.g. top table. The learning and outputs from the GLF project have proved invaluable for MSC foodservice work in other countries, and the marketing and training materials are currently being adapted for other markets and languages. For Fish and Kids specifically, the project feels that there is excellent opportunity to replicate/scale up in Scotland. More widely, the project is relevant to mobilising change in the supply chain of any sector (i.e. addressing supply and demand issues simultaneously).
SECTION 4: LESSONS FOR BEHAVIOUR CHANGE

**MSC on the Menu** has delivering against many of its original objectives, exceeding them in several instances (e.g. there are now 39 UK fisheries in full assessment, set against a target of 25). Alongside direct impacts, a number of wider successes (e.g. the engagement of McDonalds) can also be indirectly attributed to the capacity, skills and profile that the GLF project has helped MSC to establish.

In contrast, the independent restaurant sector is a notable exception where the MSC’s approach did not succeed (at least not within the confines of its GLF activities). Furthermore, and turning to Work Package 2, it is difficult to fully assess the impact on the end consumer, since the intervention was more akin to a communications campaign than a behaviour change intervention per se.

There are several possible explanations for why engagement with certain audiences worked better than with others. The first concerns the nature of MSC’s existing relationships at the outset, with strong relationships already in place with food service companies such as Sodexo compared to fewer existing ties among fisherman and independent restaurants. The second is possibly a question of scale, resources and pragmatism – the independent restaurant sector, for example, involves a large number of small business concerns which are highly fragmented – as opposed to a handful of very large organisation like Sodexo. It is noteworthy that MSC changed their focus to restaurant chains which allow them to target and then engage with a smaller number of influential players in the market, and suggests that – at least in the short term – such an approach offers more ‘bangs per buck’.

The project’s key and defining ‘success factors’ can be summarised as follows:

- **It’s ability to identify and ‘pick off’ individual barriers to sustainable seafood** - despite only marginal changes in high level awareness and attitudes (as a result of pre-existing high level awareness and attitudes), the Sodexo site managers notably changed their attitudes specifically in relation to purchasing factors and the business case. The MSC’s ability to undertake evaluation research may have played a role in the process of identifying key barriers. For example, the depth interviews with various key audiences in the supply chain, undertaken under the auspices of the evaluation, has provided a rich and valuable source of information for the MSC’s on-going engagement with these audiences.

- **The ability to take advantage of wider market forces** – the MSC successfully tapped into large organisations’ desire to gain ‘first-mover’ advantages over their competitors, as well as the subsequent market pressure for competitors not to lag too far behind the market leaders. The project itself also benefited from wider external forces, notably the requirements for MSC-certified products built into the procurement standards for both the Olympics and Government Buying Standards).

- **Identifying and empowering existing champions of sustainability** - one of the successes of the programme has been to both find and then empower existing champions, making it possible for them to act. Conversely, MSC’s attempts to appoint new champions who then go on to train others (i.e. the depot managers), was not successful and suggests that such champions must already exist in order for such an approach to succeed.
### SECTION 5: THE PROJECT’S KEY ADVICE

The following is taken from MSC’s own Final Report, and represents the advice that they would offer projects trying to undertake similar projects.

#### Work package 1 – supply chain

- **Make the business, not environmental, case** - whilst the vast majority of organisations believe that behaving sustainably is the right thing to do, the business case is the key to changing behaviour. For example, demonstrable consumer and market demand is key to driving change, particularly with the fish catching sector which is far removed from consumer-facing activities.

- **Engage existing, individual champions** - this was particularly evident with the fishing sector, where local champions, once on board, could galvanise opinion and action amongst what is a highly fragmented industry. However, nominating or appointing a champion may not work in the same way – the MSC’s ‘train the trainer’ strategy for seafood suppliers was ineffective in cascading the information/training to other employees as planned.

- **Understand and use local knowledge and networks** - having the ability to tap into the local knowledge and understanding held by e.g. coastal partnerships, local food groups, fishing organisations was crucial in driving attendee numbers.

- **Focus on one fairly narrow element of the market rather than spreading efforts too wide** - it is more important to pick one very keen set of partners that vertically cover the supply chain, and which in turn create the competitive pressure/incentive for others to engage.

- **Larger vs. smaller companies** - where large scale change is the target, bigger companies, once engaged and genuinely committed, will deliver quicker outcomes than fragmented sectors dominated by independents or microbusinesses.

#### Work package 2 – consumers

- **Developing POS materials** – this is an excellent way to add value to those businesses that make a sustainability commitment, with focussed messaging which concentrates on the ‘solution’ and how consumers can make a difference proved effective. The decision was made to focus on the solution and the positive steps that individuals can take.

- **Consultation with partners** – this proved invaluable in shaping the direction of the materials as they brought their commercial insights into the process. Also the materials had to be flexible enough to work in different restaurant settings, i.e. from a workplace canteen to a fine-dining restaurant.
Tap into Savings – Waterwise

SECTION 1: BACKGROUND & APPROACH

Waterwise is an independent, not for profit organisation focused on decreasing water consumption in the UK and building the evidence base for large scale water efficiency. They delivered the Tap into Savings (TiS) project, which aimed to use home visits and the retrofit of simple water saving technologies as a means of encouraging residents to think about how they use water and encourage changes in behaviour. The project involved two work packages:

Work Package 1: Home visits
The project aimed to undertake 7,600 home visits with residents in social housing in three areas: Merstham/Redhill (SE London), Coventry and Braintree. During the home visit a range of simple water efficiency devices were installed, including dual flush conversions, tap inserts, and low flow showerheads. Energy saving devices – including standby plug savers, energy efficient light bulbs, thermometer readers and electricity monitors - were also provided in Merstham/Redhill and Coventry. As well as installation, the installers were also trained to engage with residents and give them advice and support (including the option to join an EcoTeam). The anticipated impacts were as follows:

- 15% reduction in water consumption
- 20% of participants adopting new pro-environmental behaviours
- 20% of participants sharing their knowledge of sustainability with others
- 5 people from each project working towards wider community change

Work Package 2: TiS EcoTeams
The project aimed to establish a number of TiS EcoTeams involving a total of 380 residents. Meetings were facilitated by a member of the TiS team. The anticipated impacts of the project were the same as Work Package 1.

The primary local delivery partners were local water companies (Sutton and East Surrey Water, Severn Trent Water, Anglian Water) and social housing providers (Raven Housing Trust, Whitefriars Housing Group, Greenfields Community Housing). Other partners included the local authorities in each area (Reigate and Banstead Borough Council, Coventry City Council, Braintree District Council) and the Environment Agency (Thames Region and Midlands Region).
SECTION 2: OUTPUTS

This section assesses:

- **Key outputs** delivered by the project (i.e. the tools and facilities created, activities undertaken, training provided, and media coverage);

- **Key learning points about the outputs and their delivery**, as well as commentary from the project team on the key advice that they would give to other projects doing something similar.

2.1 SUMMARY OF OUTPUTS

The main outputs are outlined in Table 1 and summarised as follows:

- The core outputs of Work Package 1 were the initial engagement of households (via direct mail, telephone calls and door knocking), and the subsequent home visits and installation of water and energy efficiency devices. There is no target to measure against, but the project evidently deployed a large number of devices (10,353). However, the number of home visits was significantly below target (3,496 vs. a target of 7,600), although work remained on-going in Braintree at the time of reporting with a further 2,155 visits planned (which would take the total number to 5,651).

- The key output from Work Package 2 was the creation of 27 TiS EcoTeams involving 182 participants (an average of 6.7 participants/group). This was significantly below the original target of 380 participants. The distribution of participants across the three areas indicates greater success in Coventry (106 participants) compared to either Merstham/Redhill (34) or Braintree (28).
### Table 1 – Summary of outputs by work package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP1: Home visits</th>
<th>WP2: TiSEco Teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tools &amp; facilities created/deployed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tools &amp; facilities created/deployed</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,127 water efficiency devices (e.g. tap inserts, shower flow regulators) (no target)</td>
<td>253 EcoTeam handbooks (target: 370)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,226 energy efficiency devices (e.g. standby plug savers, light bulbs, electricity monitors) (no target)</td>
<td>10 water games (target: 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417 jute bags and 751 fat traps (no targets)</td>
<td>10 mix and match games (target: 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200 promotional leaflets with direct mailing in Merstham/Redhill (target: 1,200)</td>
<td>75 EcoTeam posters (target: 75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 ‘refer a friend’ cards in Coventry (target: 6,000)</td>
<td>1,650 EcoTeam flyers (target: 1,800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIY kit offer with direct mailing to 2,180 households in Braintree (target: 2,180)</td>
<td>50 electricity monitors (target: 50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,029+ thermometer cards (target: 7,000)</td>
<td>100 environmental freebies (no target)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,529+ home visit booklets (target: 7,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website – <a href="http://www.tapintosavings.org">www.tapintosavings.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 minute promotional video</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500 stickers (target: 5,000); 400 posters (target: 440); Flyers and leaflets (number unknown; no target)</td>
<td>5 minute promotional video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450 magnetic notepad calendars (target: 886)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 wind up pig torches (target: 50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities undertaken</strong></td>
<td><strong>Activities undertaken</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,496 home visits (target: 7,600) (NB. 2,155 residents are still awaiting visits in Braintree)</td>
<td>27 Ecoteams, with 182 participants attending at least two meetings (target: 380)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project launch in each area plus other events</td>
<td>1,364 follow up telephone calls to those who had home visits (no target)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct mailing to 34,500 households (target: 34,500)</td>
<td>4 recruitment events (target: 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door knocking and telephone recruitment (901 answered the door and 1,300 answered the call) (no target)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training</strong></td>
<td><strong>Training</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installer training (24)</td>
<td>EcoTeams – the basics. 25 installers trained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP ambassador training (8)</td>
<td>Facilitation of EcoTeams – 11 local facilitators, GAP Ambassadors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project facilitator training (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media</strong></td>
<td><strong>Media</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print news stories with a potential readership of 691,486</td>
<td>Part of the media of work package 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio news stories with a potential listenership of 415,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online news stories with a potential readership of 2,467,867</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 KEY LEARNING ABOUT THE OUTPUTS AND THEIR DELIVERY

The project reports a series of important lessons, many of which apply equally across the two Work Packages. Some of the key learning, however, relates specifically to the Eco-Teams proposition and is therefore presented separately.

1. The value of different methods of engagement

The project deployed a range of engagement methods, to varying degrees of success:

- Direct mail was the primary method of recruitment for home visits but uptake was only 6-15% (compared to the initial assumption of 25%). Therefore, the project had to rely much more on telephone and doorstep recruitment than was originally envisaged. The focus groups undertaken as part of the evaluation research (see ‘Impacts’, below) highlighted the importance of partner logos on written materials in terms of engendering trust about the legitimacy of the project.

- The use and effectiveness of door-knocking varied greatly between the three project areas. In Merstham/Redhill over half of the home visits were recruited via door knocking (which achieved a 69% success rate when the door was opened). However, in the other project areas the success rate was much lower - 8% in Braintree and 13% in Coventry.

- The recruitment success rate of telephone calls was more consistent - 21% (Braintree), 34% (Merstham/Redhill) and 37% (Coventry). Anecdotal feedback from recruiters also suggests that telephone recruitment achieved a higher answer rate, potentially because a key concern – about bogus callers - was overcome.

- A further reflection from the project team is the need for multiple methods of engagement, i.e. many residents had to be ‘hit’ by the offer two or three times before agreeing to book a home visit. For example, one resident made an appointment via a doorstep visit but only after having received a personalised letter from TiS, a reminder letter, and seeing a TiS stand at the local shopping centre.

2. Advantages and disadvantages of different delivery models

Three different models of delivery were used: ‘shared delivery’ (Merstham/Redhill), ‘centralised delivery’ (Coventry) and ‘contracted delivery’ (Braintree).

The centralised model of delivery (i.e. led by Waterwise) appears to have been the most effective, in that: (1) installers were trained and home visits delivered to Waterwise/GAP’s standards; (2) the time interval between recruitment and the visit itself was short; and (3) recruitment was seamlessly integrated into the booking process, minimising the administrative burden and ensuring follow through. This model did have its disadvantages, in particular that it distanced partners from project delivery and so inadvertently focused ownership of targets on to Waterwise/GAP.

With the shared delivery model (i.e. Waterwise in partnership with the Housing Association and/or Water Utility) recruitment methods were limited because of a lack of integration across the partners’ systems. For example, because half the home visits were to be delivered by one partner and half by another, two separate calendars and booking processes were in place that prevented recruiters from making appointments at events/on the door step.
With the *contracted delivery model* (i.e. with little input from Waterwise), the model tended to prevent other partners from having much oversight of what was happening during the home visits, limiting their ability to respond to any problems in the field. Losing two levels of control over these aspects of the project was unintended, and did create several problems for delivery; for example, the contractor twice failed to provide installers with sets of refer-a-friend cards (an important recruitment method).

3. **Getting the message right**
The primary message was focused on saving money (e.g. “Save up to £50 a year on your household bills – for free!”), while secondary messaging focused on additional benefits as bonuses (e.g. “And help protect local water supplies, plants and animals, too!”). Evidence from the focus groups suggests that the ‘save money’ and ‘all for free’ messages were important. However, anecdotal evidence gathered from recruiters suggests that those same messages also led to suspicion amongst some residents that there was ‘a hidden catch’ or that the offer was a ‘scam’ (although, as noted above, the inclusion of partner logos on communications was important in countering this).

4. **The quality (and quantity) of training**
As the programme progressed it became clear that the quality of installer training had a large impact on the way home visits were carried out. Training length varied substantially across the three areas – from 1.5 hours in Braintree to half a day in Merstham/Redhill to two weeks in Coventry (in part because of different levels of technical expertise). The project team reflect that the half day training of (existing) water company and social housing installers in Merstham/Redhill project was sufficient to equip them to utilise home visit materials, but not to ‘sell’ EcoTeams. In the field, the Coventry installers did make some small technical mistakes when fitting products, although these were easily rectified and satisfaction in this project area was by far the highest. In Braintree District, the opposite was true with feedback suggesting that a number of residents felt disappointed with their home visit, finding the installer uncommunicative and feeling that they had waited in for only a small number of products. Furthermore, what worked well in Coventry was spending lots of time with installers training them on the context of the project and its benefits to residents, as well as giving them the devices at home to try for themselves.

5. **Advantages and disadvantages of partnerships**
The project team highlight a range of benefits of working with a large range of partners, including the provision and availability of different kinds of expertise, resources, and contacts that enabled a holistic project roll-out. There were, however, disadvantages as well, including difficulties managing the expectations and demands of so many partners, as well as delays achieving sign off with so many interested stakeholders involved.

6. **Adaptability**
The project acknowledges that it experienced a steep learning curve through delivering the project and there were multiple instances where the approach was adapted. For example:

- The largest TiS project was originally going to be delivered with South West Water, but the home retrofit proposal in their Business Plan was not funded and so the project moved to Braintree.
Midway through delivery in Merstham/Redhill, it was decided to extend the target audience beyond social housing in the other two project areas to enable implementation of a refer-a-friend scheme, improve the efficiency of door knocking, maximise the word-of-mouth effect, open EcoTeams to existing community groups in the area and get the most out of media coverage.

Opportunities arose to include energy efficiency retrofit measures. For example, Raven Housing Trust funded energy efficiency DIY packs whilst Coventry City Council secured an energy efficiency device for free by E.ON through CERT. There is anecdotal evidence from installer feedback that the inclusion of energy efficiency products motivated some residents to book a home visit.

A working relationship was developed with National Energy Action (NEA) in Coventry, which enabled installers to refer residents struggling with fuel poverty to a professional advisor (and five residents who had a TiS home visit went on to contact NEA).

**Learning specific to EcoTeams**

- **The importance of branding** – the focus groups conducted during the preliminary phase of GLF revealed that residents were put off by the ‘eco’ in EcoTeams. A change to ‘Community Action Teams’ was discussed but could not be agreed upon among the partners.

- **Evolving the EcoTeam model for TiS** - based on feedback from partners and staff in the Merstham/Redhill project, TiS EcoTeams: (a) had greater emphasis on money saving messages; (b) did not include an EcoTeam meeting on ‘Travel’; (c) excluded the weighing of rubbish and recycling; (d) used more freebies to attract residents to the first meetings; and (e) adapted the materials to be more target audience friendly.

- **Ample lead-in time and supportive networks** – the project contends that EcoTeams were more successful in Coventry because of the amount of time for networking prior to the project’s launch. EcoTeams were introduced to key local stakeholders, largely through Coventry City Council, so that by the time the project launched there were a number of immediate leads and links into local residents and existing community groups.

- **Installer promotion of EcoTeams** - many of the participants in Coventry said that they came along to a meeting because installers had told them about it (which was less evident in either of the other two areas). Observation and informal feedback suggests that installers in Coventry – as the project’s intermediaries - were able to promote EcoTeams more successfully.

- **Telephone follow-up calls** - a large number of EcoTeamers in Coventry were recruited through follow-up calls on the back of the home visits. These calls were most effective when carried out from the Coventry office (perhaps because a local number would appear on residents’ caller IDs) and when residents were invited to EcoTeam meetings taking place within the next two days.

- **Running EcoTeams with existing local groups** - EcoTeams were run successfully with existing groups in all areas, and these groups’ interests ranged from the environment to
religion to children. The approach worked well in engaging those who were not pro-environmental in their outlook.

- **Logistics of linking EcoTeams to home visits** - an effective link between home visits and EcoTeams can only be established if a high volume of home visits is being delivered, which often was not the case. Home visits in TiS were spread geographically (especially Braintree) and temporally (particularly in Coventry).

- **Converting expressions of interest into attendance** - many residents expressed an interest in EcoTeams but did not go on to attend a meeting. The channel through which interest was expressed (e.g. sign-up sheet at an event, face-to-face or telephone) did not seem to be a factor in explaining drop out rates.

- **Careful selection of meeting venues** - meetings in well-used and respected facilities generally had better turn-out. Focusing recruitment on residents near selected venues also made EcoTeams more convenient, and there were instances of residents stating that they did not come along to a meeting because it was in “the wrong area” (i.e. perceived to be unsafe).
SECTION 3: IMPACTS

This section outlines:

- A summary of the evaluation methods used by the project;

- The project’s key impacts, drawing on quantitative and qualitative evaluation research and exploring attitudinal and behaviour change, community cohesion, organisational capacity, longevity of impact and spill-over from one pro-environmental behaviour to another.

- This section also explores the ‘what next’ questions for the project, focusing on three key issues – the anticipated legacy of the project; the potential for further scale up of the project (i.e. focusing on the same audience/locations but expanding the reach); and the potential for replication (adapting the approach for different audience/locations).

3.1 EVALUATION METHODS

A wide range of evaluation methods were used, as set out in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work package 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water meter readings</strong> – data was collected in two areas via pre-existing meters (Braintree) and meter reading loggers (Merstham/Redhill). Technical issues prevented meter reading in Coventry. Readings were taken before projects launched and continued for as long after delivery as was feasible. The methodology was subject to a number of limitations, particularly small sample size – a total of 178 water meters were read in Merstham/Redhill (including 70 households who had a home visit) and 319 in Braintree (87 had a home visit).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theoretical benefits of technology</strong> – the assumed water and carbon savings of the installed technology have been calculated, subject to the caveat that assumed savings ≠ actual savings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postal survey</strong> – A total of 433 participants, across all three areas, received a home visit and completed both the baseline and follow up questionnaire. This was based on an initial mail out of 7,316 questionnaires.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defra Segmentation questions</strong> - questionnaires were administered in-home by the installer, with the resident free to complete it then or mail it back via freepost. A total of 787 completed surveys were returned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14 Focus groups</strong> were carried out across the programme with residents who had a home visit as well as with those who were targeted but did not take up the offer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff feedback</strong> - Individual interviews were conducted with core and delivery partners; project facilitators kept diaries; and focus groups were carried out with installers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work package 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EcoTeam measuring</strong> – participants were asked to take meter readings for gas, electricity and water throughout the process. Meaningful data was reliant upon EcoTeamers providing enough accurate readings to examine at least two periods of use. However, only a very small number of meter readings were collected, making it impossible to draw any conclusions from the data collected. On this basis, the results are not presented below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surveys</strong> - questionnaires were handed out at the first meeting and sent by post following the final meeting. The questionnaires were mostly identical to those used in the main resident survey, with some changes to the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
follow-up designed to reflect experiences in an EcoTeam. However, base sizes are very small (N=37 at baseline and N=22 at follow up) with only 13 participants completing both a baseline and a follow up survey. On this basis, the results are treated qualitatively and reported according to N (rather than %).

- **Staff feedback** – A feedback session was held with GAP ambassadors who had been involved in the recruitment and running of TiS EcoTeams.

### 3.2 KEY IMPACTS

The project’s key impacts are summarised in Table 3. This demonstrates the following:

**Defra segmentation profile:** the project’s target audience was diverse, with 22% of participants classified as Positive Greens, 20% as Concerned Consumers, 14% Honestly Disengaged and 12% Stalled Starters (12%).

**Attitudes:** Very few attitudinal shifts were recorded by the evaluation. There was a marginal, but not statistically significant, increase in the proportion of respondents who said that they are environmentally friendly in most things/everything they do (from 48% at baseline to 53% at follow up); and no change in either the proportion who say they try to persuade people they know to be more environmentally friendly or those who contest that ‘being green is an alternative lifestyle’. There was, however, a small and statistically significant reduction in the proportion who agreed with the statement ‘It’s not worth me doing things to help the environment if others don’t do the same’ (from 23% at baseline to 17% at follow up).

**Behaviours:** The theoretical savings implied by the measures installed were between 47 litres and 65 litres a day per property (a 10% - 20% reduction in consumption). Based on these assumed water savings, average daily carbon savings of between 0.19kgCO2e and 0.23kgCO2e per property were achieved, with an additional 0.05 kgCO2e to 0.21 kgCO2e being saved daily per property through the electricity saving products that were used in both Coventry and Merstham/Redill.

However, the actual meter reading data did not, in spite of the large number of water retrofit devices installed, detect any statistically significant reductions in water consumption. Furthermore, the survey detected very few changes of note. There was a small but statistically significant decrease in those who said ‘I don’t pay much attention to the water I use at home’ (27% at baseline; 22% at follow up), but other similar questions showed no change. Likewise, energy-specific behaviours also showed little change (e.g. 54% at baseline said that they ‘never’ leave the TV or PC on standby for long periods of time, compared to 52% at follow up).

The focus groups offer a different perspective, pointing to an increased awareness of water use as well as a range of new water-conscious behaviours (including reducing time in the shower, reducing water used in the bath, only using the dishwasher when full, cutting down on car washing frequency and installing water butts). Speculating as to why there is a conflict between the quantitative and qualitative sources of evidence, the project team contends that the survey questions did not pick up on the right behaviours. According to the focus groups, participants did make changes but not in ways that would be picked up by the specific questions asked in the survey. Turning to Work Package 2 (EcoTeams), it is not possible to make any definitive conclusions by virtue of the very small sample sizes.
**Behavioural spill over:** There is no direct evidence of spill over impacts. However, the evaluation data suggests that participants were talking to other people about their experience. For example, almost half (46%) of those who had a home visit had talked to friends or family about ways they could save water, electricity or gas following on from the home visit. Furthermore, as part of the EcoTeams Work Package, the facilitators report that a number of individuals have gone on to do more after attending the EcoTeam meetings (e.g. In Coventry, two people from the Canley EcoTeam volunteered to promote TiS at community events, and one of these also went on to join Transition Coventry; the EcoTeam at Redhill Methodist Church has inspired a further church EcoTeam in Reigate).

**Community cohesion:** There is no evidence to suggest that TiS had a significant impact on community cohesion. However, the project did promote a series of environmentally-focused discussions within the community (e.g. the survey shows that almost half of those who had home visits went on afterwards to talk to friends/family about saving water, gas and electricity), and informal feedback from EcoTeam participants reveals that they enjoyed getting to know other people in their area. Furthermore, TiS EcoTeams did generate some interest in volunteerism and community action, particularly in terms of linking into existing community groups:

- In Redhill, one participant volunteered to coordinate a second phase of EcoTeams at a local church.
- In Coventry, participants were instrumental in spreading the word about TiS; two participants in particular were keen to volunteer time on the project.
- In Braintree, a local wildlife group was keen to volunteer time on the project, and three participants committed to launching more EcoTeams in the area.

**Skills & capacity:** The project partners built new working relationships as well as strengthening existing relationships. They also learned about a range of issues, such as the suitability of the different efficiency devices for different situations/types of homes; publicising projects in general and engaging residents in particular (e.g. what methods to use to reach residents and the number of contacts needed to achieve a target number of sign-ups); and the day-to-day practicalities of running combined retrofit and behaviour change programmes.
### Table 3 – Headline impacts at a glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work package 1</th>
<th>Work package 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hard data</strong></td>
<td><strong>Survey findings</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merstham/Redhill - households that had a home visit recorded a very small, and statistically insignificant, reduction in water use of 4 litres/day (from 383 to 380), whereas those who did not have a home visit recorded a very small, and likewise statistically insignificant, increase in water use of 3 litres/day (from 418 to 421).</td>
<td>6 of the 22 follow-up respondents listed one or more new behaviours they have tried since being part of an EcoTeam. Reported new behaviours included installing a water butt, composting kitchen waste, pulling curtains at dusk and updating white goods with energy efficient models. Meanwhile, in the EcoTeam ‘improvements’ survey (completed at the final EcoTeam meeting, n=22) 11 of the respondents reported keeping the coils on the back of their fridge clean and well ventilated. These results suggest that over 20% of those who joined a TiS EcoTeam tried new behaviours as anticipated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braintree - those who had a home visit recorded a very small reduction in water use of 10 litres/day (from 218 to 208); whereas those who did not had a larger reduction of 49 litres/day (from 312 to 263). The differences are not statistically significant.</td>
<td>The second anticipated impact was that five people from each project would start working towards wider community change. Reports from those who were involved in organising and facilitating the EcoTeams indicate that a number of individuals have gone on to do more after attending the EcoTeam meetings. In Coventry, two people from the Canley EcoTeam volunteered to promote TiS at community events, and one of these also went on to join Transition Coventry. In Braintree, three individuals have taken the remaining EcoTeam handbooks with the aim of training up more volunteers to run EcoTeams within Greenfields’ existing community support networks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Theoretical savings**
Based on the water efficient products installed or provided by each project, average water savings of between 47 litres and 65 litres a day were achieved per property, a 10% - 20% reduction respectively in consumption. Based on the assumed water savings, average daily carbon savings of between 0.19kgCO2e and 0.23kgCO2e per property were achieved, with an additional 0.05 kgCO2e to 0.21 kgCO2e being saved daily per property through the electricity saving products that were used in both Coventry and Merstham/Redhill.

**Survey results**
Marginal, but not statistically significant, increase in the proportion of respondents who said that they are environmentally friendly in most things/everything they do (48% at baseline; 53% at follow up). No change in the proportion who agree ‘I try to persuade people I know to be more environmentally friendly’ (49% vs. 49%), or ‘being green is an alternative lifestyle, it’s not for the majority’ (31% vs. 31%).

Statistically significant change in the proportion who agreed ‘It’s not worth me doing things to help the environment if others don’t do the same’ (23% vs. 17%).

Statistically significant change in the proportion who say ‘I don’t pay much attention to the water I use at home’ (27% baseline; 22% follow up). Other similar questions showed very little change, e.g. ‘I’ve never thought about saving water’ (41% vs. 41%); ‘I don’t know how to save water’ (36% vs. 34%); the proportion who said that they ‘never’ wash dishes under a continuously running tap (61% vs. 58%); and the proportion who say they ‘always/very often’ turn off the tap when brushing their teeth (64% vs. 66%).
54% at baseline said that they ‘never’ leave the TV or PC on standby for long periods of time, compared to 52% at follow up; while 33% said they ‘never’ boil more water in the kettle than they need (vs. 32% at follow up). There was, however, a moderate increase in the proportion who said that they ‘never’ leave a mobile phone charger switched on at the socket when not in use (68% at baseline, 74% at follow up).

Feedback about the installed measures was very positive for water measures although slightly less so for some electricity measures. For example, of those who received them, 88% said they ‘like’ or like a lot’ the showerhead and the hose gun, followed by the toilet conversion kit (78%) and shower adaptor (77%). The least positively rated water-related measure was the fat trap (52%). For electricity measures, 80% said that they liked the energy saving lightbulbs, followed by the standby saver (69%) and electricity monitor (59%).

The information booklet was rated as useful by 68% of respondents. The thermometer cards were rated as useful by 57%. Almost half (46%) of those who had a home visit had talked to friends or family about ways they could save water, electricity or gas after they had the home visit.

**Depth interviews**

The focus groups offer a different perspective to the survey questions. For example, they point to an increased awareness of water use as well as a range of new water conscious behaviours (including reducing time in the shower, reducing water used in the bath, only using the dishwasher when full, cutting down on car washing frequency and installing water butts) as well as energy efficiency behaviours (e.g. turning off lights in rooms not in use, fitting energy saving light bulbs, becoming more aware of how much energy their oven and other appliances were using, as well as ‘telling off’ others for wasting electricity).

It was anticipated that 20% of those involved in the project would report talking to others about what they can do to help the environment. 18 participants in the follow-up survey stated that since joining an EcoTeam they had talked to friends or family about ways they could save water, electricity and gas. Similarly, 15 respondents felt that they had motivated others to take action as a result of their participation in an EcoTeam.
3.3 WHAT NEXT?

**Legacy:** The prospects for the legacy of the project appear good. Three jobs created under TiS will continue - the Evaluation Manager and Programme Manager at Waterwise (via core funding), and the Programme Manager at GAP (working in a similar role with TiS Coventry partners on a West Midlands retrofit and EcoTeams project). Furthermore, some of the outputs from TiS will continue to be used, e.g. Sutton and East Surrey Water plan to continue to use the content of the TiS home visit booklet. In addition, the games produced for TiS EcoTeams are being developed into core EcoTeams activities.

Waterwise is disseminating the findings of the project through its policy work. For example, to date it has held two TiS policy seminars – one at Defra and the other at Ofwat. Furthermore, they are currently considering whether ‘Tap into Savings’ should be trademarked, and/or the engagement materials protected to some degree under Creative Commons (which could enable others to use the brand subject to some rules).

The project has also already begun the process of replication. For example, The Environment Agency West Midlands has funded GAP to work with Severn Trent Water, South Staffs Water and six housing providers to run EcoTeams alongside a regional water efficiency retrofit programme. Furthermore, there has been interest in TiS from social housing providers (on the back of Waterwise’s recent presentation at the Sustainable Homes conference).

**Scaling up & replication:** There is potential to scale up the project, although the project team judges that changes would need to be made. For example, they recommend that energy efficiency is integrated more fully into the home visits in order to increase uptake and deliver greater value for residents and partners. Furthermore, whilst recruitment and delivery of home visits worked well in a limited geographic area, EcoTeams required a much wider pool from which to draw. This, and the difficulties encountered during the project, suggests that EcoTeams may not be an appropriate/natural progression from the home visits. One suggestion from the team is to improve the in-home engagement model by having installers develop mini-action plans with residents (who can opt-out), which could then be followed up with support through one or more post-visit telephone calls.

By far the most important role in TiS is that of installer: a basic understanding of DIY and plumbing is essential alongside strong interpersonal skills. The installation of water saving devices can be easily trained-in, as was in Coventry, as long as installers are confident in DIY-type work. Environmental knowledge and the ability to provide environmental advice can also be trained in. What is most difficult to train in are (1) buy-in to the aims and ethos of the project and (2) engaging residents in the home. These are attitudes and skills that can be developed through good management and interactive learning experiences, like role-play and shadowing.
SECTION 4: LESSONS FOR BEHAVIOUR CHANGE

Tap into Savings is an ambitious project that is interesting from a range of perspectives, particularly in terms of its potential replicability and scaleability, the integration of different retrofit measures into a single ‘offer’, and its key focus on the relationship between a technical approach, on the one hand, and a behavioural one on the other.

The project has evidently faced a number of operational challenges which forced it to go up a steep learning curve and adapt the project, with the net result being that outputs were below target (in some cases significantly so). The project team, as a result, have amassed a wealth of knowledge which in turn has provided GLF with a rich set of learning to draw on in terms of operational lessons for delivering projects like this.

Alongside operational and delivery factors, the project also offers a range of important reflections on behaviour change, for example:

• **Engagement methods** - the relative merits and value of different methods of engagement, and the overarching need to adopt a multi-methods approach to ‘hit’ residents with the project a number of times in a number of different settings;

• **Intermediaries** - the ability of the installers to engage with residents and encourage behaviour changes is closely aligned to the quality and quantity of training. Where the project was able to invest time in training installers, not just on the process of retrofit itself but the wider rationale about water savings, satisfaction was notably higher (although there is no information to determine whether higher levels of engagement and satisfaction led to behaviour change). This model of delivery, and the learning about what makes an effective intermediary in relation to retrofit projects like this, has a number of important lessons for new policy initiatives such as the Government’s forthcoming Green Deal.

• **Legitimacy of the messenger** – this is particularly important where there are suspicions about scams in the area. A multi-methods approach (increasing the number of ‘opportunities to hear’) as well as logos and endorsement from trusted local stakeholders (e.g. council, Housing Trust) is critical in this context.

• **Synergies between energy and water** – the integration of energy efficiency measures alongside water appears to have increased resident participation, lending support to further initiatives and research concerning how individual pro-environmental retrofit measures could be packaged together into integrated offerings.

However, the project does not appear – on the basis of the available quantitative evidence – to have led to behaviour change. Indications from the focus groups (i.e. that the project may have indeed influenced the behaviours of some participants) cannot be substantiated by either the water meter readings or the survey.

Because of the number of operational challenges faced by the project team during delivery it is not possible to fully assess the extent to which the lack of behaviour change is a function of the approach itself or the fact that the delivery challenges have hindered its ability to thoroughly test the approach.
One finding that is easier to discern is that the EcoTeams element of the project has faced a significant challenge in engaging the target audience. In keeping with the findings from GAP’s own GLF project, the evaluation suggests that the concept does not always transfer readily to different groups and, as a result, this calls into question whether a programme as intense and long term as EcoTeams – which places a ‘big ask’ on the part of residents – is necessarily the most appropriate vehicle to bridge the gap between a home visit retrofit programme and enabling sustained changes in behaviour. Further research would be beneficial to explore how retrofit programmes might combine with other behaviour change approaches.

In terms of EcoTeams specifically, the experience of TiS – alongside GAP’s own GLF project - establishes just how fundamental it is for projects to have links into existing community groups and local networks. It is noteworthy, for example, that TiS Ecoteams was markedly more successful in Coventry, where the city council facilitated introductions and discussions with local networks, than in the other areas.
SECTION 5: THE PROJECT’S KEY ADVICE

The following is taken from Waterwise’s own Final Report, and represents the advice that they would offer projects trying to undertake similar projects.

Work package 1 – Home visits

- **Understand your audience, interact with them whenever possible, and build variety into your selling plan** - what is clear is that high-level communications and direct mailings, which both rely on set messages, cannot alone achieve uptake of more than 5-15%. Events, telephoning and door stepping can all boost uptake – and these all allow tailored responses to residents and thus flexible messaging, which can be developed around known motivators. Training recruiters to understand motivators and barriers as well as to recognise when and how to use them is crucial to project success. It is also important to pick up on and counter unintentional messages that may be coming across to residents; for example, some residents assumed home visits required water meters or that they had to have all the products on offer – once it was made clear that water meters were not part of the project or that choice was available, some of these residents went on to have home visits.

- **Tailor projects to local residents’ needs and create incentives for organisations to partner** - integrate energy efficiency into water efficiency home visits whenever financially and practically feasible. Combining water and energy is likely to appeal more to (a) residents since the financial savings from home visits will be greater and (b) partners who have carbon reduction targets.

- **Understand your partners, secure support from the right people and champion integration** - recognising partners’ motivations and identifying barriers that may be preventing involvement will enable successful partnerships. Knowing how partner organisations work so that buy-in from higher levels of management can be secured and the right people in the right departments can be engaged is essential. The facilitating partner’s role must be to recognise opportunities for quick-win integration and then champion the pursuit of these opportunities within partner organisations.

- **Project staff are residents too, secure their buy-in and invest time to train them properly** - make sure all frontline staff have been offered whatever the project is offering. They will have personal experiences to draw on when engaging with residents and – if they decline – they will at least know what the offer is and understand why some may refuse it. Environmental knowledge can be trained but local knowledge cannot, so having local staff on board is helpful. Making sure all frontline staff have excellent interpersonal skills is crucial.

Work Package 2 – TiS EcoTeams

- **Tailor to the community** - recruitment and delivery are most effective when flexibility is built into project plans so that staff can respond to opportunities/challenges as they arise. Linking in with local priorities and initiatives is important to maintain cohesiveness and extend reach. Even small changes, such as the times during which telephone calls are made, make a difference.

- **Make full use of ‘taster’ sessions** - EcoTeams are hard to explain on paper or through a presentation but once people see them in action then it all makes sense.
- **Reduce the initial ‘ask’** - residents were sometimes put off by the thought of committing to a whole series of meetings over a long time period.

- **Ensure all partner organisations fully understand the concept** - once partners understand and value EcoTeams, then they can promote them within their own networks.

- **Properly engage installers** - a short presentation on EcoTeams to installers is not enough to secure buy-in and ensure they sell it to residents. Invest time so that they understand the programme, see its value, and have the opportunity to ask questions.
Part B: Synthesis

This part of the report focuses on the cross-cutting themes and collective learning from GLF. Unlike part A, which presents detailed ‘Deep Dive’ case studies for each of projects individually, it provides a synthesis of the key findings across the programme as a whole and then focuses on the implications for policy and for CSOrgs delivering pro-environmental behaviour change initiatives.

The findings are presented according to four themes:

- A summary of projects’ outputs
- Learning about delivery
- Learning about behaviour change
- Legacy, scope for scale up and replication

The analysis draws on the material from the Deep Dive case studies and – additionally – from Brook Lyndhurst’s site visits and interviews with each of the projects.

As a reference tool for the reader, Table 1 in the Introduction outlines a headline summary of each of the GLF projects. The distinction between the project and its constituent strands of work is important because in some cases these strands were distinct and autonomous projects that did not integrate together. Therefore, for the remainder of the report the strands are referred to as ‘work packages’.

1. Summary of projects’ outputs

A review of the outcomes from GLF demonstrates that it successfully scaled up the delivery of pro-environmental initiatives (significantly so in some cases). While each project’s full list of outputs is outlined in the respective deep dive case studies in Part A, the table below sets out a summary of the projects’ key outputs.
### Core outputs from GLF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Key outcomes</th>
<th>Additional commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustrans</strong></td>
<td><strong>WP1: TravelSmart</strong>&lt;br&gt;• 10,074 Sustainable Travel Information packs (target: 11,250)&lt;br&gt;• 3,530 discount cards for local cycling/walking retailers (target: 6,550)&lt;br&gt;• 704 eco-driving packs (target 1,200)&lt;br&gt;• 14 Pedometers (target: 20)&lt;br&gt;• 17 bus test tickets (target: 25)&lt;br&gt;• 72 home advice sessions (no target)</td>
<td>Wide reach achieved - large numbers of information packs deployed, households door-stepped and web site users. However, specific outputs (e.g. bus test tickets) played a small part; and the number of follow up home advice sessions – potentially providing deeper engagement - was also low.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NUS</strong></td>
<td><strong>WP2: iTravelSmart</strong>&lt;br&gt;• 375,000 iTravelSmart website users (target: 240,000)</td>
<td>The project had an array of outputs across each of the three work packages, as well as through the umbrella Degrees Cooler campaign. In many instances the outputs exceeded the original target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WP3: LivingSmart</strong>&lt;br&gt;• 514 LivingSmart waste info packs (target: 500)&lt;br&gt;• 414 energy info packs (target: 650)&lt;br&gt;• 66 home energy monitors (target: 100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Umbrella supporting brand: Degrees Cooler</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Website, online forum; 2 films (target: 1 film)&lt;br&gt;• Branding materials including: 10,000 flyers (target: 10,000), 3,000 post-its (target: 3,000), 3,000 pens (target: 3,000), 750 desk-top calendars (target: 750), 750 thermometers (target: 750).&lt;br&gt;• Photo competition - 160 entries (target: none)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WP1: Student Switch Off (SSO)</strong>&lt;br&gt;• 16% of students signed up as 'Eco-Power Rangers' in Year 1; 18% in Year 2 – 14,117 in total (target: 10%/year)&lt;br&gt;• 14 Facebook groups - one for each University which signed up (target: 10)&lt;br&gt;• 15 emails to c.7,000 students each time (target: none)&lt;br&gt;• 7,000 Energy savings tips posters (target: 8,000)&lt;br&gt;• 5,000 coasters Year 1 and 41,000 in Year 2 (target: 5,000)&lt;br&gt;• 6,000 SSO branded cotton bags per year (target: 5,000)&lt;br&gt;• Distribution of Ben &amp; Jerry's merchandise - 300 vouchers, 5,000 stickers, 1,000 freezer bags, 200 T-shirts (targets: none)&lt;br&gt;• 4 Ben &amp; Jerry's ‘ice cream parties’ (target: none)&lt;br&gt;• SSO Photo Competition (744 photos submitted Year 1, 596 Year 2)&lt;br&gt;• Film screenings - 872 attendees in Year 1; 410 in Year 2 (target: 400/year)&lt;br&gt;• Climate change quiz - 2,287 participants in Y1; 2,913 in Y2 (target: 1,000/yr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WP2: Green Impact Universities</strong>&lt;br&gt;• 19 Green Impact workbooks (target: 19)&lt;br&gt;• 275 Audit reports (target: 225)&lt;br&gt;• Average of twenty teams per university - 14,606 staff in Y1; 23,667 in Y2.&lt;br&gt;• 2,461 pledges&lt;br&gt;• 1,375 departmental audits&lt;br&gt;• Launch event - 368 attendees&lt;br&gt;• Awards ceremonies - 1,460 attendees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WP3: People &amp; Planet Going Greener</strong>&lt;br&gt;• 300 Action Guides&lt;br&gt;• 200 Campaign Guides and Workbook&lt;br&gt;• Green League 2010 &amp; 11, Shared Planet 2009 &amp; 10&lt;br&gt;• Go Green Week 2010 - estimated reach: 25,916 students&lt;br&gt;• Go Green Week 2011: Meat-Free Monday activities (estimated reach: 4,924 students); Travel-Light Tuesday activities (3,230); Waste-Not Wednesday activities (3,235); Switch-Off Thursday (4,800); behaviour pledges (525)&lt;br&gt;• Environmental film screenings (70 participants)&lt;br&gt;• Carbon Speed Dating Events (63 students, 3 universities), Can Film Festivals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Trust</td>
<td>WP1: Engaging family visitors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchen gardens and infrastructure – e.g. a Keder Greenhouse, 3 seating benches, 24 potments, a kitchen garden, 3 veg stalls, 40 raised growing beds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooking &amp; food – e.g. a baking demonstration kitchen, 2 fruit cages and irrigation systems, a Cider exhibition, 17,540 recipe cards, 1,250 recipe books.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Displays and information – e.g. 15 displays for ‘how to grow in containers’, 15,750 ‘how to grow’ leaflets, 2,500 ‘how to make compost’ info sheets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bees, chickens &amp; pigs – e.g. 1 observation bee hive, 3 pigs, 25 chickens plus coop, feed, fencing etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children’s activities – e.g. 5 ride-on toy tractors, 4 food trails, 1,500 restaurant activity sheets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverford Organic activity day (estimated reach – 5,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bread making (estimated reach – 1,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recipe competition (250 entries)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food trails (estimated reach - 4,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sow &amp; Grow demonstrations (estimated reach – 26,324)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Children’s gardening clubs (estimated reach – 44)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘How to Bake’ workshops (estimated reach – 3,600)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooking demos (estimated reach – 2,515)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strawberry fields planting (estimated reach – 400)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WP2: Growing spaces

- 341 new plots and 4 community areas created at 12 sites (target: 10).
- A total of 1,366 people growing on these spaces (target: 1,000)
- Seasonal workshops (no estimate of reach; no target)
- Swap shops (no estimate of reach; no target)
- Growing competition (no estimate of reach; no target)
- Allotment courses (estimated reach: 120)
- Community BBQ (estimated reach: 120)

WP3: Training staff and volunteers

- 492 National Trust staff and volunteers trained
- Big Harvest Conference – 138 staff and volunteers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co-op</th>
<th>WP1: Action for a sustainable future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59 behavioural actions with associated CO₂ and waste metrics (target: 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Automated online communication system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greener Together brand and website, with forum and online messaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online pledge system with follow-up support email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting material for developed behavioural actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greener Together Twitter and Face book Pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43 Eco-operators recruited (target: 50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>974 participants making pledges (target: 3,600).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A range of ‘collective actions’ undertaken by cooperatives (e.g. swap shop, seed shop, film showings, litter picking days). Estimates of attendance: 30 - 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eco Operators gatherings – facilitated events for Eco-Operators to share learning and experiences (22 attended).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WP2: Knowledge for a sustainable future

- A large volume of online media articles with potential reach over 800,000
- Articles in Food Ethics Council, Three Counties Cooperative, and Co-operative News Magazines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSC</th>
<th>WP1: Supply chain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,000 MSC on the Menu training DVDs (target: 2,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>750 ‘Before certification’ restaurant packs, distribution on-going (target:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The outputs from WP1 were high in number but small in scale, and varied from one Trust property to another. It is clear that – for the outputs in combination and across the 20 properties as a whole – the project achieved scale – engaging 1,716,129 visitors (just short of the target of 2,000,000). Engagement was relatively light touch and tended to be a single event and/or a single day.

In contrast, WP2 was a more targeted intervention involving much deeper engagement with participants (as well as supporting events to foster the social and community elements of project). The outputs achieved exceeded the original targets.

WP1 produced a basket of 59 behaviour actions with associated CO₂ and waste metrics. The number of Eco-operators recruited was slightly below target, and the number of participants who made pledges was substantially below target. The project team contends that the ‘collective actions’ helped to strengthen the programme and extend its reach into communities beyond the participants of the organisations.

WP1 involved the creation – and subsequent deployment -
WP1 led to home visits and the installation of water and energy efficiency devices. There is no target to measure against, but the project evidently deployed a large number of devices (10,353). The number of home visits was significantly below target (3,496 vs. a target of 7,600), although work remained on-going at the time of reporting.

WP2 led to the creation of 27 TIS EcoTeams involving 182 participants (an average of 6.7 participants/group). This was significantly below the original target. The distribution of participants across the three areas indicates greater success in Coventry compared to either Merstham/Redhill or Braintree.

---

### Waterwise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP1: Home visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 3,496 home visits (target: 7,600) (NB. 2,155 residents are still awaiting visits in Braintree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 8,127 water efficiency devices, e.g. tap inserts (no target)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2,226 energy efficiency devices, e.g. standby plug savers (no target)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 417 jute bags and 751 fat traps (no targets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1,200 leaflets with direct mailing in Merstham/Redhill (target: 1,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1,500 ‘refer a friend’ cards in Coventry (target: 6,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DIY kit offer with direct mailing to 2,180 hh’s in Braintree (target: 2,180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3,029+ thermometer cards (target: 7,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 3,529+ home visit booklets (target: 7,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Website – <a href="http://www.tapintosavings.org">www.tapintosavings.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5 minute promotional video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2,500 stickers (target: 5,000); 400 posters (target: 440); Flyers and leaflets (number unknown; no target)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 450 magnetic notepad calendars (target: 886)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 50 wind up pig torches (target: 50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Direct mailing to 34,500 households (target: 34,500)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP2: TIS Eco Teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 27 Ecoteams, with 182 participants attending at least two events (target: 380)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 253 EcoTeam handbooks (target: 370)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 10 water games (target: 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 10 mix and match games (target: 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 75 EcoTeam posters (target: 75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1,650 EcoTeam flyers (target: 1,800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 50 electricity monitors (target: 50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 100 environmental freebies (no target)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 1,364 follow up telephone calls to those who had home visits (no target)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 4 recruitment events (target: 4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Learning about delivery

This section explores the key learning from GLF in terms of the delivery of pro-environmental behaviour change initiatives by Civil Society organisations. It was developed from the case studies in part 1 of this report and the even more extensive evidence lying behind them. Further detail about the range of evidence drawn upon, and the analysis and synthesis methods used, is set out in detail in the Annex.

The synthesis here explores six key issues, including the strengths and challenges of partnership working, the need for adequate project development time, and decentralised models of delivery that use intermediaries to access and engage a wider audience.

2.1 Decentralised delivery

One of the defining features of several of the projects was their use of a decentralised model of delivery. That is, the central project team engaged a group of local intermediaries who went on to engage with the wider membership. For Co-operatives UK the intermediary was the Eco-operator (who went on to engage Eco-pioneers); for National Trust it was the staff at individual National Trust properties (who went on to engage visitors); and for NUS it was the Eco-Power Rangers and Greener Living Advisors (who went on to engage students and staff, respectively). GLF has demonstrated that such a model can be an effective means of engaging a large audience, particularly via organisations with existing large membership bases. In each case, and given the lack of direct control they had in terms of delivery, the efforts of the central project team focused on empowering local groups and/or individuals to take a stake in the project’s development and then supporting them in their delivery.

*It’s a distributive model and the focus has been providing the tools and the frameworks to help them – and they then turn it into whatever they want to. Because co-operatives are very unique and independently minded they’ve all gone off on a different tangent. Southern Co-operative’s got 93,000 members and they were able to negotiate a deal with a local bus company, whereas Limpley did apple picking with a membership base of 135. Co-operatives UK*

*It’s a project at 20 Universities but it’s totally different at each one. So just framing it in the right way and getting them involved was better than saying ‘you are doing this project because we’ve got money from the Government’. Whether it was the students or the staff, they realised how they could shape it [the project]. NUS*

In spite of the benefits (and efficiencies) of a decentralised approach, all of the projects following this model highlight the importance of dedicated central support functions in the form of central tools and materials, or training. For example:

- National Trust responded to a perceived lack of resources, skills and capacity among its participating properties by employed two consultants (with a background in visitor attractions, sustainable food and learning techniques) to support communications and engagement work with visitors.
• NUS, through its umbrella Degrees Cooler campaign that supported each of its three work packages, developed common branding materials and activities that each University could draw upon and adapt.

• Co-operatives UK noted that the Eco-operator was the intended linchpin to the successful recruitment and engagement of Eco-pioneers, and acknowledge that technical and functionality issues with their online pledge platform had a detrimental effect on the level of support given to Eco-operators (e.g. no face-to-face training was delivered, as had originally been envisaged).

• Waterwise reported that the ability of the installers to engage residents on their behalf was closely aligned to the quality of training they received (which has a number of important lessons for new policy initiatives such as the Government’s Green Deal).

A lot of the Universities had said that they had wanted to run behaviour change campaigns, tried to do the awareness-raising side of things, but it’s just hard. They don’t have the time, but with Degrees Cooler they’ve been given a package that they can just get on and do basically. There is still time and effort involved in it but it’s something there that they can just run with really - and it’s fairly fluid so that they can adapt it to suit them. NUS

2.2 Partnership working

Partnership working was a key feature of many of the GLF projects, with partners providing a range of both financial and non-financial support. For example:

• Additional funding, e.g. Sustrans received an additional £293,300 through its local authority partners.

• Expertise, e.g. Sustrans reported that its LivingSmart work package was only made possible with the support of EST which provided materials and training for Sustrans fieldwork staff and secured home energy monitors from British Gas.

• Access to local groups and networks, e.g. Waterwise’s TiS EcoTeams were more successful in Coventry, which seem at least partly attributable to the fact that the city council actively promoted them to local groups and networks (see learning point 5).

• The value of pre-existing relationships, e.g. for their People & Planet work, NUS noted that existing groups were much easier to engage as they were more familiar with its methods, campaign model, and communication channels.

• Legitimacy and trust, e.g. Waterwise noted the benefits of using branding from local authority and Housing Association partners in their communications materials, which helped to give the project legitimacy / counter concerns about ‘scams’.

Nonetheless, GLF projects also noted that partnership working requires time and effort. Waterwise, for example, faced with large and complex partner organisations (e.g. Housing Associations, water utilities), devoted significant time early on in the project to understand how these organisations function and ‘who was who’ within them. Even with such early efforts, the challenge of on-going communication across multiple organisations complicated the delivery of the project – for example, a Housing Association partner did not link their rolling programme of maintenance to their GLF work which saw, in some cases, the new water-saving measures installed under GLF replaced by non-water efficient alternatives.
Furthermore, while Sustrans believe that British Gas’s contribution enhanced their LivingSmart work package (i.e. energy monitors were a good incentive for people to take up the in-home energy audits), the relationship took more staff time than expected and specific issues emerged around Data Protection. This was an issue that also caused unexpected difficulties for other projects, particularly GAP. For example, while 30,000 people registered their interest in EcoTeams through EDF Energy’s Team Great Britain website in Year 1, as a result of Data Protection issues there was a six month delay in GAP receiving contact details, and then only for 13,000 individuals (significantly hindering their ability to follow up on the initial interest that had been expressed).

The development of personal relationships was a key strategy for the NUS and National Trust project management teams, both of which attached significant importance to face-to-face meetings over email-only approaches.

*I think project management implies coming up with a plan and delivering it but a massive thing is building trust, friendship and a good working relationship. I've spent half my time on trains [visiting university partners], but it is definitely worth it.* NUS

*The key thing was kicking off personal relationships with every single nominated project manager, either at the Growing Space or the National Trust property. Some of them didn’t really work with e-mail very much, so we kind of had to work with a mix of phone, e-mail and personal visits.* National Trust

Some of the GLF projects were also notably successful in creating a sense of collective action among their project partners. NUS, for example, fostered a sense among partner universities that they were part of a group of vanguard Universities (which also helped to instil a level of competition between them, i.e. the universities were keen to learn what others in their peer group were doing and then either follow the approach or try to go one step further).

*The Universities had found it useful, and been glad to be part of a bigger project, partly just to be part of another 20 Universities that are all doing the same thing, and I guess having that kind of prestige attached with it.* NUS

### 2.3 Project development time and adaptability

Differences in the maturity of an initiative and/or the accumulated knowledge and ‘know how’ of the project team had a significant bearing on delivery. Many of the GLF projects underestimated set-up times, and some went through a rapid (and sometimes painful) learning curve. Examples include the problems encountered by Co-operatives UK in the development of the online pledge platform, and the fact that Waterwise were forced to find and work with new partners (in a new area) after one of the original project partners withdrew from the project. Providing the learning is embedded within the organisation (as opposed to one or two members of staff, who might leave), the learning curve can be seen as an important and necessary means of building organisational knowledge and expertise. Many of the projects also note that the preparatory phase of GLF, which was deliberatively built into the programme by Defra, was critical (with some noting that they could not have delivered the project without it):
It [the last intervention area] did go extraordinarily smoothly and I think that's because of all the difficulties that had come before it. We went in and it was like 'we need this and this, and it has to be like that'. And all the Data Protection issues were sorted out really quickly with no surprises. I know none of this was supposed to be a pilot, but the first intervention area was a pilot in some respects. Waterwise

The development of tools and materials took a long time, we probably kicked that off in December/January and we ended up with the restaurant packs in about June and the Comms materials kind of July. But I think it was worth it. We did quite a lot of consultation with the restaurants, talking to them and showing them things and saying 'What do you think about this? Is this right for you? Are you going to use this' - because we wanted it to be something that actually would be useful. MSC

More broadly, adaptability was a key characteristic of several of the projects and appears to have underpinned their success. MSC, for example, adapted their approach in a number of respects (e.g. shifting the focus to restaurant chains when it became clear that the project was not working as anticipated with independent restaurants; 'piggybacking' on a series of sustainability workshops that were being run by M&J Seafoods for their customers). Likewise, NUS took advantage of the fact that they had two academic years to test and refine their approach in response to feedback from participants and from the universities.

2.4 Technical capability

There were several instances in the delivery of GLF where a project lacked technical capability to deliver particular elements of the work programme, or where the formal support of EST was required to enable them to deliver. Specific problems with online tools are examples of the former, whereas the support that EST provided to Sustrans to deliver the LivingSmart work package is an example of the latter.

Using the experiences of Co-operatives UK and Global Action Plan with online platforms as specific case studies, in both instances the initial lack of technical capability had a significant impact on project delivery. For example, Co-operatives UK’s online pledge platform required complex and automated systems, back office functions and data retrieval, the creation of individual profiles for each of the Eco-pioneers related to their chosen pledges, and personalised reminders. Delays and glitches in the platform diverted attention away from other aspects of the project, notably the support for Eco-Operators to engage and recruit Eco-Pioneers (see learning point 1). Likewise, GAP encountered problems with its online platform that hindered recruitment and subsequent participation.

In both instances there were serious issues with the projects’ online contractors (that led, ultimately, to contract terminations), highlighting the value of having technical capability internally (or at least that could be drawn upon to the organisation). Co-operatives UK drew upon the skills of an external contractor during the re-tendering process to help guide the project manager, while GAP went one step further by ultimately taking the decision to bring the maintenance and development of the site fully in-house with an internal appointment. It is also noteworthy that Sustrans, in contrast to both of these projects, experienced few difficulties in delivering its online iTriavelSmart tool, which the project team attributed to existing in-house expertise in the form of Sustrans’ GIS team who helped them to specify the development work very tightly.
2.5 Accessing local networks

GLF highlights the benefits of, and in some cases fundamental need to, engage existing local groups and networks. For example, MSC were able to tap into local knowledge through coastal partnerships, local food groups and fishing organisations, which was crucial in terms of driving attendee numbers at *MSC on the Menu* events. Likewise, Waterwise noted that the TiS EcoTeams worked better in Coventry relative to the other two target areas, in large part because the Council introduced and promoted the EcoTeams concept locally prior to launch. In contrast, and with GAP’s own EcoTeams project, the project team acknowledged that the lack of engagement with existing groups was a particular weakness which hindered efforts to recruit participants.

_EcoTeams were successful in Coventry largely because of the ample amount of time for networking that was available prior to project launch. They were introduced to key local stakeholders, largely through Coventry City Council, so that once the project launched several channels for promotion and recruitment were already open._ Waterwise

_I think if you go to a local community group that’s already established and say ‘why don’t you deliver this EcoTeams training’ that would have worked more effectively. Whereas we were going out for mass members of the public and asking them to start an EcoTeam from scratch._ GAP

2.6 Staff Turnover

The issue of staff turnover did not present a challenge to many of the projects, in contrast to other Evaluation Funds which frequently cite this as a key barrier. The exception was Co-operatives UK, which faced the departure of the project manager not just once, but twice. While staff turnover had less of an impact on the other GLF projects during project delivery itself, key project staff from both Sustrans and NUS have moved on since completion of the project, which could likely present a challenge for legacy, scale up and replication.
3. Learning about behaviour change

This section explores the key lessons from GLF in relation to behaviour change. Drawing on the projects’ own evaluations (presented in the deep dive case studies), as well as depth interviews with the project leads, it explores a number of key issues, including audience engagement, social influence and the efficacy of specific behaviour change tools.

First, and as an overarching comment, the Deep Dive case studies (outlined in part B) demonstrate that some of the GLF projects were successful in changing behaviours. Rather than any instances of widespread and/or transformational change, the projects typically succeeded in encouraging a large number of people to undertake small shifts in their behaviour. For example, NUS’ Student Switch Off work package led to a 7-8% reduction in energy consumption in halls of residence. However, other GLF projects did not appear - on the basis of the available evidence - to demonstrably change behaviours.

The fact that the observed changes in behaviour were small in scale is unsurprising in light of wider barriers over which CSOrgs have no control (e.g. planning, regulation, market price signals); the timescale of some of the projects (i.e. which were in some instances short); and the focus on several projects on establishing the groundwork for subsequent behaviour change (i.e. focusing on bringing about cultural changes). For example, Sustrans acknowledge that the impact of TravelSmart is in part influenced by the prevailing travel infrastructure and services in an area, and that the project’s impact is greater in areas where local services and/or households are in a state of flux, e.g. a new housing development, or where there are new bus services/cycling and pedestrian infrastructure.

The small scale of behaviour changes is also attributable to the fact that many of the projects were working with audiences that were, to varying degrees, already pro-environmental in their outlook. Therefore, the predominant impact was reinforcement and/or stretching of existing behaviours, rather than initiating new behaviours. For example, participants in National Trust’s Growing Spaces work package were already growing on a small scale and their involvement enabled them to expand the frequency and scale of their efforts.

The existing pro-environmental outlook of some of the target audiences also helps explain the lack of attitudinal change in response to GLF (even though attitudinal change in and of itself was never one of GLF’s main objectives, especially in light of the existing evidence that attitudinal change alone is insufficient to challenge existing behaviours.

However, a notable exception where change was detected was in relation to a mandatory question that assessed participants’ sense of personal agency (e.g. agree/disagree that ‘it’s not worth doing things for the environment if others don’t do the same’). The positive shift achieved by some projects in this attitude indicates that the GLF projects were effective at increasing personal agency through promoting a sense of collective action. This outcome has been noted in other environmental behaviours programmes involving CSOrgs, such as NESTA’s Big Green Challenge and the Scottish Climate Challenge Fund review.

Two important caveats apply to our assessment of behaviour change and the analysis and interpretation that follows:

- First, the analysis is based on the available evidence which is subject to a number of limitations and caveats (notably, and for some projects, small sample sizes, variations in sampling approach and the lack of a meaningful control group), which does not allow for definitive, statistically robust analyses.
• Second, a key challenge for the evaluation is establishing, in instances where there is little or no behaviour change, whether this is reflective of a weakness in the underlying proposition or in how the proposition was delivered and/or evaluated. This is a critical distinction since the former suggests that fewer resources should be allocated to this type of initiative (or at least this type of initiative in relation to certain audiences/circumstances); whereas the latter suggests that further investment is required to test whether better delivery could lead to better behaviour change outcomes. For example:

• The proposition for Co-operative UK’s project had a number of strengths. It was built around collection actions, peer networks and team work, and its decentralised delivery model – using Eco-operators as an intermediary to engage Eco-pioneers – had a number of similarities with the approaches adopted by both NUS and National Trust. However, and as noted in ‘Delivery’, the project was significantly hindered by operational challenges around the departure of the project manager (twice) and technical challenges with the online platform, both of which ultimately diverted attention and support away from the Eco-operators. The final (4th) version of the website went live in July 2010. Because of these delivery challenges it is not possible to fully ascertain the project’s full potential in relation to behaviour change.

• The premise behind Waterwise’s TiS is both very interesting and pressing, in that it grapples with the key question, not just for water retrofits but also for energy retrofits as well, of how to marry technological solutions with behaviour change. On the basis of the available quantitative evidence there was little impact on behaviours, suggesting that the supporting engagement strategies need to be more hands on and extensive (and by association, more expensive), and that ‘light touch’ engagement support is potentially insufficient.

• It is difficult to ascertain from GAP’s EcoTeams project the extent to which there may be a problem with the core premise of marketing EcoTeams to a mass market audience, as opposed to a problem with how that aim was delivered by GAP in this instance. Problems with the website and the partnership with EDF Energy appeared to play a role. However, feedback from participants also suggests there may be an issue with the premise of asking individuals, on the basis of a single training event, to initiate and lead their own EcoTeam over a 5-6 month period. What is clear, from GAP’s own project as well as Waterwise’s variation, is that the proposition appears much stronger where there are links into existing local community groups and networks.

The remainder of this section looks at nine key lessons for behaviour change from GLF.
3.1 The range of approaches

In their bids, the projects had to explain how their approach would lead to behaviour change. Feedback from the initial bids suggests that projects’ understanding of this wasn’t always clear. In response, Brook Lyndhurst undertook a mapping exercise to identify similarities between the projects and their approaches to behaviour change.

Table 2 outlines a summary of the main theoretical drivers of behaviour change (Brook Lyndhurst 2011), against which Brook Lyndhurst have mapped the GLF projects. From this, it is evident that projects adopted a number of different approaches to behaviour change. Some focused largely on the personal norms and identity of individual households and adopted a service-based model of delivery (e.g. Sustrans). In contrast, others had a much greater focus on social norms and identity (e.g. NUS built their student-focused work package around group activities and social events that were intended to be fun and inspire peer competition). In general, the projects based on social models of change appear to have had a greater impact.

As a separate observation it is also noteworthy that, despite Defra encouraging bidding projects to link to the evidence base, only two projects – NUS and Waterwise – explicitly drew upon behaviour change theory (such as Defra’s 4Es, or MINDSPACE) in their proposal to Defra. This is not to say definitively that the other projects did not draw upon behaviour change models, or use their own experiences from previous projects, to help shape their approaches. But it may indicate a capacity issue for CSOrgs and their knowledge of the behaviour change literature.
### Table 2. Mapping GLF behaviour change tools vs. theoretical drivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal norms &amp; identity</th>
<th>NT 1</th>
<th>NT 2</th>
<th>NUS 1</th>
<th>NUS 2</th>
<th>NUS 3</th>
<th>WW1</th>
<th>WW2</th>
<th>Sus 1</th>
<th>Sus 2</th>
<th>Sus 3</th>
<th>GAP</th>
<th>Coop1</th>
<th>Coop2</th>
<th>MSC1</th>
<th>MSC2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helps participants believe the issue is important?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak to participants' values?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give participants information &amp; knowledge?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal footprint/monitoring?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies what simple steps people can do?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps promote personal agency?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands on support?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/skills?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained/built in commitment strategies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Habits</th>
<th>NT 1</th>
<th>NT 2</th>
<th>NUS 1</th>
<th>NUS 2</th>
<th>NUS 3</th>
<th>WW1</th>
<th>WW2</th>
<th>Sus 1</th>
<th>Sus 2</th>
<th>Sus 3</th>
<th>GAP</th>
<th>Coop1</th>
<th>Coop2</th>
<th>MSC1</th>
<th>MSC2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-home/work assessment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback about performance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reminders?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands on support?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/skills?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained/built in commitment strategies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social norms &amp; identity</th>
<th>NT 1</th>
<th>NT 2</th>
<th>NUS 1</th>
<th>NUS 2</th>
<th>NUS 3</th>
<th>WW1</th>
<th>WW2</th>
<th>Sus 1</th>
<th>Sus 2</th>
<th>Sus 3</th>
<th>GAP</th>
<th>Coop1</th>
<th>Coop2</th>
<th>MSC1</th>
<th>MSC2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer competition?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer support?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun/social events?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrate/reward achievements?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusted messenger?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building/capitalizing on community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social norms – descriptive or injunctive?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External conditions</th>
<th>NT 1</th>
<th>NT 2</th>
<th>NUS 1</th>
<th>NUS 2</th>
<th>NUS 3</th>
<th>WW1</th>
<th>WW2</th>
<th>Sus 1</th>
<th>Sus 2</th>
<th>Sus 3</th>
<th>GAP</th>
<th>Coop1</th>
<th>Coop2</th>
<th>MSC1</th>
<th>MSC2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to new services/products/infrastructure?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money saving?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to finance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice edit?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplification / leading by example</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning processes</th>
<th>NT 1</th>
<th>NT 2</th>
<th>NUS 1</th>
<th>NUS 2</th>
<th>NUS 3</th>
<th>WW1</th>
<th>WW2</th>
<th>Sus 1</th>
<th>Sus 2</th>
<th>Sus 3</th>
<th>GAP</th>
<th>Coop1</th>
<th>Coop2</th>
<th>MSC1</th>
<th>MSC2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion – scrutiny of action?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning by doing – hands on projects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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**Key:** Dark blue – core focus; light blue – partial focus
3.2 Understanding the target audience and tailoring approaches

Several GLF projects stood out for their ability to understand their target audience and tailor their engagement accordingly. For example, and to bring about sustained engagement, Degrees Cooler adopted a people-centred approach that involved a stream of outputs (e.g. film screening, photo competitions) that were fun, engaging and ensured the project retained a continual presence as well as momentum. Their incentives (e.g. Ben and Jerry’s ice cream, cinema tickets) were also tailored to appeal to a student audience. Likewise, National Trust developed their visitor activities on the basis of hand-on, sensory and fun experiences for the family. ‘Fun’ was in fact a recurring theme and deliberate behaviour change strategy for both of these projects:

*We encouraged applications which focused on a really amazing experience for visitors, with really hands-on, participative, sensory activities, things that people are going to really enjoy and things that were going to be memorable for people, because we think that that’s the best context to achieve behaviour change. When people are relaxed and enjoying themselves they’re more open to new ideas. National Trust*

*SSO is kind of cool, it’s fun, it’s about prizes, it’s not just about environmental stuff, it’s also about just getting involved, doing something your mates are doing, having a laugh and getting a free Ben & Jerry’s. So we had people get involved who said ‘I would never have normally got involved but I think it’s a really good thing’. NUS*

Some of the projects undertook scoping research as part of their project development to understand how their audience would react to different kinds of messaging. National Trust and NUS, for example, learnt that their audiences responded well to positive messaging, whereas for Waterwise it made clear the need to include some strong cost saving messages. Likewise, audience insight work helped MSC to engage their supply chain audiences on the premise of the business, rather than environmental, case.

3.3 Engaging the audience

The value of face-to-face and/or one-to-one engagement has already been highlighted in relation to partners and intermediaries, and it also proved to be a recurring theme in relation to participants. For example, Sustrans found that respondents were very positive about the one-to-one nature of the contact with both the TravelSmart and LivingSmart home advisors. For NUS, face-to-face events in halls of residence were a successful means of engaging students, while on-site launch events were important in overcoming initial difficulties recruiting staff. Furthermore, Co-operatives UK noted that feedback from Eco-operators highlighted how important peer-to-peer relationships were.

Waterwise’s TiS provided a useful test of various methods recruitment for the home visits, using direct mail, face-to-face (via both door stepping and events), and telephone contact. They found that direct mail could not elicit more than a 5-15% sign up rate, and so both telephone and face-to-face methods were also required to directly engage with residents. More broadly, the project team noted the need for a multi-methods approach to ‘hit’ residents with the project a number of times in a number of different settings:

*We come back to this time and time again – talking to people – it’s labour intensive but seems to be the best way. The really
interesting bit for us was that people were saying ‘Oh, yes, I remember seeing that letter’ or ‘Oh yes, I saw you at the supermarket’ or ‘Oh yes I saw your posters’, but they had never signed up. But then on the doorstep they decided to sign up so there were a lot of times when we were out and about talking to people that people were saying things like ‘I got the letter, I saw the poster and I saw you at the supermarket’ but only when we arrived on their doorstep did they actually take it up. Waterwise MSC also offers some important insights about engaging specific audiences. For example, while fisherman were initially difficult to engage because MSC certification was perceived as a lower order priority, the MSC on the Menu events were well received and demonstrated the audience’s interest in sustainability. A significant outcome was the MSC identifying the need for an English Fisheries outreach officer.

3.4 Targeting the audience

One of MSC’s success factors was its ability to target a small number of key individuals/organisations in the supply chain and focus on sustained engagement. It is noteworthy in this respect that, mid-project, they changed their focus from (a large number of) independent restaurants to (a smaller number of) restaurant chains.

I could be on the phone every day for an hour with a small bistro and after six months it could get certified. I could spend that same amount of time with a large chain or with a pub group or with a caterer and at the end of that time they could have 500 sites certified so it is getting that into perspective. Yes, the independent restaurants, the opinion-forming ones, we definitely want then. But with the resources we have we have to be quite tactical in terms of who we engage with. MSC

In contrast, other projects with a particularly diverse target audience faced a challenge catering to this diversity. For example, Co-operatives UK noted that many participants did not feel sufficiently challenged by the original set of 20 pledges and so the list was expanded substantially to 59 (and an online pledge generator also created to allow participants to create their own pledges). This meant that the pledge system ended up incorporating a very wide range of behaviours, from the basic (e.g. turn down the thermostat) to the advanced (e.g. install micro-generation). Those participants who were less engaged initially found it easier to get on board with the pledges, whereas participants who were already engaged found little to challenge them (apart from installations of new equipment which present significant financial challenges).

When we did some stakeholder testing in the beginning we noticed that there is a huge range within the people that we tested. So some people were still not taking their own bag to the supermarket and some people were ready to put in Photovoltaics. So we needed to cover that range basically and it was a tricky one because the more actions you add the more complicated the system becomes. Co-operatives UK
3.5 Social influences

As noted in Table 2, several of the GLF projects – NUS, National Trust and MSC in particular – stand out because of their approach drew heavily upon of social influences (in the case of MSC the reader should replace ‘social influences’ with ‘market influences’, although the same principle applies). For example:

- **NUS’ Degrees Cooler** programme was designed to bring students in halls of residence together around fun activities, and the project team note that it was more successful on campus universities where levels of engagement were higher (in contrast to universities with low student engagement levels overall, particularly in London).

- National Trust incorporated the social setting into their project in two key respects, firstly to frame the visitor experiences as an ‘enjoyable day out for the family’, and secondly in terms of the communal element of the Growing Spaces work package. To the project team the social setting was not simply a side effect, but a central means of delivering Growing Spaces (i.e. events, newsletters, celebrations and training all cultivated the sense of community which in turn kept growers engaged).

- One of MSC’s successes was its ability to understand market norms and, in particular, foster competitive market pressures. Sodexo’s certification set the standard and the press surrounding this prompted meetings with other caterers. Later on, and once the race to be the first to be certified (i.e. ‘first mover advantage’) had been settled, the commercial pressure for the other caterers shifted from ‘trying to be the first’ to ‘trying not to get left behind’.

  There was a constant balance between achieving the targets of the project and making sure clients didn’t lose interest because they saw their competitor make some headway or put out an article first. It’s an interesting contrast to the original situation where they were sort of saying ‘if they do it first, we won’t’. And now it’s ‘they’ve done it so we have to’. MSC

3.6 Tools

The GLF projects collectively provide a useful contribution to the evidence base concerning specific behaviour change tools, as follows:

- **Feedback and competition** – both of these were an important part of NUS’ Student Switch Off work package, which used regular feedback on energy performance (as well as a prize incentive) to foster competition between halls of residence. Feeding back and formally recognising achievement was also a key feature of their Green Impact Universities work package among staff, helping to encourage new participants, motivate existing ones and demonstrate senior-level buy-in. However, the experience of Co-operatives UK demonstrates that feedback and competition have the potential to accentuate negative impacts and demotivate participants (in this instance the Eco-operatives who were sent feedback on their progress), if it serves to highlight on-going problems/lack of progress.

  Some of the Eco Operators had it tough - they get their weekly emails about how well they’ve done and where they are against their targets and for a lot of them it wasn’t moving. One of our Eco Operators was like ‘I don’t even read those emails anymore’ -
they’ve just switched off because they just don’t want to hear the bad news. Co-operatives UK

- **Incentives** – While incentives were not a core part of many of the GLF projects, feedback from some of the projects offers a nuanced perspective on the role of incentives. For example, and while considered highly effective for some audiences (e.g. students as part of Degrees Cooler who were engaged with e.g. Ben & Jerry’s freebies), some experiences, for example Co-operative UK’s engagement with individual co-operators, suggests that financial incentives did not engage their audience.

  I’d probably say 80% of our organisations were not doing it for the money. Two organisations that have been driven by the money, possibly three, they’ve got the payout. The rest haven’t got the payout but they’ve still done Community actions, they’ve still put people through, they’ve still publicised it, they’re just doing it for a different reason. Co-operatives UK

- **Targeting barriers** – in addition to successfully targeting and engaging their audience, some projects also successfully identified and then addressed the key barriers faced by their audience. For example, MSC were able to identify and ‘pick off’ individual barriers to sustainable seafood purchases among Sodexo site managers. Some of the barriers that were detected at the evaluation baseline, such as a ‘lack of information’ or ‘high price premiums’, were less prominent at follow up. In addition, part of the National Trust’s programme of activities involved ‘Chop & Chat’ sessions that focused on peoples’ lack of knowledge around food preparation and cooking.

  ‘Chop and chat’ sessions proved hugely popular. Many people are interested in growing their own food but then are maybe unconfident in actually cooking it, so lots of our chefs would take visitors with them into the kitchen gardens to harvest produce, and they would then cook in front of them, just showing how quick and easy and cost effective it is to grow and cook your own food. National Trust

- **Audits** – this tool underpinned NUS’ Green Impact Universities work package and led to the completion of 275 audits (which enabled participants to identify and track simple behaviour changes in the office/work environment). However, the project notes that a radical reformatting was required for Year 2 to make the audit tool more accessible for the end user.

- **Online tools** – while the delivery side of online tools has already been discussed, their impact supporting behaviour change appears mixed. Some of the tools that have been developed under GLF, for example the iTravelSmart tool, seem to have played a specific role consolidating or stretching existing behaviours (indeed, the target user group for this tool was existing cyclers). Some tools (e.g. the Degrees Cooler website) had an important branding and coordination function, but were not aimed at changing behaviours in and of themselves. Others, however, had less success. Co-operative UK’s platform, for example, elicited fewer pledges than anticipated; while issues with the accessibility of GAP’s EcoTeams site were also raised by users. Both of these appear to be the result of specific technical problems, and so their potential impact on behaviours (or their appropriateness for different groups of consumers) is largely unknown.
• **Champions** – several GLF projects used champions to engage a wider audience and/or to cascade information, and in most cases their success in engaging existing champions was tempered by difficulties appointing new champions. For example, MSC successfully identified and empowered existing champions in the fishing sector who, once on board, were able to galvanise opinion within what is a highly fragmented industry. However, and in contrast, their ‘train the trainer’ strategy for seafood suppliers (i.e. depot managers going on to train their staff) was ineffective. The NUS’s GIU work programme also offers some key learning about champions and how they can be supported. For example, teams where the champions had support from their colleagues had more success than those ‘battling it alone’. Furthermore, these champions also found it easier to act with management-level support (and so, in response, personalised letters of thanks summarising university and programme level achievements were sent to all Vice-Chancellors, union Managers and Presidents).

• **Pledges** – The experience of GLF projects raises serious questions about the potential for pledge-based systems to encourage behaviour change, at least where there is no in-built ‘commitment’ strategy. In both of the projects where they were deployed – Co-operatives UK and NUS – there is very little verification of whether the original pledges took place. In the case of NUS, over 7,000 pledges were made but only 6% responded to follow-up contact (and, as a result, only 240 pledges could be confirmed). Theoretical impacts resulting from these pledged changes appear relatively meaningless.

### 3.7 Spill over

There was little evidence of behavioural spill-over, at least within the timescale of GLF. In some instances (e.g. MSC, NUS) there were anecdotal suggestions that behaviours were spilling over between the domains of work and home, but no robust or systematic evidence to support these observations. The one notable exception where spill over was detected was in relation to food growing which, as part of National Trust’s *Growing Spaces* project, appears to have acted as an entry point or behavioural ‘gateway’ to a wider repertoire of behaviours that includes composting, water butts and food waste reduction.

### 3.8 Synergies between issues

Several of the GLF projects noted the potential for synergistic impacts by bringing together a more targeted and joined-up offering. For example, Sustrans’ *LivingSmart* pilot was a particularly interesting test case in that it integrated waste, energy and transport advice into a single package. The evaluation suggests that it was successful, with a number of energy and waste behaviour changes evident (predominantly households scaling up their existing pro-environmental behaviours). Opportunities also arose during Waterwise’s *TiS* to include energy efficiency retrofit measures, and there is anecdotal evidence from installer feedback that the inclusion of these energy measures, in combination with water measures, motivated some residents to book a home visit.

> I think everybody's pretty much of the opinion that it's no point in just being water alone and if you're actually in somebody's home and you're fitting water stuff you might as well actually be able to provide advice on insulation, you might as well be able to answer their questions about recycling. Waterwise

Furthermore, and looking at the potential overlap with community cohesion benefits, there are very few documented examples from GLF - potentially because it was measured largely in a qualitative sense by the projects and based on anecdotal feedback. Furthermore, some projects explicitly stated that they did not set out to have a positive impact in this respect.
The clearest example of positive impacts on community cohesion comes from the National Trust’s *Growing Spaces* work package. Many of the participants reported that they felt more part of the community as a result of the project. Furthermore, a desire to be part of a community was a strong motivation for people to join the project in the first instance. Indeed, one of the defining aspects of this work package is the importance of community as a recruitment tool (i.e. people wanting to join a group activity), a support network (to share learning) and an outcome in and of itself (i.e. people feeling more part of the community).
4. Legacy, scope for scale up and replication

On the basis of the deep dive case studies and interviews with the project leads, the legacies derived from GLF are found to be multiple and varied, and it would appear that some projects have been successful, in many respects, in embedding long term change and commitment. For example:

- **Relationships**: GLF has enabled projects to make new contacts and develop relationships. For example, the relationships developed by MSC over the course of GLF should continue, allowing further expansion within this market with more certified products and outlets. A number of businesses that the MSC have been working with over the length of the project are close to announcing their certification and this will be a direct consequence of the project.

- **Infrastructure**: a number of the projects have installed physical infrastructure, for example the kitchen gardens and growing beds at National Trust properties, or the water saving measures installed as part of TiS.

- **Communications/engagement materials**: one of the most common legacy themes is the engagement materials that have been created as part of GLF (e.g. the MSC on the Menu DVDs, the materials designed for the National Trust properties, the Degrees Cooler freebies, etc).

- **Staffing**: several of the projects report that staff will be retained post-GLF. For example, National Trust report that many of the roles will continue to be funded by the organisation (e.g. the sustainable food co-ordinator’s role, some roles at property level, and the majority of the volunteer roles). Likewise, NUS report that 12 of the Greener Living Advisors have had their positions extended or made permanent (self-funded by the individual institutions), and Waterwise report that three jobs created under TiS will continue (the Evaluation Manager and Programme Manager at Waterwise, and the Programme Manager at GAP).

- **Mainstreaming**: a number of the projects highlight that the impact of the project on their own organisation has been a key outcome. National Trust, for example, contend that the GLF project has demonstrated how sustainable food can be a successful vehicle for engaging visitors, as well as a way for properties to reach out and connect to the local communities around them (both of which are key strategic drivers for the organisation).

- **Self-Funding and alternative funding models** – a particularly encouraging legacy for some of the projects is where they look set to continue, develop and/or expand. NUS, for example, report that Degrees Cooler will continue on a self-funding structure, with Universities paying for the service on their campuses. Due to the popularity of the work package, Green Impact Universities in particular has been able to roll-out to a further eighteen universities and colleges on a self-funded basis. Furthermore, the Environment Agency West Midlands has funded GAP to work with Severn Trent Water, South Staffordshire Water and six housing providers to run EcoTeams alongside a regional water efficiency retrofit programme (although this is noteworthy, and potentially challenging, in light of the evidence from GLF that such this particular variant of the EcoTeams model does not appear to lead to changes in behaviour).
Scaling up and replication

The GLF projects as a collective demonstrate the potential for further scale up and/or replication. For example:

- **MSC on the Menu** is a good example of what can be achieved within a supply chain (albeit a relatively well defined and ‘short’ supply chain) by scaling up and accelerating engagement work.

- National Trust believe that a replicated version of *Eat into Green Living* would be possible within similar organisations or networks which have an established membership base, have the potential to operate as a centrally supported network, and have staff who understand the aims of the project and have the capacity to take on responsibility for delivery. However, the team also note one caveat about existing capacity – the GLF project was already in line with National Trust’s existing objectives and so staff were able to understand the project’s aims and readily come forward with proposals. More capacity building may be needed within other organisations or networks if this pre-existing knowledge and/or strategic fit is not as strong.

- NUS contend that *Degrees Cooler* could easily be scaled up to cover more participants at existing universities and/or participants at additional universities. Furthermore, the project believes that a similar programme could easily be adapted for other types of organisations within the education sector, providing that different audiences and different settings are suitably engaged and targeted. For example, the SSO concept is relatively replicable and the project is currently working with People & Planet to pilot a version whereby schools in a local area will compete against each other to see which one can achieve the largest reduction in energy use. The project also sees scope to deploy the programme in other large multi-location organisations where people naturally work in units - including local authorities, NHS trusts or Government Departments.

- Some of the projects also point to an impact internationally. The learning and outputs from *MSC on the Menu*, for example, have already proved invaluable for MSC foodservice work in other countries. Furthermore, Co-operatives UK’s *Greener Together* concept has been tested with a small number of co-operatives in Europe to consider how they could translate and adapt the concept to engage their own members in behaviour change as part of their climate change agenda.
5. Discussion, Conclusions & Implications for policy

This section draws from the evidence presented throughout the previous sections of the report, on its own merits and in the context of the research team’s wider knowledge base of similar programmes involving CSorgs. (The Annex explains the processes used to develop the synthesis and implications). The research team’s own evaluation of the implications of the findings from the GLF for the delivery of behaviour change initiatives by Civil Society Organisations follows:

Influencing pro-environmental behaviours

- Funding projects like this can lead to large scale delivery of pro-environmental projects that are capable of bringing about small-scale changes in the behaviour of the individuals, or the organisations, engaged (see the Annex for more details about the methodological caveats around this conclusion). This latter point is important since several GLF projects were successful in bringing about cultural changes within organisations (e.g. National Trust across its individual properties).

- However, GLF has not produced any evidence to date that these projects are capable of delivering transformational changes in behaviour. While the immediate impacts are small we can’t say whether the work undertaken around capacity building/setting the groundwork will build momentum over time. Therefore, longer term monitoring would be needed to establish if, and for how long, changes in individuals’/organisations’ behaviour are maintained.

- The central premise of using membership-based organisations with national reach to deliver behaviour influencing programmes is sound. On the basis of the scale of reach achieved by projects in the GLF, this model appears to be successful at cascading information and/or delivering initiatives via a tier of intermediaries. However, quality and competence in delivery is a key consideration and risk factor, particularly in relation to the level of training and support that intermediaries receive (which has an immediate implication for other initiatives such as the Government’s Green Deal, i.e. those initiatives that will rely on intermediaries as a means of delivery).

- It is also important to be clear that the ‘cascading’ model in GLF has delivered access to large numbers of people but, so far at least, changes in behaviour have been less substantial. The wider evidence base on community-based initiatives (e.g. from community energy) suggests that building momentum may depend on factors such as whether participants stay involved with projects for the long-term and the extent to which projects are truly embedded within their local communities.

- There is a key distinction between a project’s behaviour change potential and its delivery. A sound premise (e.g. grounded in behaviour change theory or practice) is necessary but insufficient without the capacity and capability to deliver it on the ground. Some GLF projects lacked the capacity and experience to deliver the project even if the concept itself was (and potentially still is) interesting.
• A project’s ability to achieve its delivery potential was related in part to its ability to articulate its objectives, targets and the relationship between activities (i.e. outputs) and the behaviours it was seeking to change (i.e. impacts). GLF projects which were stronger in this respect appear to have drawn on the behaviour change evidence base and/or behaviour change models (e.g. MINDSPACE, Defra’s 4Es). Projects’ effectiveness was also related to their capacity to undertake partnership work, their in-house technical skills (e.g. website development, social marketing) and - where projects had adopted a decentralised delivery model - the level of support provided to intermediaries.

• GLF supports the contention that ‘local’ plays a critical part in delivery in terms of knowledge, access to local networks and trust (and the GLF evidence indeed suggests that some pro-environmental initiatives cannot be delivered effectively without them). However, GLF also cautions against underestimating the role of partners like local authorities or central Government, who provide, variously, a badge of legitimacy in the eyes of participants, a range of financial and non-financial resources, and the means to set local initiatives in the context of a wider, and collective, effort.

• One of the key success factors of GLF projects in enabling change was their ‘license to speak’ to the target audience. NUS, for example, had a license to speak to participating universities and their students and staff; National Trust had a license to speak to its membership; and MSC had the professional standing and respect to speak to the different parts of the fish supply chain. In contrast, GAP did not have a ‘license to speak’ to EDF Energy’s customers; while Waterwise only acquired this in Coventry for its EcoTeams thanks to the proactive support of the local authority who engaged local groups and networks on their behalf.

• Social-based models of behaviour change – either by influencing social norms, promoting peer-to-peer learning and/or triggering competition – appear highly effective. They have the potential to deliver greater behaviour change than initiatives that target individuals in isolation and adopt a ‘service-based’ model of delivery. This is especially true when activities are designed to be people-centred and start from the premise of peoples’ lives and what they want, and enjoy, to do.

• GLF demonstrates that a specific pro-environmental behaviour – local food growing - can act as a ‘gateway’ to a wider suite of behaviours that includes water conservation, composting and food waste reduction (at least for participants who already have some interest in food and growing). Apart from this specific instance there was little substantive evidence – within the timeframe of GLF - that the adoption of a specific environmental behaviour led onto the adoption of other behaviours. There was some anecdotal evidence that ‘spill over’ was occurring (e.g. between work behaviours and home behaviours), but this could not be verified due to weaknesses in some of the projects’ evaluations and/or the fact that the evaluations often focused specifically and only on those behaviours that were being targeted;

• Some specific behaviour change tools require careful design if they are to be of value. Pledge-based initiatives appear to offer little unless they are backed up by a checking/validation and feedback mechanism. Online tools are widely used, and can support the take-up of behaviours as part of an overall package, but their direct impact
on behaviours is unknown and it seems highly unlikely that they will alone lead to the adoption of pro-environmental behaviours.

- Likewise, the experience of GLF projects also suggests that retrofit programmes need to be supported by work to engage and educate households if they are to achieve their anticipated savings. This includes how the measures work, how they need to be maintained, and how to maximise the benefits from using them.

**Working with civil society organisations**

GLF also has a number of implications for the relationship between Defra and large CSOrgs as delivery partners. However, the insights provided by GLF are highly context-specific in that it involved a very particular form of relationship with the CSOrgs. For example, GLF focused on pro-environmental behaviour change projects, it prioritised projects’ own self-defined outcomes above outputs (rather than setting specific, measurable, performance targets) and, furthermore, the projects were creating their own ‘demand’ (i.e. seeking to engage through interest and enthusiasm) rather than meeting specific ‘client’ needs (i.e. as a service delivery model would).

The reader needs to bear this in mind if or when interpreting the lessons from GLF in the context of other initiatives where Government is seeking to partner with CSOrgs as delivery partners. There are undoubtedly general lessons arising from the GLF that could act as useful warning flags for other programmes; the lessons outlined here are not intended to be definitive ‘how to’ guides for Defra.

The key question that Defra policy teams thinking of working with CSOrgs in future will need to clearly articulate is: “what is it that we (Defra) want Civil Society Organisations to do?” The answer to this question is critical since it is clear that CSOrgs can perform different roles and achieve different kinds of outcomes. For example, the different types of role can be to:

- deliver a behaviour change ‘service’ (e.g. using ‘output’-based models such as Sustrans);
- provide a ‘test bed’ for new/alternative models of delivery (e.g. Waterwise); or
- influence the broader framework/the ‘conditions’ that will be required for the shift to a low carbon economy and society by influencing wider cultural and societal changes (e.g. National Trust).

The answer to this question will, in turn, help frame the ‘rules of engagement’ between Defra and CSOrgs in terms of the nature of the relationship, the types of support that the sector will need and the kinds of outcomes that are anticipated.

GLF was about partnering to achieve policy goals (i.e. influencing behaviours through scale) but, in the process, also generated useful insight about CSOrgs as service deliverers or as capacity builders supporting the long term direction of travel in policy (without delivering policy impacts immediately or directly). Drawing on social innovation theory, for example, CSOrgs could be said to be testing innovation and expanding the scope and scale of cultural niches which, when combined with the right policy conditions, may result in transformational change.
The evidence from GLF suggests that, at this point in time, the strength of CSOrgs is their ability to test new approaches and engender wider cultural and societal changes, rather than providing a ready-made and ‘off the shelf’ service. Indeed, the major successes achieved by GLF have involved capacity building, engaging intermediaries and enabling cultural change within organisations, rather than achieving a certain percentage of behaviour change.

The addition of the caveat ‘at this point in time’ is important, since it is likely to change as organisations develop and refine their delivery model to the point where specific services or products are created and/or can be replicated. For example, we note that after two years of GLF funding (and in some cases an additional three years of EAF funding prior to that), several of the organisations appear to be close to this point (NUS’ Degrees Cooler), albeit still grounded in the context of a specific audience (e.g. universities).

The recognition that time is a core ingredient for projects has important ramifications for the nature of the relationship between Defra and CSOrgs. A key implication is that CSOrgs cannot necessarily be expected to parachute in, deliver from ‘Day 1’ and/or operate as a ‘bolt on’ to existing models of delivery or to existing service providers. This is especially true in relation to behaviour change initiatives which rarely involve a generic product or service that can be simply transplanted from one geographic area to another, or from one target audience to another.

The GLF findings support wider research which has looked at innovative ways in which government might work with other organisations to deliver services or policy outcomes (for example, NESTA and nef’s work on co-production models and the findings from NESTA’s Big Green Challenge). CSOrgs’ need for a developmental phase most likely requires a shift in mindset about how policy interacts and engages the sector. For example, it requires the simple ‘contract and supply’ model to be expanded to create the necessary space to foster relationships with the sector and test innovative approaches to influencing behaviour. This in itself presents several specific and non-trivial challenges:

- It would require a long term commitment than GLF could provide, i.e. a ‘catalyst’ or ‘seed’ fund for the sector, e.g. through a defined CSOrg or low carbon ‘incubator’.
- Failure is a necessary part of testing creative and innovative approaches and so, in instances where CSOrgs are trialling such approaches as part of a ‘proof of concept’ experiment, Defra would need to accept failure as something that is normal.
- GLF projects either benefitted from, or could have benefited from, external support services that ranged from technical support (e.g. website platform design) through to peer mentoring. This raises the question of whether Defra can support an equivalent of small business support, but tailored to the CSOrgs.
- Diffusion of learning will be a crucial element of the developmental process, requiring commitment from Defra to explore how best to share learning across the sector and either fund, or navigate projects to, opportunities for peer-to-peer mentoring. The Diffusion Packs developed by Local United via NESTA funding may represent a useful model to draw upon.

NESTA provided funding for the development and dissemination of “diffusion packs” which have been written and reviewed by people with first-hand knowledge of the community and climate action sectors they work in - [http://www.localunited.net/?q=energy_packs](http://www.localunited.net/?q=energy_packs)
- Defra will need to embed capacity within policy teams to ensure that it is itself equipped to maintain a longer term relationship, including continuity of its own staff.

Much of the learning from the GLF programme has already been incorporated into subsequent Defra programmes. For example, Defra’s Action-Based Research (ABR) projects - involving CSOrgs (and others) – tests innovative projects which aim to establish ‘proof of concept’. The reflective nature of Defra’s ABR approach provides the opportunity to learn as the project progresses. These small-scale projects provide an important stepping stone to developing a case for or against wider scale-up or rollout.
Annex: Note on the GLF review methodology

The research undertaken to generate the evidence for the GLF review was lengthy, broad ranging and complex. The research team had continuous involvement with the projects and Defra for more than two years. It involved examining a wide array of social research methods used by the projects (e.g. from event diaries, to qualitative and quantitative fieldwork etc.), to a desk review of projects’ reports and secondary analysis of their statistical data. It required demanding co-ordination and relationship management, so that the team could work in partnership with the many individuals involved within Defra and in the projects’ own organisations, who were frequently working to different schedules and priorities.

This section sets out in detail how all of that was achieved, from the design of the approach, through the detailed methods used, to the challenges encountered in data collection, the quality of the evidence produced and its limitations.

Context for design of the methodology

The introduction to the main report describes the aims and the policy landscape in which the GLF originated and was implemented. Being a fund which ran over several years, the policy context changed significantly during the programme, including a change of government. The design of the research for the GLF was embedded in the policy context of 2008, when Defra was spearheading initiatives to build evidence on, and implement, engagement programmes that would encourage wider up-take of pro-environmental behaviours and (more) sustainable consumption.

The second factor which influenced the design of the methodology was the learning from the previous Environmental Action Fund, which Brook Lyndhurst had also evaluated. The final EAF report provided extensive detail on the strengths and weaknesses of evaluation research methods when used in the context of community-based engagement initiatives. The methodology adopted for the GLF attempted to address the principal weaknesses identified in the EAF by introducing new approaches, most notably support for self-evaluation in the funded projects (more detail is provided below).

The final factor which fed into the design was the team’s combined experience of working on other large scale evaluations of sustainable living programmes delivered by community organisations. They included NESTA’s Big Green Challenge and the Scottish Climate Challenge Fund, among others. Some of these programmes were running during the GLF period which enabled wider know-how to be incorporated as the GLF progressed – for example, in being able to look for commonly seen errors when quality checking the evidence produced by the projects; or being able to evaluate findings from the GLF about behaviour impacts in a broader context. The latter helped the team to question when impacts appeared to be over-stated; and to benchmark our interpretation of the data with respect to levels of success.

Strategic approach

The GLF research was designed to investigate both processes and impacts. This included the following specific research questions:
- What measurable impact have GLF projects had on changing the behaviour of individuals, households or business (against one or more of the 12 headline behaviour goals in Defra’s Framework for Pro-environmental Behaviours)?
- Which kinds of projects and engagement models are more successful at delivering behaviour change on sustainable consumption?
- What are the lessons from the GLF about critical success factors and barriers involved in delivering effective behaviour change projects in community based projects?
- Can successful initiatives in one location, or with a particular target group (e.g. those already receptive to sustainable behaviours), be replicated on a wider scale?
- What are the implications for future funding streams and policy developments?

The research design adopted some aspects from the previous EAF research and introduced new elements to address the weaknesses identified in that process, namely lack of projects’ capacity, skill or commitment to undertake robust evaluation. Monitoring and evaluation was therefore given the very highest priority in the GLF and was at the centre of the selection process:

- Projects were evaluated at initial bid stage on the strength of their evaluation plans (among other things) and those selected to proceed to the second stage of bidding were asked to work-up these plans in more detail.
- Those who were selected for funding were then required to do more work on their evaluation plans, before they were signed-off by Defra. In particular, projects were required to set out numerical targets for audience reach and for changes in behaviours, which they chose from Defra’s headline behaviours (in the Framework for Environmental Behaviours, 2008). They were also required to describe what metrics they would use to measure these outputs and outcomes and how that would be done.

The strategic approach to the GLF review sought to balance cost against effectiveness and data quality. It was decided that the best balance was to:

- Generate data and qualitative evidence through projects’ own monitoring and evaluation (M&E) activities;
- Provide extensive advisory support to the projects to develop high quality research methods, tools and data analysis, to enhance the quality and robustness of the evidence. This was a direct response to the risks identified in the EAF.
- Build into the process frequent and detailed quality checking by the research team of the outputs from the projects’ own evaluations, backed up by a ‘check-in’ interview with project managers at the end of the delivery stage.

In this way, it was hoped that the projects could build their evaluations on established best practice in social research and would also benefit from the practical experience of the research team regarding the common pitfalls in applying social research methods in similar settings.

At programme level, learning about processes and the analysis of impacts were derived and synthesised from the (quality checked) evidence from the projects’ evaluations. The principal
metrics of interest to Defra were audience reach (and variations across its environmental segmentation) and changes in behaviour.

It was accepted from the beginning that there would be limitations on the extent to which aspects such as attribution, additionality and value for money could be captured meaningfully. Projects were not required to have control samples for surveys, but some did. The Defra tracker survey for environmental behaviours was flagged as a way of providing an indirect indicator of additionality, but was not used widely.

In addition, the sheer diversity of the projects’ engagement activities, delivery and data collection methods made a calculation of value for money for the programme as a whole problematic. Most notably, individual units of ‘behaviour change’ are not equivalent. For example, how should we compare the value of a 10% rise in the number of ‘short journeys made by bicycle’ with a 10% increase in the number of people ‘growing their own vegetables’? Even if we wanted to convert those measures to, say, carbon metrics, insufficient information is captured in the behavioural definitions to enable a robust estimate. Equally a 10% change in a given behaviour in one type of audience (e.g. high water users) may be of much greater ‘value’ than those currently using less. The opportunity (and budget) to control for all of the confounding factors was not available to either the projects or the research team.

A qualitative scorecard was therefore developed in conjunction with Defra’s social science manager for the evaluation research, which would allocate scores for achievement against each project’s specific targets and for the quality of the data used to demonstrate achievement. In the light of the data received, however, resources were directed to improving the projects’ reporting around the key programme metrics (which are captured in detail in the main report) and their interpretation of qualitative evidence. Moreover, the nature of the data captured about behaviours turned out to be too diverse to provide a sound basis for standardised comparisons, in the team’s judgement. Value for money is therefore interpreted qualitatively in the report, by comparing (where possible) each individual projects’ achievements benchmarked against their starting targets, rather than calculated as a £ per output/outcome from across the Fund as a whole.

**Detailed methods**

**Process**

Many steps and research tasks were involved in generating the evidence. As outlined above, these included a mix of self-evaluation support to each of the funded projects plus analysis of data from projects’ own evaluations and research interviews. Defra was closely involved in the process, through the GLF policy officer and a Defra social scientist who acted as the evaluation research manager. The research contractor team comprised two semi-autonomous units who worked closely at strategic level (e.g. in the design of research tools and processes) but undertook individual tasks separately. Brook Lyndhurst was responsible for research design, guidance materials, the data gathering and the analysis overall; and independent consultant Kathryn Rathouse provided advisory support to the projects in the set-up and early delivery stages. As the projects neared their final reporting, the whole research team provided advisory support according to the specific need of each project.

The following tables summarise the entire GLF research process and team roles.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates &amp; stage</th>
<th>Defra</th>
<th>Brook Lyndhurst</th>
<th>Kathryn Rathouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bidding (2 stages)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 2009</td>
<td>Pre-bid seminars for potential bidders from Civil Society Organisations (CSOrgs) to introduce the GLF and outline the bidding process</td>
<td>Presentation at Defra pre-launch seminar Key learning about M&amp;E from the EAF; lessons about influencing behaviours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan – April 2009</td>
<td>Evaluation of bidders’ first round concept notes &amp; feedback including M&amp;E weaknesses and expectations for final bids</td>
<td>Evaluation handbook (1st draft) Guidance on the essential components of an evaluation plan and considerations to bear in mind – issued to those selected to develop full bids (17 projects)</td>
<td>Pre-bid telephone support One-hour telephone interview with every shortlisted project to discuss outline M&amp;E plan and flag issues to address. Follow-up email.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March – April 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finalise projects’ evaluation plans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2009</td>
<td>Review and sign-off</td>
<td>Evaluation plan template for the funded projects to use in drafting full evaluation plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Input into the scope of questions (including segmentation) Sign-off the question bank for projects</td>
<td>Standard questions Development of a question bank for projects to include in baseline and follow-up questionnaires: included questions to capture behaviours impacts, plus discretionary questions on broader impacts (e.g. social). Any prior surveys without these questions were not allowed to be used as baselines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2009</td>
<td>Review and sign-off</td>
<td>Evaluation handbook (2nd draft) Extended handbook with details and guidance on how the projects were expected to engage in the full evaluation process, including use of standard questions and Defra’s segmentation model and tips on research methods (e.g. sample sizes, avoiding bias etc)</td>
<td>Site visits Face-to-face visit to each funded project to give tailored support in the development of full evaluation plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation plans signed off</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone support c.1 day of email and telephone support to advise on finalising evaluation plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates &amp; stage</td>
<td>Defra</td>
<td>Brook Lyndhurst</td>
<td>Kathryn Rathouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| June 2009 – Oct 2009 | | | **Call-off support**
c. 1.5 days per project to provide support on design and execution of baseline surveys and implementation of evaluation plan |
| June 2009 – Oct 2009 | | | **Site visits**
One day site visit to support implementation, as above |
| Sept 2009 | | **Peer-to-peer support** – each project visits one other project to share expertise and early learning (co-ordinated by BL & KR, supported by guidance on key aspects to cover in discussions) |
| Dec 2009 | | **Baseline workshop**
To share early lessons, about baseline surveys in particular, plus trouble shooting advice from the evaluation team and Defra. |
| Jan 2010 | **Sign-off report template** | **Baseline report template**
Produce a report template for projects to complete including guidance on how to present statistical data |
| June – July 2010 | **Receive year 1 reports from projects** | **Check analysis of data from project reports**
Extensive checking of data, queries back to projects, and topline analysis. It provided an early check on the audiences being reached and flagged issues with survey methods and data recording that could be flagged to Defra and addressed for follow-up surveys |
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### Continuing evaluation support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates &amp; stage</th>
<th>Defra</th>
<th>Brook Lyndhurst</th>
<th>Kathryn Rathouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2009 and July 2010</td>
<td><strong>Partnership meetings</strong></td>
<td>For projects to share their experiences and gain further advice on implementing (and updating, where necessary) their evaluation plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2009 – Dec 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2011</td>
<td><strong>Refresher workshop</strong></td>
<td>A detailed ‘walk through’ of the reporting template as the focus for projects to ask for advice on aspects of data analysis and reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2011 – Mar 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Call-off support</strong></td>
<td>2.5 days per project to provide on-going advice and support on evaluation (e.g. baseline &amp; follow-up survey and interim reporting)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Programme evaluation: final data collection and synthesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates &amp; stage</th>
<th>Defra</th>
<th>Brook Lyndhurst</th>
<th>Kathryn Rathouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb – May 2011</td>
<td><strong>Site visits and project manager interviews</strong></td>
<td>To collect qualitative data on success factors/barriers relating to the project model and implementation, and qualitative aspects of impact (e.g. community capacity)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr – June 2011</td>
<td><strong>Review and give comments on projects’ draft reports</strong> including several rounds of revision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June – Oct 2011</td>
<td><strong>Discussion &amp; sign-off of reporting structure for project to use to feed back to Defra</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisions: Mar 2012 and Jan 2013</td>
<td><strong>Comment on projects’ reports to Defra</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Quality check of projects’ draft and final reports</strong></td>
<td>Detailed checking of the evidence presented and comments fed back to projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Synthesis and review report</strong></td>
<td>Development of a reporting structure in light of an assessment of the robustness and coverage of projects’ data. Analysis: quantitative data trends and statistical significance; structured thematic analysis of qualitative data and projects’ reports. Reporting: ‘deep dive’ case study of outcomes for each project; synthesis of findings across agreed themes based on project evidence (the case study summaries and the extensive data lying behind those)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Metrics

The approach described above was designed to enable ‘bottom up’ flexibility for the projects to evaluate in ways they felt were appropriate to their audience; and ‘top down’ in that Defra needed consistency across the projects, which was to be achieved through a set of mandatory survey questions and standardised ways of reporting outputs, outcomes and behaviour impacts. The mandatory questions were drawn from Defra’s tracker survey (about environmental attitudes and behaviours) and included Defra’s standard segmentation questions so that projects’ audiences could be profiled. Detailed definitions and guidance were also given for capturing data on audience reach, project tools and outputs. The benefits and limitations of this approach are considered under ‘challenges’ below.

Tools

In an effort to maximise the quality of the data which would flow into the programme-level evaluation, significant investment was made in the design of research tools and guidance. These included:

- A detailed evaluation handbook, including detailed guidance on research methods (e.g. sample sizes, survey design, qualitative research methods, and so on);
- An evaluation plan pro-forma, to capture information in common format on projects’ inputs, targets, expected outputs and outcomes, and related metrics (both quantitative and qualitative);
- A survey question bank of mandatory and advisory questions, including question areas not covered in the Defra tracker but that projects might want to monitor (e.g. social capital or community capacity);
- A template for a ‘key events’ diary, for projects to record significant events throughout the delivery of their project which would help to explain success factors and barriers in terms of process;
- A template for peer-to-peer site visits to shape the types of information captured by visiting peer projects, which was then fed back to the research team to provide an arms-length view of delivery and M&E processes;
- A standard pro-forma for the baseline report with specific guidance for each element – both for a written report (including tables with required standard content and guidance on data presentation) and a survey data spreadsheet;
- A standard pro-forma and spreadsheet template for projects’ reports back to Defra, with detailed guidance for content to include and, where it was needed, SPSS scripts for statistical testing.

Both the question bank and the evaluation handbook involved drawing together examples of best practice from academic and practitioner literature, in addition to the team’s own expertise in this area. As a preventative quality control measure, a key aim was to encourage projects to use tried and tested approaches rather than devise their own.

Quality checking

Outputs from the projects’ own evaluations and their reporting back to Defra were checked in detail by the research team. Checking included spreadsheets of survey data for each question included in surveys and, in some cases, additional checking of raw data (e.g. in SPSS). It also included detailed checking of projects’ baseline and draft reports, both for robustness of the evidence presented (qualitative and quantitative) and how the data had been interpreted. All projects received at least one round of comments and queries on their draft final reports from Brook Lyndhurst and Defra combined; some were subject to multiple rounds of comments.
Analysis and synthesis

Once Defra and the research team were satisfied with the quality of the data and evidence from the projects, the research team embarked on the analysis. This phase involved a number of key activities:

- Drawing on the projects’ original evaluation plans (including targets), reports to Defra and data sheets, to collate achievement profiles for each project, as shown in the tables in the ‘deep dive’ case studies in the main report;
- Review and synthesis of qualitative evidence from the projects’ reports to Defra according to a structured thematic template, to generate insights about delivery processes and explanations of behavioural impacts;
- Development of detailed case studies for each project which used all of the evidence at the team’s disposal to generate an understanding of the projects’ achievements, success factors and barriers.

When the detailed case study material had been developed it was interrogated in team workshops where common themes across the GLF programme were developed. This included synthesis and interpretation of behaviour outcomes from the GLF, the effectiveness of delivery processes and reflections on the research methodology. The team were able to benchmark emerging findings from the GLF against their wider knowledge base from other research of sustainable living projects delivered by CSorgs, including Defra’s EAF and Climate Challenge Fund. The initial case studies and synthesis were discussed in a meeting with Defra and further work was undertaken to respond to Defra’s questions.

As a convention, the 95% level was used as the threshold for calculating whether or not results produced by the projects are statistically significant.

Challenges

Numerous challenges were encountered in implementing the research design and these were discussed with Defra as part of the quality checking and programme reporting process. Key challenges that had an influence on data limitations are summarised here.

The principal strategic challenge of the research approach was balancing Defra’s desire for ‘gold standard’ scientific data and the feasibility of generating data which could live up to those standards in projects that involved a ‘workforce’ comprising largely volunteers or community engagement officers. Projects were encouraged to spend at least 10% of their funding on evaluation which equated to around £20,000 each. Within that budget, the projects were required to undertake at least two rounds of surveys, in many cases of multiple audiences to reflect their different work packages, to collect a wide range of supporting quantitative and qualitative data, and to redraft their reports to Defra several times. Even with the advisory support provided, evaluation resources were stretched in most projects so that they were encouraged to focus research activities on aspects that were measurable in low cost ways. In this context, specific data collection and quality challenges were:

- Including all of the mandatory questions in projects’ surveys, including Defra’s raft of segmentation questions. Survey length was an issue in many cases in the context of the types of participants attracted to projects and the settings in which surveys were administered;
- Some projects ‘sacrificed’ questions tailored to their specific behaviour change activities in favour of segmentation questions - but in most cases the projects did not, or were not able to, make good use of data from the segmentation questions;
The ‘bluntness’ of some survey questions didn’t enable capturing of small and subtle changes in behaviour (according to both feedback from the projects and where survey evidence conflicted with observed impacts such as energy use);

The challenge of demonstrating behaviour change over a relatively short timescale, when set up of delivery tools and mechanisms, and participant recruitment, consumed a large part of the first year’s timetable;

Achieving high response rates to surveys, especially in follow-up surveys;

Not always being able to match data from baseline and follow-up respondents (e.g. to check for sample bias);

The essential nature of community engagement projects, where project activities need to be responsive to participant interests, barriers and needs – in order to secure their involvement and at the same time the need for monitoring methods to capture robust measures of impact while delivery processes are evolving;

At programme level, the vast quantity of disparate data to check and synthesise (for example, in one project, more or less verbatim reporting of qualitative evidence which extended to over a hundred pages). As explained above, this challenge was addressed by filtering for the most robust data and evidence, then funnelling those sources into detailed case studies, then synthesising general themes from across the case studies.

Limitations

In the research team’s judgement the data generated in the GLF is of higher quality than that generated by projects funded in the EAF. It also compares well to other national community-based sustainable living programmes which the team has reviewed or evaluated. In particular, the standardised structure for how projects should report back to Defra helped to focus the coverage of the evidence reported and ensure that numerical data was correctly presented and interpreted, or was straightforward to check.

There were still weaknesses, however, in the way in which qualitative evidence was interpreted by some projects. Many of these weaknesses were picked up in the quality check of projects’ reports back to Defra and queried where relevant. The same was true where errors or inconsistencies appeared to be present in numerical data. As a result, the team is confident that the data and evidence used in this report are the best that they can be, given the challenges of generating scientifically robust data in these types of project. The team is also confident that only the strongest evidence has been used as a basis for the case studies and synthesis in the main report; weaknesses and limitations are flagged in specific instances; and data that were considered unreliable were not included in the analysis or this report.

Limitations that need to be borne in mind in reading the evidence that is presented in the report include:

• Potential for sample bias because of the unavoidably self-selecting nature of the projects’ surveys. Instances where this is likely to have had a material influence on measures of impact are flagged in the text (e.g. MSC). Where possible, results are given for matched baseline and follow-up samples.
• Lack of research processes and measures that would provide reliable data to demonstrate attribution or additionality;
• The survey questions do not provide a comprehensive account of the outcomes from projects’ activities: because projects focused their limited resources on capturing certain impacts; and due to issues with the power of some survey questions, as set out above. Objective measures of impact are used as well as survey results wherever available (e.g. energy usage in the NUS projects).

8 A similar barrier was noted in Brook Lyndhurst’s evaluation of Hampshire’s Small Changes Big Difference project supported by Defra. Defra project WR117.
• Results from one project are not strictly comparable to another project because survey and research methods differed, as did the audiences being targeted. This was taken into account when developing the cross-cutting themes during the analysis;

• In spite of the steps that were taken to triangulate evidence sources, to moderate the analysis and interpretation through group workshops and discussion with Defra, there remains a risk that gaps in the available evidence may have introduced bias into the research synthesis. The team considers this risk to be small and it is mitigated by benchmarking the GLF findings against our knowledge base from other similar research projects.

• The research was not able to generate a robust measure of value for money of the Fund in achieving pro-environmental behaviour change.

• Good quality data on outputs however provides useful evidence on the scale of reach that was achieved through partnering with this group of CSorgs, though it cannot reliably be converted into a cost effectiveness measure.