

Promoting Pro-Environmental Behaviour: Existing Evidence to Inform Better Policy-Making

Chapter 3: Practice

Contents

Executive Summary

- 1. Introduction**
 - 1.1 The case studies**
- 2. Illustrating behaviour change theory in practice**
 - 2.1 Changing the context**
 - 2.2 Action networks / action learning**
 - 2.3 Changing habit**
 - 2.4 Changing agency**
 - 2.5 Understanding the situation from the actors' perspective**
 - 2.6 Whole organisation change**
 - 2.7 Theories about whole system change**
- 3. Links to policy tools**
- 4. Practical lessons for influencing behaviour**
 - 4.1 Different approaches to influencing change**
 - 4.2 Replication and 'rolling out'**
 - 4.3 Opportunities for policy-makers to influence others**
 - 4.4 Replicating good practice**
- 5. Relevance to global environmental challenges**
 - 5.1 Scaling up**
 - 5.2 Changing the social context**
 - 5.3 Quantifying the challenge**

References

Annex to Chapter 3: The detailed case studies

Defra has commissioned and funded this study, but the views expressed in the report do not necessarily reflect Defra policy.

Executive Summary

This chapter presents 14 detailed case studies of real-world initiatives that have delivered changes in environmental behaviour. The case studies illustrate a wide range of approaches that have led to behaviour change amongst individuals, businesses and other organisations in the seven principal pro-environmental behaviour domains outlined in Chapter 1.

The case studies provide some practical lessons for policy-makers wanting to influence environmental behaviour, as well as raising some questions and issues that could not be fully resolved in the scope of this study but which provide potentially important ground for further investigation.

Practical lessons for policy-makers

Four key practical lessons for policy-makers have emerged.

1. Changing environmental behaviour through others

Policy-makers can directly develop initiatives themselves that will influence environmental behaviour, but they can also help support the development of initiatives that are being delivered by non-governmental organisations. The case studies highlighted a number of ways for policy-makers to influence the development of independent initiatives that lead to environmental behaviour change (discussed in more detail in section 2.3 below):

- **Funding** can clearly support the development of environmental behaviour change initiatives, although this is only ever likely to be a minor element of the wider policy package. Previous studies have shown that the availability of even small amounts of funding can free up organisations to develop new projects, and can help determine the type of project an organisation develops (Elster, 2004);
- **Legislation** can drive the development of initiatives on the ground, but needs careful consideration;
- **Specific initiatives** can be highlighted in policy or policy guidance;
- **Joint-working** can transfer expertise from external organisations, as well as helping support external initiatives; and
- Government can help by **setting the right context** to encourage and support the development of practical initiatives through policy targets and policy statements.

2. Lessons for replicating behaviour change initiatives

A common policy response to successful behaviour change initiatives is to want to replicate them elsewhere. Theory warns against too simplistic an approach to replicating successful behaviour change initiatives. The case studies illustrate some points that should be considered (discussed in more detail in section 2.2), including:

- **Complexity.** More complex initiatives may be harder to replicate, and even if an initiative has a simple basis, it may need significant development time to replicate it elsewhere. Previous work on small scale local sustainability projects found that the processes of capacity building and community development were key to the development of local community initiatives and represented a key limiting factor to their development – i.e. even if you have funding and a successful project ‘model’, it can still take a long time to develop a new project elsewhere (Elster, 2004). Chapter 1 reports that behavioural models do not ‘travel well’ without being adapted to specific circumstances (1.3.1 in Chapter 1) and this also appears to be true of practice examples.
- **Customised solutions.** Initiatives need to be tailored to specific audiences and circumstances, even when the initiative appears very simple and straightforward. This may be especially true when trying to influence hard to engage or traditionally excluded audiences.
- **Unique Circumstances.** Initiatives may have developed in unique, or unusual, circumstances, which could make them hard to replicate. It is important to understand the key factors in the success of initiatives and consider how they can be replicated if trying to develop a similar initiative elsewhere.

3. Practical approaches for influencing behaviour change

The case studies illustrate a range of practical approaches that have worked to change environmental behaviours (see section 2.1 for more details). Policy-makers may find the list of approaches helpful when thinking about how they could influence behaviour. The case studies do not provide a wide enough basis on which to draw general conclusions, but they suggest that a lot of the approaches used appear to be fairly generic – i.e. have been successfully used to influence individuals, businesses and other organisations.

Some key, widely applicable, approaches include:

- using measurement and targets to drive change;
- using hands-on support and facilitation to encourage behaviour change;
- using groups / networks to support change; and
- financial incentives.

4. Illustrating behaviour change theory in practice

The case studies provide a useful illustration of the application of behaviour change theories in real world situations. It is likely that the practical initiatives may not have always consciously applied behaviour change theories, but the cases still illustrate some key theoretical points. These are discussed in detail in section 1 below. This discussion should help policy-makers understand what some of the more theoretical

ideas presented in chapter 1 mean in practice. In particular, two key messages have emerged:

1. **The importance of action, reflection and feedback cycles.** Half of the case studies have employed aspects of action networks and action learning, where groups of people are brought together to support individual or organisational change, usually with a facilitator and using ongoing action, reflection and feedback to drive change.
2. **The importance of regarding policy targets as ‘actors’ and partners in the change process.** A key theoretical idea that is also reflected strongly in the case studies (employed in at least 6 of the cases) is that the audience you are trying to change needs to be engaged in developing the intervention, and even identifying what needs changing.

Issues for further investigation

Applying behaviour change theory in practice

There is a wide range of theory that tells us something about how to change environmental behaviours. However, behaviour change ultimately takes place at a practical level and it is interesting to note that a number of the case studies that have delivered actual environmental behaviour change, do not necessarily follow theoretical ‘best practice’. For example the Lambeth PLEASE scheme removes financial barriers to landlords investing in energy efficiency measures in their properties, or the BedZED development that provides infrastructure that automatically reduces residents’ environmental impact.

Some aspects of behaviour change theory may view these approaches as too simplistic, but they have delivered change. An important question would be whether such simplistic practical approaches that do not follow theoretical ‘best practice’ are in fact worse at delivering behaviour change than more theoretically ‘sound’ approaches? It also remains to be seen whether practical application of some theories is more successful than that of others?

Ultimately, real world constraints are going to influence what can be done in practice, for example what target audiences are willing to engage with and what resources are available. However it is important to start looking at whether opportunities are being maximised within these constraints by making best use of behaviour change theory. The case studies in this study suggest that this may not always be happening.

A useful avenue for future research may therefore be to look at the role theory plays in the development of practical behaviour change initiatives – what level of theoretical knowledge is there, how systematically is it being applied, and how is its application influenced by real world constraints?

Is there a special role for policy-makers?

As discussed in the previous point, many of the case studies take a fairly narrow, targeted approach to environmental behaviour change. For example, aiming to change a single behaviour or the behaviour of a single target group, such as use of non-disposable nappies, energy efficiency investment in properties, or procuring more local and organic foods by hospitals.

Where more systematic approaches have been taken this usually seems to be because the aim of the initiative is to change a system (such as in the East Anglia Food Links, Sussex Real Nappies, or Marine Stewardship Council cases).

Real world initiatives aiming to change environmental behaviours are perhaps inevitably likely to be narrowly focused on one aspect of the whole system that produces environmental behaviour. This is in keeping with Gardner & Stern's Principles, in which step one is to identify the specific behaviour to be changed.

However, theory also explains that environmental behaviour is determined by a complex of interacting factors operating at individual, organisational and societal levels. It is perhaps worth considering the fact that policy-makers may be better placed to take a much broader approach to delivering behaviour change and can at least attempt to influence all of these levels at once.

Policy programmes can operate to influence social norms, business and individuals all at once, while this is less likely to be true of non-governmental approaches. For example, many of the case studies considered in this study do make use of all four Es in the Defra Sustainable Development Diamond (see Chapter 1).

Could policy-makers be best placed to take an overview approach that consciously attempts to support the many independent initiatives that exist, and to make use of them to deliver parts of a bigger picture approach?

How far can individual initiatives go to address global environmental problems?

Many individual initiatives, including some of the case studies, have delivered impressive results in terms of changing environmental behaviours. However, despite many thousands of initiatives repeated over the globe, overall progress towards sustainable development, and on most environmental challenges, remains very slow (for example, attempts to tackle global warming).

Individual initiatives at all different scales probably are necessary to address pressing environmental problems and progress towards sustainable development – for example they may contribute to change in social norms and values (see section 3 below).

However, the problems policy faces are both massive and pressing. Any attempt to influence environmental behaviour needs to be conscious of this broader challenge and try and address the question of how a particular intervention might contribute. Some attempts to explicitly quantify the challenge may be necessary – for example can we identify what levels of what behaviour changes would deliver target reductions in CO₂ emissions?

Learning from practical initiatives

There is no denying the complexity of the task of influencing environmental behaviours and the limits to understanding the process through theories and models. A key advantage of practice is that, if properly tracked and reflected upon, it allows both practitioners and policy-makers to learn and adapt their approaches.

The greatest advantage of practical initiatives is their flexibility, ability to adapt and 'real world' basis – if they work, they work, and if they don't they can be changed. It is therefore important that practical initiatives incorporate an aspect of feedback, learning and reflection. It may also be productive to build in an explicit learning process in any new initiatives so the lessons learnt through practice can be fed back to theory and policy-makers who are trying to design subsequent interventions.

1. Introduction

This chapter presents 14 detailed case studies of real-world initiatives that have successfully delivered changes in environmental behaviour. The case studies cover behaviour change amongst individuals, businesses and other organisations, and the seven principal pro-environmental behaviour domains outlined in Chapter 1. They also represent a range of different approaches to influencing behaviour, delivered by very different partners, on a huge range of scales, from hands-on work with individuals, through national organisation-wide change, to international environmental accreditation and labelling schemes. Table 1, and the thumbnail case study introductions, below introduce the case studies and some of this variety.

The 14 case studies contain a wealth of detailed information that illustrates some important points, and qualitative conclusions, in relation to the challenge of changing environmental behaviour.

The case studies have been used to highlight lessons under the following headings:

- Illustrating behaviour change theory in practice;
- Links to policy tools;
- Practical lessons for influencing behaviour; and
- Relevance to global environmental challenges.

The following brief descriptions give an introduction, and basic information, for each case study. Table 1 below provides an overview of the case studies, detailing their coverage, scale and approach. Detailed case studies are provided in the Annex to Chapter 3.

1.1 The case studies

Beddington Zero Energy Development (BedZED)

BedZED is an environmentally friendly, energy-efficient, development of 100 housing and work units, with a childcare facility and green space. It has been designed not to add any net increase in carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, and is the first large-scale development of this kind in the UK. The development targets behaviour change by individuals, providing environmentally friendly infrastructure that by default reduces people's environmental impact from everyday household activities such as heating and water use. The development also incorporates opportunities for more active environmental behaviour change, for example recycling facilities and a car share scheme. The project aims to influence behaviour more widely, by actively promoting the idea of sustainable living, and using BedZED as a practical case study. This is done through visits, an information centre and training.

BTCV Environments for all

Environments for all is a three-year programme run by BTCV (a national environmental voluntary organisation) with the aim of increasing involvement from under-represented groups in environmental action, by: directly involving people from excluded groups in environmental projects; increasing the representation of these groups within BTCV (as staff and in the management of the organisation); and disseminating lessons to the wider environmental sector. The programme was led by a central project management team, and worked through outreach project workers who used a hands-on community development approach to engaging communities in pilot areas across the UK. These teams consulted local communities, recruited local volunteers, and developed projects. The outreach projects reported back any lessons, which were then disseminated by the central team. Involvement from excluded groups in the governance of BTCV was encouraged through BTCV's networks of community groups and supporters. A baseline review was carried out and a system of monitoring, evaluation and review set up. This was used to set targets for making the organisation more representative in terms of volunteers involved, staff and management.

East Anglia Food Link (EAFL)

EAFL is a not-for-profit co-operative that works to develop a more sustainable and local food system across the East of England. EAFL represents stakeholders from all parts of the food chain, including producers, consumers and independent retailers. The project works to improve the sustainability of all aspects of the food chain, through partnerships and a range of specific projects with different stakeholders. EAFL provides a strategic overview and develops tailored projects to support more sustainable and local food consumption in East Anglia. For example: providing access to more local and organic food through farmers markets; promoting local and sustainable food; support for producers to produce and market more organic food; work with processors and local food businesses to help them use more local produce; encouraging and working with the public sector; running a school fruit and vegetable scheme.

Envirowise

Envirowise is a Government programme, designed to encourage the sharing of best practice across UK industry to help businesses improve competitiveness through improved environmental performance and more efficient use of resources. The

programme provides tailored information, advice and hands-on support to help businesses reduce all aspects of their environmental impact. This support is delivered through: a helpline giving confidential advice on resource efficiency; free on-site visits to help businesses identify areas where they can improve resource efficiency, and suggest actions; events, including workshops, seminars and major exhibitions to help businesses tackle their environmental impact, comply with legislation and save money; a website with practical advice and information, including case studies, best practice guides and benchmarking tools.

Envision

Envision is a voluntary organisation that works to engage and support young people aged 16-19, at school or college, to develop practical social and environmental projects. The organisation runs a standard school-based programme that engages young people, works with them to identify issues they think are important and helps them develop practical projects. Local volunteers, often from businesses work with the pupils and help them develop their projects, which cover a wide range of issues including: fair trade; green space projects; recycling; energy efficiency and renewable energy; and sustainable transport. Achievements are celebrated at the end of the project and the pupils have access to a website to showcase their projects and share ideas and experiences. Envision has also become involved with wider work on active citizenship, including training for teachers.

GAP Ecoteams

Ecoteams is a project run by the environmental charity Global Action Plan (GAP) that uses the context of a group to support and encourage individuals to make changes to their environmental behaviour. Ecoteams bring together a small number (usually 6-8) of individuals or households for a four-month programme. The groups are recruited through community outreach work, or through workplaces. The groups discuss different aspects of household environmental impact (including water, electricity and gas use; waste produced; transport used and shopping habits), and ways of changing behaviours, at monthly meetings. Individuals are required to monitor aspects of their household's environmental impact on a weekly or monthly basis, and encouraged to change their behaviour to achieve improvements over the course of the programme. The individual's measurements are fed back to the group, together with measurements for the group as a whole, providing a means of monitoring progress and providing an incentive for improvement.

Interface

Interface Incorporated is a multinational carpet tile manufacturing company that is working to improve the sustainability of every aspect of its operation, with the ultimate goal of eliminating all negative environmental impact and achieving a restorative business (i.e. one that restores the natural environment rather than extracting from or damaging it). Senior management have developed this vision, and provided the drive for change. They set up an environmental task force within the business and recruited help from outside experts. They reviewed all aspects of their business and outside connections, and developed a strategy to achieve change, identifying seven 'fronts' on which to focus: waste; emissions; renewable energy; recycling and closing the loop; resource efficient transportation; sensitising stakeholders; and redesigning commerce. The management team set a series of goals and developed measurement systems to drive change within the company. Change has

been delivered through a range of specific innovations and projects aimed at improving different aspects of the company's operations. For example, cutting water use, and incorporating the use of recycled materials.

Private Landlord Energy Award Scheme (PLEASE)

PLEASE is an ongoing initiative, running in approximately 11 local authorities, to improve the energy efficiency of the private rented sector. It provides grants and interest-free loans to assist private landlords in improving the energy efficiency of their properties. Grants are available for improvements such as: new central heating systems and boilers; upgraded heating controls; cavity wall insulation, loft insulation and draught proofing. The scheme is extended to small social landlords in some of the participating local authorities. Landlords are made aware of the grants in a variety of ways (differing across the 11 local authorities) including: information on council websites; through private sector housing forums (private landlord networks); energy efficiency leaflets; promotion through estate agents; suggestions, or even requirements, as part of property inspections by the local authority.

London borough recycling schemes

This case study covers doorstep recycling schemes for residents in three London boroughs. We present the different approaches taken by the three boroughs for comparison. Camden provides a collection service using recycling boxes that are sorted at the point of collection by recycling officers and special vehicles. In Wandsworth recyclable materials are collected along with domestic waste in a separate orange sack. Residents are provided with orange sacks every three months and can place glass bottles and jars, paper, cardboard, plastic bottles and metal cans into the bags. Barnet runs a compulsory recycling scheme that obliges residents to place recyclable materials in their black box that is emptied on designated collection days using an on-street separation method and special vehicles. Residents are not allowed to place recyclables in their wheeled refuse bins, with the threat of prosecutions and fines.

London borough of Merton sustainable highways procurement strategy

The London borough of Merton's highways department have developed a new procurement framework for highways maintenance and road schemes, that allows them to judge tenders on the basis of quality (which includes the contractor's approach to recycling) as well as price. The new framework has been developed to increase the sustainability of work on roads in the borough by increasing the use of recycled materials by contractors, as well as influencing other impacts of road schemes including energy use, lorry journeys and pollution. Two different processes have been developed that both involve a number of stages for tendering, allowing quality and price to be assessed. In both cases tenders are scored using a weighting of 60:40 for price and quality.

The Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) fish certification scheme

The MSC is a not-for-profit organisation that has developed an environmental standard for sustainable, well-managed fisheries. The organisation runs an international certification programme that certifies and labels seafood products that meet these standards. The scheme targets fishermen, fisheries, and consumers of seafood, with the aim of changing fishing methods and consumer choice. The MSC accredits 12 independent certification bodies around the world. These bodies then

certify fisheries that can then use the MSC label to identify their seafood as sustainable. Suppliers and retailers who want to use the MSC logo have to pay to undergo a supply chain audit to certify that the fish they are selling comes from a certified fishery. The MSC also works to promote, and increase awareness of, the MSC label.

Sustainable Hospital Food Project

The Sustainable hospital food project was a two-year initiative aiming to increase the amount of local, seasonal and organic food used in four London hospitals to 10% of routine catering. The project targeted NHS hospital caterers and procurement managers as well as producers, suppliers, wholesalers, patients and staff. It aimed to change food buying by hospitals and hospital suppliers as well as the way local and organic producers sell their food. The project was delivered by dedicated project staff who carried out intensive hands-on work to help introduce local and organic food into the hospitals over two years. These staff worked closely with hospital caterers and procurement managers. After detailed research into how food was procured in the four hospitals, the main focus for the project workers was to act as 'go-betweens' to identify potential suppliers who could meet the hospitals' needs for produce and then work to get their produce to the hospitals. Most of the local and organic produce introduced to the hospitals was added into the supply chain of the big suppliers and wholesalers who already supply the hospitals. This prevented the need for more vehicles delivering to the hospitals, or additional paperwork. In addition, the project staff: worked with hospital dieticians to redesign the hospital menus; ran training for hospital caterers and small suppliers; ran promotional events; and monitored the projects' progress and impact.

West Sussex Real Nappy Initiative

The West Sussex County Council Real Nappy Initiative is a programme aimed at new parents and designed to encourage the use of real, cotton nappies. The core of the initiative is an incentive payment of £30 for parents using real cotton nappies for their children over the first 18 months of their lives. New mothers are targeted at pre and post-natal classes, and through Sure Start, and all nappies used in the county's maternity hospitals are cotton so that parents' and babies' first experience is with non-disposable nappies. The initiative is supported by a communications campaign through local press, radio and bus adverts targeted at new fathers and grandparents. The council is also now providing Cotton nappy starter packs, worth £100, and there has been an internal promotion campaign within the council.

WWF UK ranking power companies project

This project ranks the UK's six big power companies on the basis of their efforts to reduce carbon dioxide emissions, and invest in renewable energy programmes and energy efficiency measures. The project is part of WWF UK's climate change campaign that is aimed at the UK power sector, as it is the largest contributor to carbon dioxide emissions in the UK. The aims of the ranking exercise were to: influence the behaviour of the large power companies, and less directly that of consumers and potential shareholders; increase the profile of the issue in the public and political domain; and engage the big UK power companies. The ranking exercise was carried out by an independent research consultancy, with informal peer review, in order to give it greater credibility. The WWF UK climate change team then publicised the results and used them as a campaign tool.

Table 1 – Introduction to case studies illustrating their coverage, scale and approach

Project name	Purpose	Policy domain	Target group	Delivery agent and project scale	Approach to influencing behaviour
Interface Europe ltd. carpet manufacturer	Integrating sustainability into all aspects of a large manufacturing company	Sustainable production	Producer	Senior management / Multinational company	Internal champion, targets, internal framework to systematically approach change within the organisation, specific projects
London Borough of Merton sustainable highways procurement scheme	Procurement process designed to increase sustainability of road schemes, including increased use of recycled materials	Sustainable production	Producers	Local Authority / All road maintenance and road projects	Using a specially designed procurement process
Global Action Plan Ecoteams	Group of households working together with support to monitor their environmental impact and make improvements	Sustainable consumption	Consumer	Environmental NGO / Over 400 individuals and households in a few areas in the UK	Facilitated, or trained, groups to support individual behaviour change, with monitoring and review
West Sussex real nappy initiative	Programme to increase use of non-disposable nappies	Sustainable consumption	Consumers	Local authority / 6% of new parents in West Sussex have been influenced	Financial incentives; communications campaign; providing alternatives; influencing habit; demonstrating in practice and using the approval of authority
World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) ranking	Scoring system to rank world's largest energy companies in terms of their	Sustainable production and	Producers	Environmental NGO / Covers the 6 largest	Providing information; publicising environmental

of electricity companies	response to global warming	consumption		power companies in the UK	performance to influence consumer choice and create competition between companies; linked to climate change campaign
Lambeth borough council private landlord energy award scheme (PLEASE)	Grants and interest free loans for private landlords to improve energy efficiency of their properties	Sustainable resource use within the home	Producers	Not-for-profit organisation, delivering for a local authority / Aimed at 150 landlords across 1 borough	Financial incentives; removing financial barriers
BedZed - Bedddington Zero Energy Development	Combined housing and work space development incorporating environmentally friendly design	Sustainable resource use within the home	Consumers	Environmental NGO, housing association and an architect firm / 100 unit development	Providing infrastructure to enable environmentally friendly living without effort; providing environmentally friendly choices; leading by example; inspiring others; demonstrating in practice; information and communications
Envirowise work to reduce waste in businesses	Information and support programme to help businesses reduce waste and environmental impact	Tackling waste	Producers	A Government programme / Available for all UK businesses, and has worked with 'many thousands'	Information, advice and hands-on support
Envision project with secondary school pupils	Project to engage 15-19 year old school pupils in developing social and	Engaging different sectors	Consumers	Sustainability NGO / Over 700 pupils in 60	Inspirational presentation to engage interest; Facilitated

	environmental projects	of society		schools	group to allow individuals to develop action
BTCV Environments for All	Programme to try and get more people from excluded groups involved in all aspects of BTCV's work	Engaging different sectors of society	Other organisation; Consumers	Management and project team within the organisation / 4 outreach projects in the four countries of the UK, with influence throughout organisation	Central team leading; outreach work to engage and develop work with hard to reach groups; targets and monitoring; disseminating lessons to try and influence rest of organisation, and external organisations
East Anglia food links	Not-for-profit co-operative with aim of developing sustainable local food economy and supporting small local and sustainable food producers	Helping farmers produce more sustainably	Producers; Consumers	Not-for-profit co-operative / working with food producers and buyers in the East Anglia region	Multiple, targeted projects; working with all stakeholders to change a whole system
Marine Stewardship Council fish certification scheme	Independent certification of sustainably managed fisheries	Helping fishers produce more sustainably	Consumers; Producers	Not-for-profit organisation / World-wide scheme	Information provision, through certification and labelling to influence consumer choice and producer behaviour; communications campaign and promotion of the scheme
Sustainable hospital food procurement pilot project	Work with four hospitals in London to increase the proportion of local and / or organic food used in their catering	Sustainable procurement	Other bodies	Environmental NGOs / 4 London hospitals	Intensive hands-on work with different stakeholders to change one aspect of a system

Three London borough recycling services	Provide household recycling collections	Sustainable consumption	Consumers	Local authorities with waste companies / In three London boroughs	Various approaches, based on doorstep collections
---	---	-------------------------	-----------	---	---

2. Illustrating behaviour change theory in practice

The case studies are complex, real life examples and as such often do not cleanly follow the theoretical models described in chapter 1. Each tends to illustrate or embody a number of different principles discussed in the theory. However, it is useful to illustrate some of the points made in the theory with the cases, and to use the theories to comment on the cases.

2.1 Changing the context

The BedZED case study provides a classic example where change is achieved by simply changing the context within which an individual acts. The project provides homes that will lead individuals to significantly reduce the environmental impact of many of their household behaviours (such as heating and water use) without any effort, or even needing to be aware of the changes.

This does not necessitate any conscious change in the individual. This approach may be effective, but is limited in the environmental impact that it can achieve. It will not automatically lead to other changes by the individuals involved and will not produce sustained change in individuals if they move out of the BedZED development.

Various measures have therefore been introduced alongside the provision of more environmentally friendly homes to try and engage people with reducing their environmental impact including a visitors centre, publicity work and 'lifestyle officers' who have contact with new residents to help them make use of the environmental features of the development.

The development also provides additional infrastructure that requires conscious effort to behave in an environmentally friendly manner, including a car share scheme. The development also aims to influence a wider audience by demonstrating the feasibility of environmentally friendly building schemes in practice and helping to develop the necessary technology for others to replicate the approach.

2.2 Action networks / action learning

Global Action Plan's (GAP) Ecoteams project, and the Envision programme with sixth form school pupils, both use the principle of learning networks to support individual behaviour change. Facilitated groups provide a supportive context for individuals to reflect on and change their environmental behaviour. Interestingly, the GAP Ecoteams project has tried running groups that do not have a trained facilitator and have found that this approach is very effective.

The Ecoteams manager speculated that this was because there was no 'expert' that the team members could be intimidated, or put off, by. This observation may fit with the theory that champions of change often share the same role of a reflective practitioner as those who they are inspiring. Action learning is also integral to a number of the other case studies:

- Interface Ltd. set up a team of external experts who worked along with senior management to develop principles, targets and a framework to deliver change in the company. Employees were also engaged in the challenge.

- Action learning was central to the BTCV Environments for All project. Outreach teams worked with people from excluded groups to engage them with environmental action, and then fed the learning back into the main organisation, as well as reflecting on and sharing learning with each other. People from the target groups also identified the issues they wanted to work on themselves, which is another important aspect of action learning, and other behaviour change theory.
- East Anglia food links has engaged stakeholders from all parts of the food chain, including producers, distributors, consumers and retailers. These partnerships have allowed the project to identify the issues that these different stakeholders face in relation to changing their behaviour. They have then developed tailored projects to support change together with the stakeholders they are trying to change.
- The Marine Stewardship Council worked closely with stakeholders in the international seafood trade to develop their criteria for assessing and certifying sustainable fisheries.
- The Sustainable Hospital Food project worked with hospitals, small suppliers and bigger distributors to identify the issues that were preventing change and develop solutions that worked for all stakeholders

2.3 Changing habit

The GAP Ecoteams case study illustrates Lewin's Change Theory about how the barrier of habit can be overcome to achieve behaviour change (see Chapter 1). Thus, the teams identify and discuss everyday habitual environmental behaviours, such as water or energy use. They then discuss ways of changing these behaviours and monitor their success in doing so. This correlates with the theory of 'unfreezing' an habitual behaviour by bringing it to conscious attention and scrutinising it, before changing it and then allowing it to 'refreeze' into a changed habit.

2.4 Changing agency

Agency – i.e. the extent to which someone feels that they are able to have an effect - is another key barrier to behaviour change discussed in Chapter 1. The Envision programme brings together young people and supports them in taking action in response to a problem they think is important. The idea is that this will help them learn that they are able to make a difference to the world, which should help them be more active in their future lives. This approach has strong links to the 'active citizenship' agenda and Envision is involved with research and delivering training on active citizenship.

2.5 Understanding the situation from the actor's perspective

A number of the case studies illustrate one of Gardener and Stern's principles for policy-makers wanting to influence environmentally significant behaviours (see Chapter 1); namely that it is important to take into account the perspective of the people whose behaviour you are trying to change, and preferably to involve them in designing the intervention.

- Envision's programme with young people and BTCV's work with excluded groups both involve consulting the target groups to identify which issues they want to address.
- The Envirowise service for UK businesses provides a responsive approach tailoring information to the needs of specific businesses.
- East Anglia food links works by developing a wide range of focussed projects working with producers, retailers and others involved in the food system.
- The Sustainable Hospital Food project worked with Hospitals, suppliers and distributors to identify barriers to change and develop new solutions.
- Interface Ltd. provides some opportunity for employees to engage with the challenge of changing the business, and to suggest changes that they think might help.
- The Marine Stewardship Council has worked with stakeholders from the Seafood industry to develop criteria for assessing and labelling sustainable fisheries.

The remaining case studies involve a degree of prescription about the behaviour to be changed or the measure used. For example, BedZED provides environmentally friendly housing, without consultation with potential users and the GAP Ecoteams have to choose from a narrow list of behaviours.

It is important to work with target groups that are hard to engage and have traditionally seemed reluctant to engage with environmental behaviour change. It is likely to be particularly important in these cases to allow the people you are trying to change to identify the issues that are important to them and the constraints that they face. For example, the BTCV Environments for All project has shown how engaging with excluded groups such as Black and Minority Ethnic communities, and allowing them to set the agenda, can lead to more effective engagement and participation.

2.6 Whole organisation change

Both the Interface and BTCV Environments for All case studies illustrate organisational change. In both cases change was driven from within the organisation and targets and monitoring helped drive the process. In the case of BTCV, the motivation for change came from within the organisation, while in the case of Interface, change was adaptive, in that the organisation decided to change as a result of the changing context in which they were operating – for example, growing interest in environmental business practices and pressure from customers. An extra dimension was added by the fact that this external pressure led to the company's chairman becoming 'converted' to the idea of sustainable business and a dynamic 'champion' for change from within the organisation.

In relation to organisational change theory, the BTCV case study seems to illustrate an incremental approach to change – they put in place a team to change one aspect of their organisation. The case of Interface however seems less clear-cut. In common with incremental change, the process in Interface was driven and co-ordinated by management and involved looking at how to change existing aspects of the business. However, the business was aiming at significant change to all aspects of its operation that is perhaps more akin to transformational change (see Chapter 1).

Both examples illustrate aspects of learning and action learning theory, in that change in these two organisations involved action, learning and feedback. In the case of Interface a ‘dream team’ of external experts was assembled to help guide change, which has elements of Chapman’s learning theory, but with the difference that the experts involved were not direct stakeholders in the business.

2.7 Theories about whole-system change

The case studies illustrate a range of approaches from single interventions to initiatives that take a more holistic approach to changing behaviour and hence illustrate aspects of whole systems approaches to changing behaviour. Interestingly the case studies we have that illustrate whole systems approaches relate predominantly to initiatives that are trying to change aspects of the food system – i.e. they are aiming to change a system, rather than using a whole systems approach to changing a specific behaviour.

For example, East Anglia food links is working to change consumers, producers, retailers and distributors in order to try and make the food system in East Anglia more sustainable. The Sustainable Hospital Food project is working in a similar way on a smaller scale to change the amount of sustainable food procured by four hospitals. Comparison can be drawn with the ‘More from Less’ waste minimisation work of Hampshire County Council, highlighted in Chapter 1.

These examples illustrate the idea of influencing both consumers and ‘the market’ (producers) put forward in the balanced policy-making model developed by Sharp for Defra (see Chapter 1). Most of the cases employ a sub-section of Defra’s four E’s of Sustainable Development, rather than all of them at once. For example, the Sustainable Hospital Food project ‘enabled’ change by providing a worker to research sources of local organic food for hospitals, and ‘engaged’ both the buyers and producers. However, there was no mechanism for ‘encouragement’. One case that does illustrate all four Es in action is the West Sussex Real Nappy project, which:

- **encourages** with a cash reward for changed behaviour
- **engages** through a media communications campaign
- provides an **example** through the use of real nappies by hospital staff
- **enables** by providing real nappy starter packs.

3. Links to policy tools

Since the case studies discussed here are not directly linked to the policy tool examples discussed in Chapter 2, they can best be seen as offering parallel perspectives and no particular lessons from comparing them have emerged.

4. Practical lessons for influencing behaviour

This section summarises practical lessons from the case studies in relation to changing environmental behaviours, under the following headings:

- 4.1 Different approaches to influencing change
- 4.2 Replication and ‘rolling out’
- 4.3 Opportunities for policy-makers to influence others

4.1 Different approaches to influencing change

The 14 case studies illustrate a range of different practical ways in which it is possible to influence environmental behaviour, as summarised in Table 2. The cases cover a wide range of approaches to influencing environmental behaviour, from fairly straightforward single interventions, to integrated whole systems approaches.

The whole-system approach can either involve working to influence the behaviour of more than one stakeholder within a system at the same time (for example producers and consumers), or taking an integrated approach to changing a single behaviour of a single target group (for example use of non-disposable nappies).

Effectiveness

An important question would be ‘Which approach to influencing environmental behaviour change is most effective?’ This current study does not have the scope to allow us to meaningfully compare the cases in terms of effectiveness, and in any case this may be a pointless exercise as they differ so fundamentally in scope, aims and methods.

Theories of behaviour change discussed in chapter 1 would suggest that some approaches should be more successful than others, for example more integrated approaches may be more likely to be successful.

Approaches that take a more linear and simplistic approach to changing behaviours such as Envirowise’s provision of information and advice to businesses, or the Lambeth PLEASE project that aims to remove financial barriers to investment in energy efficient improvements, could be expected to be less successful.

This is an area where further, more systematic research could be valuable by looking at whether the expected outcomes on the basis of theory are borne out in practice.

Different target groups

Table three summarises the different approaches used to influence environmental behaviour in the 14 case studies.

The case studies that influenced individual (consumer) behaviour used the following main approaches to doing so:

- Facilitated group or outreach work (GAP Ecoteams; Envision programme; BTCV Environments for All).
- Information provision, linked to awareness-raising/campaigns (Marine Stewardship Council fish certification; WWF ranking of power companies).
- Providing infrastructure/necessary facilities to allow environmentally friendly behaviour (BedZED housing development; also to some extent the West Sussex real nappies project and the East Anglia food links project that has helped develop farmers markets and increased availability of locally produced sustainable food in retail outlets).
- Integrated approach including: financial incentive; providing access to environmentally friendly alternatives; communications campaign; outreach and using the influence of trusted institutions (West Sussex Real Nappy initiative).

The approaches to influencing the behaviour of businesses and other organisations (hospitals and a large environmental NGO) included the following approaches:

- Providing information and advice (Envirowise);
- Removing financial barriers (Lambeth PLEASE);
- Using tender specifications to influence the environmental behaviour of contractors (Road tender);
- Using ranking or certification to create competition to be the most environmentally friendly, and add brand value in being so (WWF ranking power companies; MSC sustainable fish labelling);
- Using targets, targeted initiatives and organisational learning to change an organisation (BTCV Environments for All; Interface);
- Hands on support to help create capacity to change current ways of operating (Sustainable hospital food project; East Anglia food links work with retailers and buyers).

These case studies do not appear to illustrate very strong or clear-cut differences in approach or methods used for changing the behaviour of individuals or organisations. Many of the approaches used are employed in slightly different ways to influence change in both groups. For example:

- Providing information – both for businesses through Envirowise, and to consumers through the MSC sea food labelling scheme;
- Measuring progress – for example BTCV Environments for All, and GAP Ecoteams;
- Hands-on support and facilitation – for example, Envision programme, BTCV Environments for all and Sustainable Hospital Food project;
- Financial incentives – for example Lambeth PLEASE and the West Sussex Real Nappy initiative.

In these examples, there are some approaches that only appear under either individuals or businesses / organisations, but which could apply to the other group. For example:

- using ranking to create competition to drive change; and
- providing infrastructure.

The only approach that appears to be totally specific and non-transferable between these categories is tender specification, which by its nature can only influence the behaviour of a contracting business.

Table 2 – Comparison of case studies by target group and approach to influencing change

Project name	Target group	Approach to changing behaviour
Interface Europe Ltd. carpet manufacturer	Producer	Whole system approach to organisation change led from within – with leadership drive, targets and measuring, and an integrated framework to achieving change across the whole organisation
London borough of Merton sustainable highways procurement scheme	Producers	Using tender/ procurement process to affect contractor's environmental performance
World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) ranking of electricity companies	Producers	Using a ranking system to influence consumer choice and encourage improvements from producers, with an awareness raising and political lobbying campaign
Lambeth borough council private landlord energy award scheme (PLEASE)	Producers	Financial incentive / removing financial barrier
Envirowise work to reduce waste in businesses	Producers	Information and advice service
Global Action Plan Ecoteams	Consumer	Using a facilitated group situation to support individual behaviour change
West Sussex real nappy initiative	Consumers	Integrated approach using financial incentives, communications campaign, outreach, partnership working, and using the influence of trusted institutions
BedZED - Bedddington Zero Energy Development	Consumers	Providing the infrastructure necessary to allow more environmentally friendly living
Envision project with secondary school pupils	Consumers	Using a facilitated group situation to support individual behaviour change
BTCV Environments for All	Other organisation	Integrated approach to organisational change, including central leadership, targets, outreach teams

	Consumers	Outreach, hands-on work including consultation on priority concerns, and developing tailored projects
East Anglia food links	Producers; Consumers	Whole systems approach using targeted projects with all relevant stakeholders
Marine Stewardship Council fish certification scheme	Consumers; Producers	Integrated approach to changing supply chain, using certification to influence consumer and producer behaviour, along with communications campaign and partnership working with stakeholders
Sustainable hospital food procurement pilot project	Other bodies	Integrated approach with hands-on support to buyers and producers to change supply chain behaviour
Three London boroughs recycling services	Consumers	Various approaches based around providing doorstep recycling collection; one borough has successfully introduced compulsory participation in their scheme

4.2 Replication and ‘rolling out’

A key policy question is often ‘If that initiative has been successful, why can we not replicate it elsewhere?’ Theory warns against adopting too simplistic an approach to the replication and roll out of environmental behaviour change projects, due to the fact that the context, target audience and behaviour in question can mean that very different approaches are needed (see chapter 1). The 14 cases help illustrate some points about replication.

Complexity

It is likely to be easier to replicate an approach to influencing behaviour change if it is relatively simple and straight forward, for example, the Envision programme with sixth form pupils involves a standard approach with a presentation to engage young people followed by group working over a set period of time. This project has already expanded from an initial pilot and its creators are looking into the potential to ‘franchise’ the approach for other organisations to deliver, as a way of expanding across the UK.

In contrast, an example such as East Anglia Food Link may be harder to replicate, as it is a complex programme of many different related initiatives working with many different stakeholders. Although the core approach is perhaps fairly straightforward, involving a strategic overview and many linked projects operating with different stakeholders at all levels of the food system, it would be necessary to build up any similar project from scratch in a new area. The appropriate stakeholders would need to be identified and engaged, local issues identified and individual projects developed.

Tailoring to specific audiences and circumstances

In all cases, even with a straightforward approach, it is important that any attempts to replicate an environmental behaviour change intervention are sensitive to the specific audience and circumstances. For example, one of the simplest approaches among our case studies is the use of grants and interest free loans to encourage private landlords to invest in energy efficiency measures in their properties.

Although it is easy to see how this could be replicated it would be important to consider any specific variations in circumstances. For example, how you get information about the initiative to landlords might vary depending on the area in question, the language spoken by landlords, and the availability of other incentives or schemes that the project could be linked to.

Adapting to specific audiences is particularly important when dealing with hard to engage groups. BTCV's Environments for All project and Envision's work with young people both illustrate how important it is to consult those you are trying to change to find out what priorities, barriers and drivers are relevant for them.

Unique circumstances

Sometimes practical examples of behaviour change may be difficult to replicate as they have developed in fairly unique circumstances. The main example among our case studies is that of Interface. In this case, radical and fundamental change to the environmental impact of a company has been driven by a champion within the company, and while it is perhaps not that rare to find champions for environmental issues within organisations, it is rare that the champion has such a strong influence over the company and that such ambitious targets are set by a commercial business.

4.3 Opportunities for policy-makers to influence others

A key way in which policy-makers can influence environmental behaviour change is by supporting the delivery of behaviour change initiatives by others. The following points of influence are illustrated by the case studies:

- ***Funding***
For example, nearly half of the funding for Envision now comes from Government sources and this has had the added benefit of giving confidence to the project managers who now feel able to work with Government departments to share learning. The Marine Stewardship Council's commercial manager also reported that receiving funding from Defra had acted as an important endorsement of their work. Unpublished research into support for local environmental initiatives found that even small amounts of funding can help catalyse and justify the development of new community projects (The LSE Win Win project final report to the Esmee Fairbairn foundation).
- ***Legislation***
For example, the Lambeth PLEASE project was ultimately driven by the Home Energy Conservation Act, and is funded by the Home Energy Conservation Action 2000 Programme.

- ***Specifying approaches in policy***
For example, the London Mayor's draft Food Strategy proposes that the Sustainable Hospital food project be expanded to every hospital in London if it is found to be successful.
- ***Joint working***
For example, Envision is now working with the Government's Learning and Skills Agency to share learning about engaging young people with active citizenship.
- ***Directly delivering programmes***
For example, Envirowise is a Government programme.
- ***Helping set the right context***
For example, the WWF ranking of power companies project was developed by looking at the maximum savings in CO2 emissions power companies could achieve within the current policy context. Targets for CO2 reduction and the fact that Government is taking this issue seriously also helps create a supportive context for the development of behaviour change projects by other bodies.

5. Relevance to global environmental challenges

Ultimately, these case studies are of interest because we are concerned with the challenge of global environmental problems. The problems we face are pressing, huge and often fairly poorly understood, such as global warming. It is important to address the question of how appropriate and relevant interventions to influence environmental behaviour change are, and how far they can contribute, when faced with such massive and important problems.

Table 1 above summarises the scale of impact that the different case studies have. Their scope ranges from increasing recycling in a single road scheme to an impact on the sustainability of global fisheries. It is beyond the scope of this study to go into detail, but it is possible to highlight the following issues from the case studies considered. Further research into the scope of practical environmental initiatives to contribute to significant environmental change is likely to be difficult to conduct, but is important if we are to have a better idea of the significance of our current efforts.

5.1 Scaling up

Many of these projects are taking place in the context of a much wider effort. For example, WWF is running an international campaign to reduce the carbon dioxide emissions of power companies; GAP Ecoteams and BTCV Environments for All are operating in the context of literally tens of thousands of small scale sustainability projects taking place across the UK, often led by local community groups. For example it is estimated that 1 in 6 UK households is served by a community recycling project (Shell Better Britain Campaign, 2002; Church and Elster, 2002)

5.2 Changing the social context

Even projects that have little environmental impact themselves could help change social norms, or people's attitudes, which in turn can help contribute to broader societal changes in behaviour– for example the Envision programme probably achieves fairly modest environmental impact but engages young people and helps them develop a sense of agency that, in theory at least, may make them more likely to take action throughout their lives. Research into this mechanism is likely to be complex but may produce some interesting results?

5.3 Quantifying the challenge

Would it be useful to convert environmental targets such as recycling or CO2 reduction into meaningful behaviour change measures? For example could we say how many people we would need to get to reduce their household waste by how much in order to reduce demand for landfill sufficiently? This may then help to judge efforts to change behaviour.

References

Church, C and Elster, J (2002) *Thinking locally, acting nationally: lessons for national policy from work on local sustainability* Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York

Elster, J (2004) *The Win Win project final report* internal report to the Esmee Fairbairn Foundation

Shell Better Britain Campaign, (2002) *The Quiet Revolution*, Shell Better Britain Campaign, Birmingham

Annex to Chapter 3: The detailed case studies

Beddington Zero Energy Development (BedZED)	
Description and background/history	
<p>BedZED, the Beddington Zero Energy Development, is an environmentally friendly, energy-efficient, development of 100 housing and work units built on a former sewerage works site in Beddington, Sutton. The development includes a childcare facility and green spaces, including private gardens. It is designed to be carbon-neutral in use – i.e. designed not to add any net increase in carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, and is the first large-scale development of this kind in the UK. BedZED has been designed with the aim of minimising environmental impact, including carbon dioxide emissions. Its environmental design features include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - where possible building materials were selected from natural, renewable or recycled sources and wherever possible brought from within a 35-mile radius of the site - a combined heat and power unit able to produce all the development’s heat and electricity from tree waste (which would otherwise go to landfill) - PV panels on roof tops and in glazing which contribute to the electrical load - energy-efficient design - with the houses facing south to make the most of the heat from the sun, excellent insulation and triple-glazed windows - a water strategy able to cut mains consumption by a third - including installing water saving appliances and making the most of rain and recycled water - a green transport plan which aims to reduce reliance on the car by cutting the need for travel (for example, through internet shopping links and on-site facilities) and providing alternatives to driving such as a car pool - recycling bins in every home <p>The development was a partnership project between:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BioRegional, an entrepreneurial environmental organisation that works to develop practical local sustainability projects led the development of the project - The Peabody Trust who financed the initiative and brought a long-term commitment to innovation in construction, quality accommodation and strong communities - Bill Dunster Architects who had carried out previous work on zero-energy housing - Sutton council, the land-owners, who are committed to sustainability in the borough, including promoting energy conscious developments - Ellis & Moore, and Arup – consulting engineers - Gardiner and Theobald - Quantity Surveyors and Construction management 	
Context – for example, location, scale, type of organisation	
A Partnership housing development in South London	
Target audience	
<p>Consumers who are renting housing and work units. The development has deliberately targeted a mix of residents. A third of the units are available for social rent, for people on the London Borough of  housing list. The development also houses key workers, private tenants and private owners who  purchased on the open market.</p>	
Nature of behaviour change targeted	
The project targets all aspects of environmental impact from housing, aiming to provide a housing option that will allow residents to have a reduced environmental impact without necessarily having to make specific changes to lifestyle or behaviour.	
Delivery mechanism	
<p>The main mechanism is through the provision of housing and infrastructure that allows residents to have reduced environmental impact without necessarily having to make specific changes to lifestyle or behaviour. The development also incorporates opportunities for more active environmental behaviour change. For example recycling infrastructure and a car share scheme.</p> <p>The development employed a “green lifestyle officer” for the first two years of the project, to offer support for residents. BioRegional, the organisation that led the development of BedZED has their offices on site, which allows them to provide informal support to residents.</p>	

<p>They actively promote the idea of sustainable living, and BedZED as a case study, through visits, an information centre and training on sustainable living.</p>
<p>Who leads and who delivers</p>
<p>This was a partnership project between BioRegional, the Peabody Trust and Bill Dunster Architects. BioRegional instigated the project.</p>
<p>Funding – cost and sources of funding</p>
<p>The Peabody trust provided the majority of funding for the development and will receive income from rents. Other funders included: the Housing Corporation who fund projects within the BedZED Scheme; Biffaward; WWF; the New Opportunities Fund, Onyx environmental trust; DTI; and the London Cycling Campaign.</p>
<p>Any lessons reported?</p>
<p>Currently the Combined Heat and Power is not working, frustrating the residents. This demonstrates some of the problems with working with new technology and innovations – it is hard to remove the element of risk with new technologies.</p> <p>The properties in BedZED have shown something of a ‘Green Premium’ when re-sold on the open market, with prices 8-20% more than the surrounding area (depending on unit type – largest difference is 20% for 1 bedroom flats), suggesting a demand.</p>
<p>Behaviour change outcomes achieved</p>
<p>BioRegional and Peabody are monitoring the impact of the development on residents’ environmental behaviour and impact, with assistance from a University PhD student who has carried out questionnaire surveys with new residents. Measured results, compared with the UK national average include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 88% reduction in space heating - 57% reduction in hot water usage - 25% reduction in electricity use - 50% reduction in use of mains water - 65% reduction in fossil fuel car mileage <p>Additional environmental savings were achieved in the building of the development, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 15% (3,404 tonnes) of the construction materials used at BedZED were reclaimed or recycled - 52% by weight of the construction materials used were sourced from within a 35 mile radius of the construction site - choosing timber over uPVC window frames for the BedZED scheme saved nearly 800 tonnes of CO2 emissions, some 12.5% of the total embodied CO2 for the scheme - careful selection of construction materials reduced the embodied environmental impact of the BedZED development by 20-30%
<p>Legacy – lasting impacts and seeding of further activities</p>
<p>BedZED has stimulated debate and is often cited as an example of sustainable building. It is of particular interest because it is a large-scale development that has taken a comprehensive approach to sustainable housing. It incorporates latest environmental design and technology and other sustainability principles like mixed tenure and live/work units. It has acted as a focus for interest in sustainable housing developments and has attracted visits from many major developers. It represents an important step forward in that it is a practical demonstration of how many different environmental improvements can be incorporated into a large-scale working housing development that can be used by mainstream residents.</p> <p>The UK is not very good at sharing commercial knowledge, and BedZED might help to ease that problem.</p>

BTCV Environments for all
<p>Description and background/history</p> <p>Environments for all is a three-year programme being run by BTCV with the aim of increasing involvement from under-represented groups in environmental action. The programme was developed by BTCV to further their overarching aim of maximising the potential of voluntary action for the environment. Traditionally, environmental volunteering has been largely restricted to certain sectors of the population. BTCV had already developed their work from a purely environmental focus to begin to engage with social issues. Although they had carried out some work with marginalised communities, they were keen to significantly expand the range of people who get involved with environmental volunteering in order to expand their impact over the long-term.</p> <p>BTCV's 2000 – 2004 strategic plan set the aim of 'expanding the boundaries of conservation volunteering' by changing and adapting the ways in which it works.</p> <p>The Environments for All project was developed to begin to address this under-representation of 'significant proportions of the UK population' in environmental volunteering by piloting and developing work with Black Minority Ethnic and other excluded communities in pilot areas of the UK. The project set out to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - engage excluded communities with environmental volunteering by providing opportunities appropriate to different excluded communities; - identify and disseminate good practice in order to spread lessons through BTCV and the wider environmental sector; and - encourage the involvement of people from BME communities in the running and management of BTCV. <p>BTCV set up a project management team with strong community development skills and environmental experience. The team was made up of 15 staff including, a project manager in Northern Ireland, a part-time project manager in Scotland, a help line coordinator in Wales, eight full-time and four part-time community project officers. In addition they worked with 27 community volunteer officers and 36 mentors in Wales.</p>
<p>Context – e.g. location, scale, type of organisation</p> <p>The programme was designed to influence a large national voluntary organisation, using pilot projects across the UK.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In England, the pilot areas / communities were: non-white communities in Oldham; the predominately Asian area of Belgrave in Leicester; the ethnically mixed areas of Smallheath, Sparkhill, Sparkbrooke and Handsworth in Birmingham; and a predominately black area in the London Borough of Brent. - In Scotland, the project concentrated on Asian and non-white communities in Glasgow - In Wales, existing outreach was extended in three different areas. Work was focused on non-white communities where possible. - In Northern Ireland the pilot focused on more broadly disadvantaged communities, with a special emphasis on the black and ethnic minority communities in Belfast including the Indian, Chinese and Traveller communities.
<p>Target audience</p> <p>The programme aimed to engage excluded communities with environmental volunteering and projects.</p> <p>It also aimed to influence the whole of BTCV, a national voluntary organisation, and the wider UK environmental sector.</p>
<p>Nature of behaviour change targeted</p> <p>The programme aimed to increase the involvement of excluded groups in environmental volunteering and local environmental projects. It also aimed to increase the representation of excluded groups in BTCV's activities, staff and management.</p>
<p>Delivery mechanism</p> <p>The programme had a dedicated project management team, and set out to deliver its aims as follows:</p>

- Engaging excluded groups and increasing their involvement with environmental volunteering – hands-on community development approach to engaging communities
Teams were set up in all four UK countries with dedicated community project officers. These officers were trained and undertook outreach work in the pilot areas. They developed local partnerships, recruited community volunteer officers locally and actively carried out consultation work to identify the environmental issues of concern to the specific communities they were working with. The local teams were supported by regional management and central BTCV services with, for example, publicity and marketing expertise. Advice help-lines, local contact points and local projects were provided through the project officers and volunteers / mentors.
- Capturing and spreading lessons
Project staff gave monthly reports on progress, lessons and challenges. Central support was provided to help the teams develop, publicise and share good practice. However, sharing information and lessons proved difficult due to BTCV's size and complexity.
- Making the organisation more representative
They carried out an initial base-line review of BTCV's work with BME and other excluded communities and of involvement of these groups in the organisation. They then developed a system of monitoring, evaluation and review linked to their existing central database. This system then allowed them to set targets for the pilot projects in terms of the numbers of excluded people they were engaging. In addition the local pilots carried out qualitative research into engagement, attitudes and customer satisfaction. At the organisational level, the monitoring system allowed them to set targets and timescales for making the organisation more representative in terms of volunteers involved, staff and management.
- They encouraged involvement from excluded groups in the governance of BTCV, through their networks of community groups and supporters.

Who leads and who delivers

The programme was led by a management team in the organisation and delivered by outreach teams in local areas, who also recruited local community volunteers and mentors.

Funding – cost and sources of funding

The programme was funded by the Community Fund and Barclays. It cost over £1,770,000 with the Community Fund providing £1,370,000 over the three years of the project. BTCV made in-kind contributions of staff experience and expertise.

Any lessons reported?

Although the programme succeeded in engaging more people from excluded communities with environmental projects, their involvement was not generally considered to be likely to continue without ongoing support. The project staff now have greater awareness of the importance of this factor and are developing management strategies to try and ensure the sustainability of environmental projects after BTCV support ends.

Lessons reported by the project include:

- the importance of listening and responding to the exact needs and wishes of the community or group;
- the importance of planning ahead, communicating clearly and regularly;
- changing or doing small things can make a big difference to the community;
- the importance of having positive, reliable, knowledgeable, enthusiastic project staff; and
- the importance of on-going contact, support and sustainability of projects.

Some issues and concerns reported by respondents to the external evaluation questionnaire survey included:

- sustainability – ongoing funding, experienced staff and long time scales are needed;
- knowledge and understanding of, and sensitivity and responsiveness to, the needs of each community are important;
- many other communities and groups have yet to become involved; and
- many other activities, projects, ideas and events have yet to be tried or undertaken.

Behaviour change outcomes achieved

The project involved internal reporting and evaluation, and an external evaluation of the project has been carried out by the Black Environment Network. This included questionnaire surveys with project staff and target communities, and a final report of the project and assessment of its success.

The following outcomes are reported:

- in ethnic minority and other marginalised communities where the Environments for All outreach teams have been working, there has been a significant increase in the awareness of BTCV (or Conservation Volunteers Northern Ireland, CVNI) and the general environment sector;
- there has been a significant increase in the numbers of ethnic minority and other marginalised communities and people involved with environmental projects;
- there has been an increase in the number of BTCV/CVNI staff working with these target groups; and
- Environments for All staff have gained skills and knowledge in relation to reaching, and working with, marginalised groups. They have received relevant training such as conflict management within community groups and lone working practices. Volunteer officers have been trained in the Environments for All ethos.

The following percentage changes over the life of the project are reported:

- directly managed volunteers who are BME – changed from 7-10%
- directly managed volunteers who are unemployed – changed from 27-28%
- directly managed volunteers who are disabled – changed from 3-17%
- millennium volunteers who are BME – changed from 26-15%
- millennium volunteers who are unemployed – changed from 9-16%
- millennium volunteers who are disabled – changed from 7-10%
- community work with BME groups – changed from 22-27%
- community work with unemployed – changed from 31-48%
- community work with disabled – changed from 3-13%

Areas where the project has been less successful include:

- there has been little, or no, increase in diversity in the staff or management of BTCV/CVNI; and
- the level of involvement of excluded groups in environmental projects has not been to the extent where groups can continue and sustain their involvement independent of support.

Legacy – lasting impacts and seeding of further activities

- The ethos and experience of the Environments for All projects (namely, putting people first in nature conservation) is being communicated within BTCV and to communities and the wider environment sector including wildlife trusts, local councils, water authorities and environmental agencies.
- The Integration of the ethos of the Environments for All projects into other BTCV projects has created new partnerships and new networks.
- BTCV project officers from outside the programme have been involved in the Environments for All projects and they have learnt new skills.
- Other organisations are approaching BTCV for training, and have approached the communities engaged by Environments for All, to ask people to participate in other projects.
- Other projects have been developed by BTCV as a result of the programme. For example, E-merge is a new multi-media training project arising from the Environments for All projects.
- The success of the Environments for All projects has given BTCV positive publicity, influencing its image of being a ‘white, middle-class, male’ organisation.

East Anglia Food Link

Description and background/history

East Anglia Food Link (EAFL) is a not-for-profit NGO that works to develop a more sustainable and local food system across the East of England. It aims to represent all parts of the sustainable food chain from producers to consumers and independent retailers. The organisation works through many projects and partnerships influencing all aspects of the food chain, including:

- driving the region's cutting-edge work on sustainable public-sector food procurement
- the development of genuinely local/regional and sustainable food supply chains
- projects to improve access to good food for people on low incomes
- earlier projects in support of organic producers, the establishment of an organic wholesale business, and to support farmers' markets

EAFL grew out of another regional project called Farmers' Link, a not-for-profit organisation working in the East Anglian farming community to promote sustainable agriculture and rural development and to develop links between rural communities in the UK and in other parts of the world. EAFL was originally an idea developed by one of Farmers' Link's working groups in the mid 1990s. The working group involved representatives from a broad range of rural interest groups including farmers and agricultural scientists. They identified producer-consumer relations as being one of the key areas for developing sustainable agriculture and rural development, and this led to the development of EAFL. EAFL's first co-ordinator, Clive Peckham, was working at Farmers' Link and had a key role in the development of the organisation.

EAFL's official aims are to:

- promote environmentally and socially responsible food production
- encourage the development of community based local food economies
- develop interactive links between producers and consumers

Context – e.g. location, scale, type of organisation

Works across the 6 counties of the East of England Region. It is constituted as a company limited by guarantee. EAFL currently has two full-time staff as well as a team of freelance consultants. Turnover is around £100,000 per annum.

Target audience

All stakeholders involved in the food chain in East Anglia including producers, wholesalers, processors, retailers, school and hospital caterers and consumers.

Nature of behaviour change targeted

The sustainability of all aspects of food chain including production, retail, procurement and consumption. Specifically, production, procurement, processing, retail and buying of food.

Delivery mechanism

The organisation works on many different aspects of the sustainable food chain, developing and running many different projects. In general, their work covers:

- leading the East of England's cutting-edge work on sustainable public sector food procurement, an agenda that EAFL has been driving since 1999.
- developing food supply chains in which the food supplied has clear local/regional provenance and other attributes of sustainability, to supply public-sector markets and others (eg retail, restaurants)
- projects to improve access to good food for people in rural areas and/or on low incomes
- past projects have included work in support of farmers' markets and organic producers.
- assisting and developing local, national and transnational partnerships and projects to create models of sustainable agriculture and local development appropriate to all geographical levels.

Specific project examples include:

- a project with the catering teams of seven local education authorities (total food spend £15m) to increase the amount of food sourced locally/regionally; similar work in the hospitals sector
- a project in rural Bedfordshire to create community-led food access initiatives
- a project in Norfolk to introduce supplies of local and regional food into independent shops
- research into the issues faced by village shops

- a major research study mapping food supply chains in a part of Norfolk
- a project to establish Eostre Organics, a producer-owned organic wholesaling business
- hosting members of the schools fruit and vegetable team for the East of England region.
- they were co-founders of Food Links UK (a best-practice network/federation of Food Links organisations), and helped establish AlimemTerra (a Europe-wide sustainable food network)

Who leads and who delivers

EAFLE is controlled by around 50 members who support its aims (but are not the beneficiaries of its work). The members elect a Board, which seeks to represent a range of interests in the food supply chain including farmers, retailers, public health professionals etc. The organisation has two full time staff and all of its work is delivered as specific projects, which are always managed by the core staff but are often delivered in partnership with partner organisations and/or employ freelance consultants.

Funding – cost and sources of funding

East Anglia Food Links relies entirely on project funding. It does not have any core funding and its workers and other core costs are funded through management costs from the projects it develops. The organisation also hosted two Department of Health workers – a five-a-day worker and a worker for the school fruit and vegetables scheme – from 2004 to 2006. The hosting fees contributed to office costs. Project funders have included: the Esmee Fairbairn Foundation, the Rural Development programme (money from the Regional Development Agency administered through the local authority), DEFRA, MAFF, EEDA and the Department of Health.

Any lessons reported?

- Involve stakeholders and partners in work from the outset to ensure consensus, agreement and demand from people you are aiming to support - rather than thinking of a good idea and doing it.
- Take a broad view and make sure that any efforts to support one part of the supply chain / system make sense in terms of supporting change in the whole system / supply chain.
- EAFLE has an increasing focus on working with existing, and increasingly quite large, businesses in the local/regional food supply chain (eg school caterers, greengrocery wholesalers, catering butchers, foodservice distributors, retailers’ buying groups) rather than on creating new businesses. Changing the behaviour of existing businesses can have a much greater impact in a shorter timescale than creating and growing new businesses.
- Developing good relationships with regional and local government has been important. It has meant that their work is recognised and acknowledged, and has allowed them to plug into local authority networks. It has also helped them identify sources of funding.
- It has been a key, and important part of their work to look at alternative food systems elsewhere in Europe, and to try and apply any lessons or good ideas here. For example, EAFLE pioneered work on sustainable public sector food procurement in the UK and the idea for this came from existing systems in France and Italy.

Behaviour change outcomes achieved

The organisation has had an impact on the environmental behaviour of many different target groups in many different ways. For example East Anglia Food Links:

- has helped support farmers to switch to organic production. For example, with the development of Eostre Organics a successful producer co-operative with a turnover of around £1m
- was one of the leading organisations calling for sustainable food in schools and hospitals in the late 1990s. This is now a widely accepted goal and part of Government policy
- co-founded Food Links UK which promotes and supports the local food sector nationally
- has been working with and supporting caterers and retailers in the region to get them buying more local and sustainable food
- supports the development of farmers markets and other opportunities for consumers to access organic and local food
- runs a sustainable public procurement project that is working to increase the sustainability of public sector procurement in the region. This has so far achieved sales for local/regional food businesses of some hundreds of thousands of pounds per annum, with an expectation of achieving several millions of pounds per annum within a few years

Legacy – lasting impacts and seeding of further activities

The organisation has given rise to many other initiatives, including:

- a successful organic farmer’s co-operative, and this model is being looked at by others
- EAFLE founded, and continues to play an active role in, Food Links UK

- EAFL helped establish a Europe-wide sustainable food network, called AlimenTerra

East Anglia Food Links have also been involved in developing thinking and practice on sustainable local food, and sustainable food procurement in the public sector. EAFL was the first organisation to bring the idea of sustainable food procurement onto the agenda in the UK at a time when it wasn't widely talked about. They organised the first sustainable food procurement conference in the UK with Somerset Food Links in 2001.

Envirowise
Description and background/history
Envirowise is a Government programme, launched in 1994. It was designed to encourage the sharing of best practice across UK industry in order to help businesses improve competitiveness through improved environmental performance and more efficient use of resources. The programme provides free, confidential, advice, information and support to UK businesses to help them improve their environmental performance.
Context – e.g. location, scale, type of organisation
The service is available to any UK business.
Target audience
UK businesses.
Nature of behaviour change targeted
The programme aims to influence the environmental performance of all aspects of a business' operation. The service aims to meet the different needs of different businesses and provides information and advice across a broad range of business sectors, and practices. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - reducing water consumption - making better use of raw materials - innovation in the design of 'cleaner' products - minimising waste
Delivery mechanism
Envirowise provides information, advice and hands-on support to help businesses reduce their environmental impact. They aim to meet the specific needs of each different businesses, by providing a core service tailored to different aspects of bussiness operations in different sectors. The core service includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - an Environment and Energy Helpline, which gives free confidential advice on resource efficiency to businesses in all industry sectors - free on-site visits from Envirowise advisors to help businesses identify areas to improve resource efficiency. This includes identifying potential savings, suggesting actions on how to consume fewer resources and advice on legislation. Every visit is individually tailored to companies of varying size and sector, ensuring that the most relevant waste and cost-saving information is available to them - events, including workshops, seminars and major exhibitions to help businesses reduce their environmental impact, comply with legislation and save money. Envirowise runs and signposts events such as practical workshops on profitting from cleaner design - a website with practical advice and information, including case studies, best practice guides and benchmarking tools - a range of publications containing practical advice on a variety of resource efficiency topics <p>The programme aims to get more businesses to recognise resource efficiency and environmental improvement as business imperatives. The service is promoted to businesses as helping save money and comply with legislation, as well as helping reduce environemntal impact.</p> <p>Envirowise also works with companies over time – sometimes over years - to help improve their resource efficiency and help them move up the waste hierarchy.</p>

<p>Some specific examples of support available include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - guidance on complying with new environmental legislation, including Hazardous Waste Directives - a list of water saving technologies that businesses can use, and information about financial incentives to invest in new water saving technology - ‘designtrack’ visits from an Envirowise advisor to help manufacturers develop products using cleaner design principles. Businesses are helped to identify opportunities to reduce environmental impact over whole product lifecycles, along with advice on redesigning packaging and products to save costs and reduce environmental impact - advice and on-site visits to help businesses develop environmental management systems
<p>Who leads and who delivers</p> <p>Envirowise is managed and delivered by contractors on behalf of Defra, DTI, Scottish Executive, Welsh Assembly Government and Invest Northern Ireland:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Momenta which is a division of the major environmental consultancy AEA Technology plc - and Serco Technology Transfer and Innovation Ltd (TTI), a subsidiary of Serco plc., a major service delivery company.
<p>Funding – cost and sources of funding</p> <p>Envirowise is funded at UK level by DTI and Defra, in England by BREW (Business Resource Efficiency Waste Programme), in Scotland by Scottish Executive’s Waste Strategy unit and in Wales by the Welsh Assembly’s Materials Action Programme. In Northern Ireland it is delivered in partnership with Invest Northern Ireland Total funding for 2005/2006 is £16.5million.</p>
<p>Any lessons reported?</p> <p>No data.</p>
<p>Behaviour change outcomes achieved</p> <p>Envirowise has provided information, advice and support to ‘thousands’ of UK businesses, and reports that it has saved UK businesses around £1.3 billion over 11 years from 1994.</p> <p>More specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the programme has helped UK business to reduce waste sent to landfill by over 1.6 million tonnes per year - the programme has helped UK businesses cut water consumption by 35 million cubic metres per year, saving £40 million in the process - the Environment and Energy Helpline has become a source of business advice on environmental issues for thousands of firms. More than 90% of callers to the line said they found answers to their queries <p>Specific case studies of savings to UK businesses quoted by Envirowise include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a white goods manufacturer, Indesit Company, made savings in the region of £17,500 per annum after an initial investment to improve waste management - following an Envirowise visit, electrical equipment maker S2S Electronics began to see compliance with electrical waste regulations as an opportunity rather than a threat. They achieved savings of £33,000 per year after redesigning their product based on clean design principles - Envirowise has helped Center Parcs by facilitating collaborative sessions between them and their suppliers. Together they identify ways to make the entire supply chain more streamlined and resource efficient, cutting waste and costs in the process.
<p>Legacy – lasting impacts and seeding of further activities</p> <p>No data.</p>

Envision

Description and background/history

Envision is a voluntary organisation that works to engage and support young people aged 16-19 to develop practical social and environmental projects. The organisation runs a school-based programme that engages young people and then works with them to identify issues they think are important and develop practical projects.

The organisation was set up by four young graduates who had been inspired by a 'wilderness leader' school in South Africa. The Wilderness school takes young people and decision makers on short wilderness trails in South Africa to engage them with the importance of conservation and get them discussing environmental issues. Two of the four British founders of Envision had been on a wilderness trail and came back inspired, with the idea of helping more young people from the UK access the experience. Their two friends were less convinced but they continued talking about the idea of engaging young people with environmental issues.

The four friends felt that people were generally keen to do something positive about environmental problems but were generally disempowered – environmental problems were often associated with a lot of guilt and it is often unclear what individuals can do to make a difference.

The friends were keen to engage young people as they thought it was important to work with people at the stage that they could be influenced for the rest of their lives. This also tied in with the wilderness school model that worked with young people and decision makers. The friends did not feel that they could influence decision makers so opted for young people.

They decided that they would try and develop a project to engage young people with environmental issues through schools and committed their time voluntarily to developing the project. They decided to focus on sixth formers (16-19 year olds) as they felt this group would be more mature and were more able to make their own decisions.

The friends persuaded five schools to let them come in and run a pilot programme for 1 year. They successfully applied for a grant from the lottery youth millennium awards so all four of them could go back to South Africa. This experience helped a lot, with all four going to the wilderness school, but also meeting a number of community projects who helped them broaden their idea of environmental issues to encompass local social and urban issues and think about the environmental issues that were relevant to people the projects were working with. They realised that this community development approach could be applied to the work they were planning with young people in the UK.

They had managed to get support from the Gaia foundation, an international environmental charity supporting environmental projects in many countries. This organisation introduced them to the community projects in South Africa, and provided them with office space for their first 2 years.

The friends organised a fundraising launch event and raised enough money to buy a computer and a power-point projector.

They started running their programme in the five pilot schools in September 2001, beginning with an interactive presentation to engage pupils, and then ongoing work with interested young volunteers in the schools. They worked with the young people to identify issues they thought were important and then helped the young people develop projects to address the issues. For example: recycling schemes; healthy food initiatives for school food; fair trade vending machines; car sharing scheme for teachers; collections for homeless shelters.

The programme has since expanded, now working in 60 schools with over 700 pupils, and having just set up an office in Birmingham working with a further 14 schools.

Context – e.g. location, scale, type of organisation

The project works in schools with 16-19 year old pupils, focused on London, but now expanding.

Target audience
16-19 year-old school or sixth form college pupils.
Nature of behaviour change targeted
Young people's engagement with environmental and social issues and practical project work to address issues. Projects cover a wide range of issues including: fair trade, green space projects, recycling, energy efficiency and renewable energy, sustainable transport.
Delivery mechanism
<p>Envision uses a standard programme to engage 16-18 year olds at school or college. The programme involves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - an interactive presentation to the whole sixth form - a meeting with interested pupils to establish a core project group - local volunteers, often from businesses, work with the pupil's group through weekly lunchtime meetings to identify issues and develop projects with support (including information, signposting, researching contacts, and helping with networking) from the Envision core staff. Pupils constantly evaluate and review progress - the programme ends with an award ceremony - the pupils have access to a website to showcase their projects and share ideas and experiences <p>Envision has also become involved with providing training for teachers on active citizenship with the Teacher Development Agency. They have also been carrying out work for the Learning Skills and Development Agency and with the Citizenship Department at Canterbury University, on active citizenship with young people.</p>
Who leads and who delivers
<p>Developed and set up by four young friends. Now run by three of the four and employing 10 members of staff, with 2 based in a new office in Birmingham.</p> <p>The core staff start off the programme in schools and then hand over to volunteers who work on a weekly basis with pupils. The volunteers are recruited through Internet adverts and active approaches to organisations and businesses, including several volunteers from Defra.</p>
Funding – cost and sources of funding
The organisation is reliant on grant funding. Originally most of its funding was from grant making trusts. Now nearly 50% of their funding comes from Government – Defra, the Home Office and the Association of London Government. They also receive funding from the National Lottery.
Any lessons reported?
The people involved in Envision did not feel confident when first trying to engage with Government. However, after receiving funding from Government departments, they felt they had something to contribute and have been more confident.
Behaviour change outcomes achieved
<p>They have succeeded in engaging nearly 700 16-19 year olds with environmental and social issues and practical action to tackle them.</p> <p>The pupil groups have developed a wide range of projects with positive environmental impact, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - recycling - solar panels - car sharing - fair trade - local environment and green space improvement <p>In 2003/4 97% of students taking part said that Envision had increased their understanding of environmental issues. 89% said that Envision had had a “large” or “very large” impact on their motivation to make a difference. 70% of contact teachers said that Envision had had a large or very large positive impact on participating students’ skills.</p>

Legacy – lasting impacts and seeding of further activities

- Envision’s founders are now thinking about expanding the project by using a ‘franchise’ approach where other organisations deliver their programme.
- The Envision schools programme has been used as a case study in a DEMOS report of active citizenship.
- Envision has been working with the Government’s Learning Skills and Development Agency and Canterbury University to disseminate their lessons about engaging young people with active citizenship.
- Envision has started providing training for teachers on active citizenship.
- The volunteers involved in the programme can take lessons back to their organisations, for example Defra volunteers.

GAP Ecoteams

Description and background/history

Ecoteams is a project run by the environmental charity Global Action Plan (GAP). Ecoteams are a small number (usually 6-8) of individuals or households brought together for a four-month programme during which they monitor the environmental impact of their everyday lives at home (including water, electricity and gas use; waste produced; transport used and shopping habits). The team gets together for meetings once a month during which they discuss different aspects of their domestic environmental impact and how to reduce it. Each member monitors and records their waste and recycling, gas, water and electricity usage, and other environmental impacts on a weekly or monthly basis and feeds this back to the group via an Ecoteams support worker or group coordinator. The coordinator / worker also feeds back the communal progress of the group. Participants discuss their progress, share information and advice, and encourage each other to improve their environmental performance.

The project began as a pilot that ran for three years in Nottinghamshire, and has now been expanded to cover other areas.

Ecoteams are run in two different ways:

- facilitated teams are led by a Global Action Plan worker who runs each meeting, leads discussions, provides information and feeds back on progress; or
- a more recent approach that has been tried and proven successful is for teams without trained facilitators. In this case teams are recruited through workplaces, including local authorities and businesses. They are given one day’s training. They then are left to run themselves and report progress back to GAP.

The Ecoteams approach was developed by Global Action Plan Netherlands and adopted by GAP in the UK.

Participants are recruited in two main ways depending on the different approaches discussed above.

- The facilitated teams are recruited by GAP workers through outreach work in communities. The GAP workers initially make contact with the local authority in an area, and then carry out doorstep leafleting and leafleting through community centres and other focal points for the community.
- In the case of workplace Ecoteams, initial contact is with an organisation, either from GAP approaching the organisation, or visa versa. The group participants have then been recruited in different ways. For example, British Gas call center staff directly volunteered to join groups. In another example, volunteers from Shrewsbury council recruited the rest of their team members – a mixture of colleagues, friends, neighbours and family members.

‘Ecoteams are designed to help households reduce their environmental impact from energy and water use, household waste, transport and consumer behaviour. The aim is that, by measuring improvements, the household will be able to change its behaviour and play its part toward a cleaner, more sustainable future.’ GAP web site.

Global Action Plan was set up in 1993 as an environmental organisation focusing on supporting people to take practical action to address environmental issues in their everyday lives. It aims to promote individual environmental action and make it more accessible and straightforward.

Context – e.g. location, scale, type of organisation
Individuals interested in reducing their environmental impact, are recruited through doorstep leafleting and outreach in local communities, or through a workplace or organisation (for example a community group, group of work colleagues, or Women’s Institute).
Target audience
Members of the public / consumers – with an interest in environmental issues and action. Individuals who want to make positive changes to their environmental behaviour.
Nature of behaviour change targeted
The programme targets individuals and households: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - water, electricity and gas usage - transport habits - waste habits - shopping behaviour
Delivery mechanism
Using the mechanism of a group situation to support, encourage and drive individuals to make changes to their environmental behaviour.
Individuals join a group and work together to support each member to improve their environmental behaviours.
The group discusses different aspects of household environmental impact and ways of changing behaviours on a monthly basis. Individuals are required to monitor aspects of their household’s environmental impact on a weekly or monthly basis (e.g. water usage, weight of rubbish thrown out), and encouraged to change their behaviour to achieve improvements over the course of a four-month programme. The individual’s measurements are fed back to the group, together with measurements for the group as a whole, hence providing a means of monitoring progress and providing an incentive for improvement.
The group provides a mechanism for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - provision of information about environmental impact and actions - discussion of environmental behaviour and sharing ideas, advice and information - individuals to receive support to change their behaviour - generating and using team motivation and goals to change individual behaviours - generating social pressure to help encourage individuals to change - monitoring progress against a base-line
Who leads and who delivers
Global Action Plan leads the programme and GAP workers recruit Ecoteams and provide facilitation or training.
Funding – cost and sources of funding
The initial three-year pilot received funding by Biffaward, Rushcliffe Borough Council, Nottinghamshire County Council and the Energy Savings Trust.
Funding for an extension of the project has been received from the Big Lottery Fund's CRED Programme, Broxtowe Borough Council, Rushcliffe Borough Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, Nottingham Green Partnership and the project is working in partnership with the Broxtowe Partnership Trust. The project is currently supported through DEFRA’s environmental action fund.
Any lessons reported?
Un-facilitated Ecoteams have been found to work very well, sometimes better than the facilitated teams. One potential explanation, put forward by the national Ecoteams coordinator at GAP, is that in peer led teams participants feel more ‘in it together’, and less intimidated by ‘greenies’ (committed environmental workers), than in the groups led by GAP workers. They have found it easier to attract ‘non-greenies’ (i.e. people who are not so obviously used to environmental action already) to the non-facilitated groups.

Behaviour change outcomes achieved
<p>The national Ecoteams coordinator reported some new initial results from an ongoing analysis of the achievements of around 800 Ecoteams. On average they had achieved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a 27% reduction in residual waste disposed of - a 22% increase in recycling - 28% reduction in electricity usage - 20% reduction in gas usage <p>There are currently a number of initiatives to evaluate the impact of the Ecoteams in more detail, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a Defra funded evaluation of the initial Ecoteams pilot project - a project working with the New Economics Foundation to evaluate the qualitative, social and environmental benefits of Ecoteams, such as engagement with the issues <p>GAP is starting to collect demographic data about Ecoteam participants so they can get a better understanding of the types of people they are reaching through the programme.</p>
Legacy – lasting impacts and seeding of further activities
No data.

Interface Incorporated
Description and background/history
<p>Interface Incorporated is a multinational carpet tile manufacturing company. The company was founded in 1973 as a joint venture between a British company and American investors. In 1994 the company's entrepreneurial chairman and founder, was asked to think about the company's environmental impact by senior managers. Some customers had started to ask questions about the company's environmental credentials and it was a time when environmental and sustainable development issues were increasingly registering with Government and business. Interface's chairman was asked to give a speech providing a vision for an internal task force that was being set up to review Interface's environmental position. Until this point the chairman had heard of sustainability but did not know what it was. In the course of writing his vision speech the chairman was given a book on sustainable business that inspired him and converted him to the cause of sustainability. He realised that his business had a huge environmental footprint and accepted the idea that the business needed to take some responsibility for this. The speech succeeded in setting a challenge for Interface to embrace sustainability, and the top management set about developing a comprehensive vision for the business and the means to achieve it. The move to embrace sustainability was driven by this acceptance of the need for the business to take responsibility for its environmental impact, along with more pragmatic drivers. In particular, the fact that reliance on petrochemicals was unsustainable in the long term and the potential for differentiation and competitor advantage that environmental business could offer. The vision that the chairman and senior management developed was a radical one that set the goal for Interface to become a restorative business (i.e. ultimately restoring the natural environment rather than extracting from or damaging it). This goal to be restorative involved changing the way that Interface worked internally, but also using their influence to affect others.</p>
Context – e.g. location, scale, type of organisation
Interface is a multinational company with headquarters in America. With an entrepreneurial founder and chairman who had significant control over the company.
Target audience
Every aspect of a large international company, including staff.
Nature of behaviour change targeted
Addressing the sustainability of every aspect of the business operation, with the ultimate goal of eliminating all negative environmental impact and achieving a restorative business.
Delivery mechanism
The change was led by the company's chairman who acted as a champion within the organisation,

working together with other members of senior management through an environmental task force. The chairman and task force spent time developing their approach, with the aim of integrating sustainability into every aspect of the business. They drew heavily from existing ideas and theories about environmental business, and recruited outside experts from the environmental field to help them do so – setting up a so-called ‘dream team’ that included Jonathan Porritt. The chairman and environmental team drew from this team of experts and from other external ideas and tools. For example they adapted the natural step approach. They have applied the idea of bio-mimicry to develop new products including a carpet tile with a random pattern that reduces the waste when they are fitted to different spaces.

The team reviewed all aspects of their business and outside connections, and developed a strategy to achieve change. They identified seven ‘fronts’ on which they would work to improve Interface’s sustainability: waste; emissions; renewable energy; recycling and closing the loop; resource efficient transportation; sensitising stakeholders; and redesign commerce. They also used five ‘P’s’ to guide their approach to each front, namely looking at: the Product, the Process by which it was manufactured, the People involved, the Place, and the Profit that results (i.e., whether any changes would make business sense). For example, under waste they employed a top-down mandate to reduce waste in all aspects of the business, but also considered the ‘people’ aspect and developed a process where employees were encouraged to suggest opportunities for improving the efficiency of the manufacturing process, as experts in the processes they work on.

The management team set a series of goals and developed measurement systems to drive change within the company.

They have used motivational techniques and other approaches to engage their staff with this project. For example, empowering staff to suggest changes to processes and working with their sales staff to make sure they have ownership of the idea of sustainable development (including through workshops run by Forum for the Future in the UK).

They have identified that they need to have an influence outside the company if they are to become a restorative business, and so they have tried to have an impact on sustainability both up and down their supply chain. They engage their suppliers in discussions about how to improve the sustainability of the materials they are supplied with. They have also been looking at how they can have an influence on sustainability down the supply chain through initiatives such as taking responsibility for the disposal of their products after they have been sold.

Who leads and who delivers

The original lead, and the ongoing drive for change in the organisation, came from the company chairman and senior management. Environmental / sustainability managers were employed to continue driving progress. Setting goals and targets and setting up measurement systems has meant that all employees are involved in delivery. Employees are deliberately involved through initiatives such as asking for employee suggestions on reducing waste and improving efficiency.

Funding – cost and sources of funding

They have taken advantage of external funding opportunities where possible, but the biggest investment and driver for the changes they have made has been cost savings / avoided costs from efficiency gains. They still face dilemmas relating to long-term investment for environmental improvements where the gains are very uncertain. For example investment in product innovation is difficult when it is uncertain whether it will make money.

Any lessons reported?

Interface’s European sustainability director made the following points:

There are cultural differences that need to be taken into account when developing a sustainable development approach. For example, motivating workers is easier in the US than in Europe. Also, Scandinavians see sustainability as a necessary aspect of business, whereas in Southern Europe and the UK it is still more of a novelty and not a given.

They have tried to engage their employees with the task of embedding sustainability into Interface’s work and feel that empowerment is important to maintain motivation.

Justifying long-term investment and product innovation can be hard as the pay-offs are uncertain. Public procurement could be used as a tool to help encourage and justify environmental innovation by business. For example, if a business was awarded procurement points for having an end-of-life strategy for products. A consistent procurement policy that rewarded such practices / innovations would help justify them.

Interface attempts to affect sustainability using its whole circle of influence. Exerting influence down the supply chain is easier as you have produced the product. Interface has found that having an influence up the supply chain is much harder. When you are dealing with suppliers who are bigger companies than you are, or when there are only a small number of specialist suppliers, then you cannot easily exert pressure or dictate terms. They have engaged suppliers in constructive dialogue in order to try and engage them with sustainability. Other companies, such as Tesco and Toyota have been able to exert influence up the supply chain by dictating terms as they are bigger than suppliers and there is enough competition between suppliers.

Behaviour change outcomes achieved

By 2005 the following outcomes had been documented:

- cumulative avoided costs from waste elimination activities since 1995 total over \$262 million;
- total energy consumption per linear yard of manufactured fabric is down 19% since 1996;
- improved efficiencies and conservation efforts have reduced the total energy required to manufacture carpet by 36% since 1996;
- almost 11% of total energy consumption from renewable sources;
- green electricity used as part of an overall strategy to increase the use of renewable energy. Three facilities currently have photovoltaic arrays onsite, and six facilities purchase certified green electricity;
- on an absolute basis, Interface has reduced total carbon dioxide emissions by 52% since 1996. This reduction has been achieved through improved energy efficiency, increased use of renewable energy and a major landfill gas project at their LaGrange, Georgia facility;
- water intake per square meter of carpet is down 81% in modular carpet facilities and down 41% in broadloom facilities from 1996 due to conservation efforts and process changes such as eliminating the printing processes at some locations;
- the ReEntry program diverted 66 million pounds of material from landfill between 1995 and 2004. In 2004, over 17 million pounds was diverted from landfill and used in recycling (60%), energy capture and conversion (37%), and repurposed (3%);
- in early 2004, Interface was included in the Global Finance list of the "World's Most Socially Responsible Companies";
- product innovations including bio-mimicry, recycled content and recyclable, using natural materials;
- other initiatives such as offsetting carbon dioxide emissions from employee travel to work.

Legacy – lasting impacts and seeding of further activities

Interface has the aim of influencing others in order to develop a restorative business. The company's chairman delivers lectures and works to make the case for sustainable business to others. Their chairman has been involved in advising the US Government on sustainable business practices. They have also worked to try and engage their employees with sustainable development. They pro-actively work with their suppliers to try and engage them with sustainability and improve the environmental impact of the materials they buy. They use their environmental credentials to sell their products and provide consumers with the choice to purchase environmentally friendly products. They have been acknowledged as an example of how business can become more sustainable, and cited as a case study for others to learn from.

Private Landlord Energy Award Scheme (PLEASE)

Description and background/history

The Private Landlord Energy Award Scheme (PLEASE) is an ongoing initiative, running in approximately 11 local authorities (some have joined and some have left—the scheme over time), to improve the energy efficiency of the private rented sector. It provides grants and interest-free loans to assist private landlords in improving the energy efficiency of their properties. Grants are available for improvements such as: new central heating systems and boilers; upgraded heating controls; cavity wall insulation, loft insulation and draught proofing. The scheme is extended to small social landlords in some of the participating local authorities.

The initiative has been developed by a partnership of eleven local authorities, led by Lambeth borough council. The 11 authorities are members of the London and South East HECA (Home Energy Conservation Act 1995) Forum. Funding to develop the scheme initially came from the Energy Saving Trust under their HECAAction 2000 programme which was developed by the Energy Saving Trust to provide financial assistance to help local authorities in England and Wales deliver their HECA (Home Energy Conservation Act 1995) strategies.

The initiative's official aim is to tackle fuel poverty by providing private sector tenants on low-incomes with efficient heating and insulation to make their homes warmer and reduce the amount of money they spend on fuel. The scheme aimed to improve a total of 150 privately rented homes over its first three-years.

Drivers in Lambeth

There are currently around 15,000 privately rented properties in Lambeth and the borough's 1994/5 Private Sector House Condition Survey indicated that within the borough privately rented properties were the least energy efficient. The survey also demonstrated that people living in the private rented sector are amongst the poorest in the borough.

The Home Energy Conservation Act requires the Council to publish a strategy, identifying measures, which will result in a 30% energy efficiency improvement in homes in the city over the next 10–15 years. The Council is required to monitor progress and report this to Defra on an annual basis. The Council is also committed to achieving measured improvements in the energy efficiency of the borough's housing stock as part of the Best Value Pilot project.

As a result, improving the energy efficiency of the private rented sector would assist the Council in achieving these goals. PLEASE also allows the Council to achieve some of the Council's strategic aims by attracting external funding and developing partnerships with the private sector.

Context – e.g. location, scale, type of organisation

Grants are aimed at private landlords (and some small social landlords) in 11 local authorities in London and the Southeast.

Target audience

Directly aimed at the notoriously difficult-to-reach sector of private-rented landlords. Indirectly attempting to improve the energy efficiency of properties occupied by low-income tenants.

Nature of behaviour change targeted

Energy efficiency improvements to private-rented properties.

Delivery mechanism

PLEASE aims to influence behaviour by providing grants and interest-free loans for private landlords. Grants are available as a contribution towards the total cost of work, and will be paid once the work has been completed and assessed, although the work will need to be approved beforehand. Grants typically contribute around 50% of the cost of improvements, with loans available to help meet the rest of the costs. Some local authorities offer fixed sum grants for specific measures, such as installing an energy efficient boiler.

Landlords are made aware of the grants in a variety of ways, which differ across the 11 local authorities

<p>delivering the scheme, but include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - information on council websites; - through private sector housing forums (private landlord networks); - energy efficiency leaflets; - promotion through estate agents; and - suggestions, or even requirements, as part of property inspections by the local authority.
<p>Who leads and who delivers</p> <p>PLEASE delivery in Lambeth involves a local partnership between the local authority and the Greater London Energy Efficiency Network (GLEEN) who carry out the day-to-day management of the scheme. The Heat, Light and Power Company (HelpCo), a sister company of GLEEN, administers the loans. HelpCo is a not for profit company, set up in 2000, by the GLEEN and the Energy Saving Trust, with the support of local authorities in London. The company has social and environmental aims and offers a range of energy and financial services to residents in the UK to help reduce the incidence of fuel poverty and to encourage carbon savings.</p> <p>The London Borough of Lambeth is responsible for monitoring the effectiveness of the scheme and reporting back to the EST on progress on a regular basis.</p>
<p>Funding – cost and sources of funding</p> <p>The 11 authorities were awarded £255,100 from the Energy Saving Trust (EST) in the form of a HECAction Grant for 2000/2001 to launch PLEASE. Part of this money went to establish a loan fund.</p> <p>Funding for the energy efficiency improvement grants comes from mainstream local authority budgets, usually housing renovation or housing assistance funds.</p>
<p>Any lessons reported?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Originally, the plan had been to offer 50% grants and then loans for 25%, expecting the landlords to contribute the further 25%. This approach proved unattractive and too complicated for landlords and the scheme now offers approximately 50% grants and loans that can cover up to the remaining 50%. - In practice the loans are not that often used, but they are still considered to be an important part of the scheme. They provide an additional incentive / attraction for landlords to consider the scheme; and in some cases they are essential to allow landlords to make the required investment. For example, one small social landlord wanted to carry out energy efficiency improvements to 8 properties and could not have done so without the availability of a loan to cover their part of the cost. - The fact that several local authorities were working together on this project, with initial regular meetings helped in the following ways: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - they shared information and experience – some local authorities were more successful than others and they could provide advice; and - the arrangement provided a support network. Private landlords are a difficult sector to engage and so the project could be disheartening for officers at times. The fact that they were part of a larger network helped them continue with the scheme. - Getting uptake from landlords has been hard, but interest is increasing. A worker delivering the programme suggested that the following factors could be contributing to this increase in interest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - growing awareness of energy efficiency issues, especially driven by new EU regulations coming in, such as the Energy Performance Directive; and - possibly also because energy efficiency measures are being seen as a way of making properties more attractive to tenants.
<p>Behaviour change outcomes achieved</p> <p>The scheme aimed to improve a total of 150 privately rented homes over its first three years. The scheme managed to administer 132 grants over the 11 local authorities during the first three years, catalysing £485,000 worth of energy efficiency improvements to homes in the 11 local authorities.</p> <p>The Energy Saving Trust and the London Borough of Lambeth approved the scheme’s continuation in 2004 and the scheme is continuing.</p>

Legacy – lasting impacts and seeding of further activities

No data.

London borough recycling schemes

Description and background/history

This case study covers recycling in three London boroughs. The different approaches taken by the three boroughs are presented for comparison

Camden: Camden started its first doorstep-recycling scheme around 1997, originally using a bag collecting paper only. In 1999 the scheme went borough-wide and a multi material service was introduced collecting paper, mixed glass, cans and textiles. Residents leave materials for recycling outside their homes on a designated collection day and the different materials are separated at the roadside by collection officers using special vehicles. The borough plans to change to a mixed recycling method in March in order to include plastic bottles and cardboard into collections.

Camden have also had a large network of on street bring facilities (98) for some years, collecting glass, paper and plastic bottles/cans. They also have a network of over 300 mini-recycling centres on estates in the borough.

Camden is also developing recycling services for businesses.

Camden employs 5 full time Recycling Advisors who work to increase participation on all recycling services through door stepping, workshops, stalls and other outreach and promotion work. They also have a comprehensive communications and PR plan that runs throughout the year, including 2 months of bus stop recycling adverts and work with the local press as well as the GLA's Recycle for London team.

Wandsworth: In Wandsworth recyclable materials are collected along with domestic waste in a separate orange sack. Residents are provided with orange sacks every three months and can place glass bottles and jars, paper, cardboard, plastic bottles and metal cans into the bags. They then put them out for collection along with their normal refuse. Orange sacks used for domestic refuse will not be collected, and there is a fine system in place for deliberate misuse.

At blocks of flats where rubbish is usually collected using large communal bins, the council attempts to provide wheeled recycling banks for communal use by the residents.

Public on-street recycling banks are available, and the council is working with its housing department to identify suitable sites for recycling banks on council managed housing estates (subject to consultation with residents).

The borough has a partnership with the London Community Recycling Network to offer free advice on composting.

A Christmas tree recycling service is offered for two weeks in January.

The council does not provide a recycling service for businesses, but provides a list of companies that do on its website.

Barnet: The borough began a black-box curb-side recycling collection scheme in 2001, followed by a green box scheme. This approach was only achieving an at-best 50% participation rate in recycling, with most of this being paper. The council wanted to increase this proportion and tried leaflets and school programmes, but with little success. The council decided to take the radical step of piloting a compulsory recycling scheme in 2004, which was successful and expanded to the whole borough in 2005. The legislation to allow them to do this was contained in the 1990 Environmental Protection Act.

The compulsory scheme obliges residents to place recyclable materials in their black box that is

emptied on designated collection days using an on-street separation method and special vehicles. Residents are not allowed to place recyclables in their wheeled refuse bins. Assistance is provided for those who find it difficult to, for example, lift their boxes. The scheme is policed by noting any households who are not leaving recyclables in their black boxes. These households are then visited by recycling assistants who explain the scheme and try and encourage participation. Those who persistently fail to recycle are sent official notices and eventually prosecuted or fined.

Barnet also runs an opt-in garden waste recycling scheme that has been taken up by 60% of those offered the service.

The council also provides on-street recycling banks. They do not provide any recycling services for businesses.

Context – e.g. location, scale, type of organisation

Three London boroughs.

Target audience

Residents in the three London boroughs.

Nature of behaviour change targeted

Household recycling.

Delivery mechanism

Doorstep and on-street recycling services offered by the different boroughs, as described in the ‘background’ section above.

Who leads and who delivers

Camden: The scheme is managed by the council. Collection services, including on-street separation are delivered by Onyx (a large commercial waste company).

Wandsworth: The scheme is delivered by Recycle Western Riverside, an organisation run by the Western Riverside Waste Authority that delivers recycling schemes on the ground with four London boroughs.

Barnet: The scheme was developed and led by the council. Collections are carried out by ECT Recycling Ltd., a community recycling organisation.

Funding – cost and sources of funding

Camden: All costs are covered from internal council budgets.

Wandsworth: The scheme is funded by landfill tax credits.

Barnet: Funding for the recycling service mainly comes from mainstream council budgets with income made from selling recyclable materials. In addition:

- Barnet has negotiated a Local Public Service Agreement with ODPM for a higher Government recycling target. This is tied to an extra £140,000 to help reach the higher target in 2004/5 and 2005/6
- the authority has made three successful bids to the London Recycling Fund. Two of these contributed to expanding their green garden waste scheme, and were worth a total of £202,000. The third was a joint bid with other local authorities for improvements to collection and a shared composting facility. Barnet’s share of the bid was £840,000.

Any lessons reported?

No data.

Behaviour change outcomes achieved

Camden: Door stepping work undertaken by the recycling advisors has led to increases in participation rates on the kerbside service ranging between 5% and 10% with an increase in tonnage of between 25-

28%.

Barnet: In the first 7 months of the compulsory scheme recycling increased by 30% (an additional 2420 tonnes). We do not have information about whether this was sustained.

Residents who had either not heard of the scheme or who would not previously recycle, have started recycling.

The associated publicity has captured interest in the scheme.

Legacy – lasting impacts and seeding of further activities

No data.

London borough of Merton sustainable highways procurement strategy

Description and background/history

This case study concerns the tender process developed for LB Merton Highways projects in order to increase the sustainability (specifically recycled content) of highway maintenance and schemes.

The London borough of Merton had been using recycled materials in highways maintenance since 1999, but there was no formal mechanism for favouring more sustainable proposals in the procurement process. The use of recycled materials was informal, depending on individuals involved in different schemes.

In 2003 the council carried out a review of highways services and developed strategic objectives for the department, based on the council's corporate objectives, combined with information from resident surveys, complaints received, Best Value performance indicators and best practice information. 'Increasing sustainability' was chosen as one of four strategic objectives for the department. The highways department then developed a procurement strategy and other approaches to put these objectives into practice.

The objective to 'increase sustainability' was focused on the aim of reducing the use of virgin aggregates, mainly by increasing the use of recycled and secondary aggregates (RSA). It also covers reducing energy use, lorry journeys and pollution.

A new procurement framework was developed to deliver the new objectives and make them the basis of any contracts that are let. The procurement processes adopted (discussed in detail below) allow the council to judge tenders on the basis of quality (which includes the contractor's approach to recycling) as well as price. This inclusion of quality into the assessment of tenders reflects the scope of the Local Government Act, which allows councils to spend money that reduces costs to the community such as disruption, pollution and congestion.

Context – e.g. location, scale, type of organisation

London borough highways contracts.

Target audience

Contractors carrying out highways work for the London borough of Merton.

Nature of behaviour change targeted

Principally the use of recycled aggregates in road schemes. Also aims to influence other sustainability impacts of road schemes including energy use, lorry journeys and pollution.

Delivery mechanism

The project was delivered by developing procurement frameworks that specified minimum levels of recycled aggregate use in road schemes, allowed the awarding of contracts to take into account contractors' approach to recycling and use of recycled aggregates, and encouraged ongoing improvement in sustainability of road works.

Two procurement processes were developed:

- i) a term partnering contract to cover routine road works and minor road projects
- ii) a framework agreement for major projects

i) Term partnering contracts

This approach allows the highways department to let contracts for road maintenance and minor projects for five year periods, with an option to renew for a further two years. This approach means that a partnership can be built up with the successful contractor and the best approach to the work developed through this partnership. The contracts are let on the basis of a three stage tender process:

- at stage 1 all interested contractors fill in a questionnaire which asks questions relevant to the department's objectives and tender requirements, including a question on their experience of recycling
- the 12 highest ranked contractors from stage 1 are then asked to attend a briefing session where the highways department outlines their objectives and aims for the contract. They are given an opportunity to meet with council engineers and discuss the work. They are then asked to produce a quality submission outlining their proposed approach and including a section on recycling
- finally the six highest rated contractors are invited to submit tenders, requiring:
 - another quality submission
 - proposals for a model scheme
 - draft materials management plan

Partnership teams are established with the successful contractor at management and project levels, which allows planning and responsive problem solving. London Remade is one of the partners in the integrated management team, and they contribute information on industry best practice, at a London-wide level, for recycling rates. These best practice recycling rates are used to set minimum targets for recycling in the contract, which represents 1 of 5 performance measures, which are:

- use of secondary or recycled aggregates at the levels set in the contract
- reduction of lorry journeys to 90% of those that would be otherwise required
- use cold recycled bitumen bound material in all base and binder courses, where the use of this material would not compromise quality or increase whole life costs
- ensure that all materials removed from the borough that are suitable for recycling or reuse, are sent for recycling or are reused
- extend the use of in-situ recycling techniques to all suitable sites, where the use of these techniques would not compromise quality, increase whole life costs, or cause congestion or inconvenience to the public.

Contractors are expected to monitor their performance against these measures and report back to the Highways department.

ii) Framework agreements

This approach again allows Merton to build on-going relationships with contractors, while allowing them to retain a competitive aspect to tenders for large road projects. Four contractors have been appointed to a 'framework panel' (which has a partnership charter), and these four are asked to competitively bid for large road projects. In order to drive innovation and continual improvement, 50% of the quality score used to assess tenders is based on the contractors' previous road project they delivered.

Each tender round involves an initial assessment of the tenders against the department's objectives to produce a quality score, of which at least 10% comes from recycling proposals. The quality score also incorporates other factors such as reduced time to complete the work, fewer lorry journeys, and less pressure on landfill.

The tenders are then assessed using the 60:40 price / quality balance.

Who leads and who delivers

London borough of Merton Highways department.

Funding – cost and sources of funding

The scheme is funded through mainstream budgets.

Any lessons reported?

Lessons reported in relation to the project in a case study written by the Waste and Resources Action Programme WRAP, are:

- have a drive/mandate from the top to implement sustainability/recycled requirements
- identify your objectives, then formulate a strategy for procurement
- have a clear link between your policy priorities and the contract specifications, award criteria and performance indicators
- ensure that performance measures will lead to the improvement that you want
- ensure that objectives are clearly defined during tendering
- have early contractor involvement in the design and planning of projects
- continuously review the process and progress against your objectives

Behaviour change outcomes achieved

The approach has:

- ensured that all road maintenance and projects formally include recycling and other measures to improve sustainability
- set minimum standards for recycling based on London industry best practice
- set up a process where there is an incentive for contractors to improve on these minimum standards and innovate new approaches to improving sustainability of road projects

Legacy – lasting impacts and seeding of further activities

The approach has been used as a case study on sustainable procurement of road contracts, as part of guidance for local authorities produced by WRAP.

The Marine Stewardship Council fish certification scheme
Description and background/history
<p>The Marine Stewardship Council (MSC) is a not-for-profit organisation that has developed an environmental standard for sustainable, well-managed fisheries. The organisation runs an international certification programme that certifies and labels seafood products that meet these standards.</p> <p>The MSC was set up by the multinational Unilever, together with WWF in 1997. The idea for the organisation came out of talks about how to assure the long-term sustainability of global fish stocks and the integrity of the marine eco-system. This issue was of concern to Unilver as they are the world's largest buyer of seafood and were worried about the long-term sustainability of their business. WWF were interested from an environmental / conservation point of view.</p> <p>The MSC began its work by conducting a two-year consultation process with stakeholders from around the world to establish an environmental standard for seafood and fishery certification. They originally based this standard on the UN's Food and Agriculture Organisation's (FAO) Code of Conduct for responsible fisheries. However over the years their standard and accreditation has evolved in response to criticism from some other environmental organisations.</p> <p>The organisation became independent in 1999 and has operated independently ever since.</p> <p>The Marine Stewardship Council's vision is to "enhance responsible management of seafood resources, to ensure the sustainability of global fish stocks and the health of the marine ecosystem." and "safeguard the world's seafood supply by promoting the best environmental choice".</p> <p>The MSC web site states: 'In a bid to reverse the continued decline in the world's fisheries, the MSC is seeking to harness consumer purchasing power to generate change and promote environmentally responsible stewardship of the world's most important renewable food source' (MSC Homepage, 2005).</p> <p>MSC's principle aims are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increase the overall sustainability of the world's seafood supply; - increase the percentage of the global seafood market certified to the MSC Standard; and - increase awareness of the MSC eco-label.
Context – e.g. location, scale, type of organisation
The global fish market, including fisheries, and buyers of fish (both companies and consumers).
Target audience
Fishermen, fisheries, and consumers of seafood.
Nature of behaviour change targeted
Fishing methods and the seafood that consumers and other buyers choose to purchase.
Delivery mechanism
<p>They have developed an internationally recognised certification system for fisheries linked to labelling of sustainable, well-managed seafood.</p> <p>They have developed an environmental standard for sustainable, well-managed, fisheries, in conjunction with stakeholders, and have worked to improve the standard and accreditation over time.</p> <p>The MSC accredits 12 independent certification bodies around the world, with a yearly surveillance audit. This third party system allows the MSC to be independent from the process of certification, providing transparency and credibility.</p> <p>Certified fisheries can then use the MSC label to designate their seafood as sustainable giving buyers choice.</p> <p>Suppliers and retailers who want to use the MSC logo have to pay to undergo a supply chain audit to certify that the fish they are selling comes from a certified fishery.</p>

<p>The MSC works to promote, and increase awareness of, the MSC label, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - outreach and awareness raising with all members of the supply chain, including fisheries, processors, retailers and restaurants; - consumer outreach programmes, including through the BBC good food show and Organic Food Festival; and - work with Aquaria to develop education with young people. <p>The MSC's ongoing work and development is supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a Technical Advisory Board composed of scientific, commercial and environmental experts from around the world; and - a Stakeholder Council made up of representatives from all stakeholder groups, from all areas of the world.
<p>Who leads and who delivers</p>
<p>The MSC leads the accreditation programme, which is delivered by 12 independent certification bodies around the world.</p>
<p>Funding – cost and sources of funding</p>
<p>The MSC receives funding from a wide range of sources including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - over 20 charitable trusts and foundations from the UK and abroad; - Government agencies providing statutory funding including Defra and the Swedish International Development Agency; - businesses including: Marks & Spencer, Sainsbury and Unilever; and - individual donors.
<p>Any lessons reported?</p>
<p>The MSC commercial manager reported that Defra funding was a big endorsement of their work. Government support also helps. For example, the Prime Minister's Strategy Unit recommended all fisheries become MSC certified by 2015 leading to the Government recommending that it continue funding UK fisheries to secure MSC certification.</p>
<p>Behaviour change outcomes achieved</p>
<p>The organisation is still fairly new but some of the major UK food retailers have paid for their supply chains to be certified so that they can sell MSC accredited seafood products. The fact that they have paid for this process and think it is worth stocking these products is an important endorsement and outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a number of major retailers, including Sainsbury's, Tesco and Waitrose, have undergone supply chain certification allowing them to stock MSC certified fish; - Sainsbury's has commitment to source 100% of the wild-capture seafood it sells from sustainable sources; - 50 seafood products on the UK market are MSC certified; - 300 seafood products are MSC certified in 24 countries around the world; and - many retailers have included the MSC in their sourcing policies and encourage their supply fisheries to seek MSC certification.
<p>Legacy – lasting impacts and seeding of further activities</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The MSC has been involved in developing the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation's (FAO) guidance for setting up an eco-label for seafood. - The Australian Government has recently issued guidance that MSC certification is acceptable in place of their own domestic standards for seafood - The MSC hosts a 'European Commercial Group' meeting twice yearly that is attended by up to 50 representatives from major retailers, processors and foodservice operators from across Europe to discuss the MSC and how to develop work on certifying sustainable fisheries and seafood.

Sustainable hospital food project

Description and background/history

The Hospital Food project is a two-year initiative to increase the amount of local, seasonal and organic food used in four London hospitals to 10% of routine catering. The project was co-ordinated by Sustain, the alliance for better food and farming, in partnership with the Soil Association.

The project developed from an initial idea by the Soil Association and Sustain. An initial study at one London hospital (St George's, Tooting) looked at the potential to integrate more local, organic, food into hospital catering. The study involved interviews with the hospital's catering manager who said that they would be interested in more local and organic food, but would need help to do so in practice. The task of supplying more local organic food would face a number of serious barriers including: very tight budgets; time constraints; complexity of public procurement rules; and the practicalities of, for example, changing menus, finding suppliers and negotiating new contracts. It would not be feasible for the catering manager to overcome these on her own and so the report concluded that someone needed to be employed to do the work involved in helping the hospital buy more local organic food.

Following this report a detailed proposal for a pilot project with four London hospitals was developed by Sustain and funded by Defra and the Kings Fund. Defra funding came from a grant designed to support producers to market quality agricultural produce. The Kings Fund was interested in the potential health benefits of feeding patients more fresh food.

A number of hospitals were approached to take part in the pilot, mainly through informal contact at conferences and meetings, and existing contacts and networks.

The four hospitals chosen represented a mix in terms of existing approaches to catering, degree of engagement with the issues, and potential for change.

- Ealing General: 444 patients, spending £2.92 per patient per day on food; catering entirely contracted out to a large catering company who buy their food in bulk – 'cook chill' form from a large food manufacturing company (cook chill involves bulk cooking of food off the premises that is chilled and then re-heated at the hospital); the hospital had not considered sustainable development as part of their food procurement before; they thought it not feasible to change patient meals so the pilot focused on the staff restaurant.
- Royal Bethlem and Lambeth hospitals: The Bethlem Royal has 319 beds with contracted out catering and 'cook chill' meals; spending on meals not disclosed. Lambeth hospital joined the scheme in the second year and cooked its meals from fresh ingredients at the hospital.
- Royal Brompton hospital: 250 beds; purchase fresh ingredients from wholesalers and give food priority in the hospital with a committed catering team and, a £3.50 per patient per day spend on meals; wanted to involve both patient and staff food in the initiative and catering staff were willing to work with smaller suppliers.
- St. George's hospital: approximately 1100 beds; £3.53 spent per patient per day on food; Meals purchased frozen from a manufacturer and cooked in kitchens on the wards, plus fresh fruit and vegetables purchased from a wholesaler; central kitchen prepares meals for staff on site; decided to focus on staff meals for the project; hospital was trying to apply sustainability to its operations, but did not have a policy on local or organic food.

The project also engaged the NHS Purchasing and Supply Agency (PASA) early on. This agency acts as a co-ordinating centre for purchasing and supply in the NHS, and develops policy. It also runs framework contracts on a national basis for products and services that the NHS needs, including running national and large-scale food procurement contracts. They were therefore an important partner.

The policy context for the project was well established and supportive. For example:

- the Government's new sustainable development strategy included the development of a sustainable procurement task force, and the Prime Minister has stated his commitment to make the UK a leader among EU states in ensuring public sector purchasing contributes to sustainable development;
- a key theme for the Government's strategy for sustainable farming and food in England, which is led by Defra, is reconnecting producers with consumers;
- Defra have developed the public sector food procurement initiative (PSFPI), and their Organic Action Plan aims to increase the proportion of organic food in public sector catering;

- the Choosing Health white paper identifies that the NHS can use its purchasing power in a way which helps it become a 'good corporate citizen'; and
- the Department of Health's food and health action plan notes the NHS' corporate social responsibility to offer healthy, nutritious, food and encourages the NHS to 'look beyond initial price' at wider benefits when thinking about food provision.

The projects central aims were to:

- increase the amount of local, seasonal and organic food to 10% of routine catering in four London hospitals;
- help promote healthy eating in participating hospitals; and
- support farm and food businesses in London and the South-East by increasing the proportion of food bought from these areas.

The more specific objectives were to:

- provide new markets for organic and/or local food;
- provide more secure markets by encouraging medium-term supply contracts;
- develop markets for products rejected for cosmetic reasons, for example, by supermarkets;
- increase returns for producers where possible, while maintaining a good price to public sector buyers by shortening supply chains;
- identify and help create viable distribution mechanisms;
- secure high level support in NHS catering as a step towards integrating local and/or organic products into standard procedures; and
- promote the practical lessons learnt as widely as possible to the health, food and business sectors.

Context – e.g. location, scale, type of organisation

The Project works with four London hospitals and small food producers in the South East.

Target audience

NHS hospital caterers and procurement managers. The initiative also targeted:

- producers – helping them better understand and adapt to the requirements of hospital food buyers
- suppliers and wholesalers – to sell the idea and communicate the benefits of adding local / sustainable producers to their supply chain
- patients, staff and visitors to the hospitals who learnt about sustainable food, and healthy eating

Nature of behaviour change targeted

Food buying by hospitals and hospital suppliers and how local and organic producers sell their food.

Delivery mechanism

The project was delivered by dedicated project staff who carried out intensive hands-on work to help introduce local and organic food into the hospitals over two years.

The project began by researching detailed information about food procurement in the four hospitals. This was a complex task involving the production of a database that listed suppliers used by the hospitals, prices paid and volumes of produce required. It also worked with each hospital to identify the type of advice and support required.

The project was supported by expertise from the organisations involved and an advisory working party that provided information and advice to the project workers through regular meetings.

The project delivery involved

- **redeveloping menus** – the project staff analysed the hospital menus to identify which products could be substituted and worked with hospital dieticians to redevelop the menus.
- **practical logistics** - the main aspect of the project was the work of project officers at Sustain and the Soil Association acting as go-betweens to identify potential suppliers who could meet the hospitals' needs for produce and then work to get their produce to the hospitals. A key requirement of the project was that local and organic produce needed to be supplied to the hospitals: without generating more vehicles on the roads, and particularly coming into the hospitals; and without generating extra paperwork, in terms of lots of small contracts, for the hospitals. A key way of achieving this proved to be to add local and organic producers into the supply chain of the big suppliers and wholesalers who already supply the hospitals. So, for example, a Sussex apple

<p>grower was found who could supply apples to the hospitals' existing fruit wholesaler. Organic meat was integrated into the Royal Brompton's supply chain by supplying it to the hospital's existing meat wholesaler.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - training and events – were delivered by the Soil Association who ran a number of events throughout the project including: training for hospital caterers on organic food standards and clarification of the rules; networking and development event for organic suppliers, looking at potential ways of getting their produce into major London wholesale markets; an event for suppliers looking at barriers to buying more local and organic food and what would help. - promotion and communication – an aim of the project was to promote the benefits of local and organic food to caterers, patients and hospital staff. The project ran a series of promotional events and used promotional material, and actively involved all catering staff in the changes made. - evaluation – the project aimed to economically evaluate its impacts on producers in the South East. Some initial estimated economic impacts were carried out and then it was agreed that external experts needed to be employed to carry out a more detailed evaluation. The New Economics Foundation won the tender for this work and attempted to carry out an evaluation based on local economic impacts. However this evaluation met with mixed success due to the difficulty of obtaining data from large suppliers. The Kings Fund wished to evaluate the health impact of the changes to hospital food. However, these effects are impossible to measure in a project of this scale and so a contract was let to carry out an assessment of any impact that changes in the food in hospitals had on food choices, knowledge and attitudes to healthier eating in the hospitals. Results from these evaluations will; be available in early 2006 when the project is complete.
<p>Who leads and who delivers</p>
<p>Led by Sustain, in partnership with the Soil Association. Delivered by project staff at Sustain and the Soil Association.</p>
<p>Funding – cost and sources of funding</p>
<p>Funding from Defra (67%) and the Kings Fund (33%).</p>
<p>Any lessons reported?</p>
<p>The following recommendations to Government were reported by project staff, following the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - funding is needed for the kind of practical help this project offered. This funding will not be needed indefinitely. Once potential purchasers and suppliers have been “matched” and any practical problems ironed out, the systems should continue to work - conflicting policy signals need to be tackled. It is not helpful on the one hand to extol the virtues of sustainable food in the public sector, and on the other to insist on budget cuts. While sustainable food is not inevitably more expensive, it will certainly not be cheaper - all hospitals should have the equipment and staff to be able to cook food from scratch. Without these facilities there is no flexibility to allow for the changes needed to increase gradually the proportion of sustainable food - investment is needed to ensure that a wide variety of sustainable food is available everywhere in the country, and that the transport and distribution infrastructure is adequate - vigorous and imaginative marketing is needed to support the efforts of those who are already promoting more sustainable food in hospitals, and to convince more people to engage in this task.
<p>Behaviour change outcomes achieved</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a calculation of savings in food miles (distance travelled by food from production to consumption) as a result of the changes to local organic produce from the South East of England showed that before the project the total distance travelled by 1 kg of a selection of fruit and vegetables used in the hospitals was 65,077 km (e.g. Apples from Chile and New Zealand, Beef from Botswana and Argentina, tomatoes and potatoes from Holland). After the project, the same products were being supplied to the hospitals with a total of 665 km / kg. This represents a saving of over 36,000 grams of carbon dioxide emissions per kg for the food that the project managed to replace at the hospitals. - Progress by hospital: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ealing General: the project engaged the major catering company that supplies the hospital but did not manage to achieve any changes in their purchasing; staffing difficulties at the hospital meant that staff have had very little time to engage with the project. - Royal Bethlem and Lambeth hospitals – South London and Maudsley NHS Trust: Staffing

difficulties meant that little progress was made at Lambeth; the Royal Bethlem have a contract with a large catering company that allows them to nominate a limited number of suppliers and as a result the project was able to work with the large catering company to introduce organic milk into the supply chain for the whole NHS Trust; The Royal Bethlem has also started using an organic fruit and vegetable box scheme that makes fresh fruit and vegetables available for staff, patients and visitors to buy on one day a week.

- Royal Brompton: this hospital made the most progress. All staff in the hospital were positively engaged with the project, from the Chief Executive to the food serving staff, and the hospital's catering manager worked very hard to achieve the project aims. The hospital now spends 13% of its food budget on local and/or organic products, including local potatoes, organic beef and milk, local seasonal fruit and vegetables and organic porridge oats. Staff at the Royal Brompton are responsible for the catering contract at another hospital and have included a new clause in the contract for the catering company to work with the Hospital Food Project, resulting in organic milk being supplied to this other hospital.
- St. George's: despite budgetary cuts and severe financial difficulties the project has been working with the hospital restaurant and the hospital will be making the organic fruit and vegetable box scheme available for patients, staff and visitors.
- the project has succeeded in supporting small producers to develop systems and accreditation to meet the standards necessary to supply hospitals and other large food buyers
- the project has succeeded in engaging wholesalers and large suppliers, and changing their buying behaviour. For example, one wholesaler involved in the project is now supplying more locally grown fruit and vegetables to all other customers, as well as hospitals, due to the positive response from customers.

Legacy – lasting impacts and seeding of further activities

- The project has developed a database of suppliers who meet the standards necessary to supply hospitals and who are operationally able to do so.
- The project established a 'replication network' comprising people working in sustainable public procurement, which is actively spreading learning from the project. For example through an event for 15 hospitals from around the UK.
- The Soil Association is developing a code of practice on organic food preparation to help make it easier for hospital staff to incorporate organic food into their catering.
- The project has engaged suppliers in looking at the practicalities of buying more local and organic produce.
- The project has led to further projects, for example further work on wholesaling local and organic produce in London is planned by Sustain.
- The project is included in the draft London Food Strategy, which includes a proposed action to expand the scheme if it is deemed successful after evaluation.
- The project has responded to requests for help from a range of other organisations that want to make their food procurement more sustainable, including:
 - the Houses of Parliament;
 - the Metropolitan Police; and
 - 4 other hospitals.

West Sussex Real Nappy Initiative

Description and background/history

The West Sussex County Council Real Nappy Initiative is a programme designed to encourage the use of real, cotton nappies. The initiative involves:

- a cash incentive for parents using cotton nappies
- cotton nappy starter packs
- use of cotton nappies in maternity hospitals
- a communication campaign through local press, radio and bus adverts
- promotion at all pre and post-natal classes, and internal promotion within the council

The initiative was developed as part of a drive to reduce waste going to landfill in the county. West Sussex only has 5 years of landfill space with planning permission left and every day 82,000 disposable nappies go to landfill in the county.

The county council developed the initiative with a wide range of partners including the National Health Authority, maternity hospitals in the county, a local nappy laundering company, nurseries, district and borough councils and local retailers.

The official project aims are to:

- enable the residents of West Sussex to have a choice of nappy options to prevent disposable nappies from entering the household waste stream
- change residents' behaviour towards waste, and to normalise the use of real nappies by increasing the number of households participating in the initiative
- continue to develop the existing West Sussex Real Nappy Initiative as a sustainable Best Practice methodology
- support the existing nappy laundering service/real nappy providers and to build new partnerships
- to achieve 11% of parents using cotton nappies by March 2007

Context – e.g. location, scale, type of organisation

A countywide initiative led by the county council and delivered with partners including major hospitals and the private sector.

Target audience

The initiative targets the behaviour of new parents.

Nature of behaviour change targeted

The initiative aims to encourage and support the use of non-disposable, cotton, nappies.

Delivery mechanism

The core of the initiative is an incentive payment of £30 for parents using real cotton nappies for their children over the first 18 months of their lives. In order to try and encourage sustained use of non-disposable nappies, the incentive payment is split into three different stages with parents receiving £10 when their child is six weeks old, £10 at 12 months and £10 at 18 months. If parents use a nappy laundering service then their use of non-disposables is audited through the laundering service. However, if laundering nappies at home parents are required to complete an application form, a copy of the baby's birth certificate and dated confirmation from a health professional that real nappies are being used at each age.

New mothers are targeted at pre and post-natal classes and all nappies used in the one of the county's maternity hospitals are cotton so that parent's and baby's first experience is with non-disposable nappies (all three maternity hospitals in West Sussex originally participated in the scheme, but this has reduced to one). The initiative has also been supported by a communications campaign through local press, radio and bus adverts targeted at new fathers and grandparents. The idea is to raise their awareness so that they support and prompt the change to real nappies.

The council is also now providing Cotton nappy starter packs, worth £100, and there has been an internal promotion campaign within the council. The initiative has also started working with Sure Start to provide information and education to mothers about non-disposable alternatives and potential cost savings.

Who leads and who delivers
West Sussex County Council has developed the initiative with a wide range of partners including the National Health Authority, maternity hospitals in the county, a local nappy laundering company, nurseries, district and borough councils and local retailers.
Funding – cost and sources of funding
West Sussex CC has received no external funding for the initiative so far. Savings in disposal costs have funded the incentive payments and free cotton nappy starter packs. The County Council Members are committed to continual funding of the initiative. The council received £65,000 from WRAP in 2005 to fund a part time project liaison officer, a communications plan, and extra Home washing nappy starter packs / free nappy laundry.
Any lessons reported?
The people involved in the scheme reported that the following elements were key to helping achieve the rate of uptake of real nappies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a cash-back incentive - use of real nappies in maternity wards
Behaviour change outcomes achieved
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The initiative was launched in June 1999 and up to December 2005 there had been 1019 parents registering with the real nappy laundry service and 1110 registering with the home washing scheme. This number is approximately 6% of new parents in the county and equates to a potential diversion of 10.6 million disposable nappies from landfill, with a saving of £85,000 in disposal costs for local authorities. It is not possible to measure the exact number of nappies diverted from landfill and this is an estimate based on the number of parents registered with the scheme. This impact is considered remarkable as waste prevention is known to be difficult to measure and most other nappy campaigns around the country are based around an educational program and have not been able to achieve any sustained and measurable results. - Most babies born in hospitals in West Sussex at the start of the scheme were immediately put into cotton nappies, as these were the only nappies provided by the hospitals. Now this is true in one of the local hospitals. - The hospitals involved in the scheme have benefited by savings in chemical waste disposal costs to the NHS. - The commercial nappy laundry company, Cotton Bottoms, involved in the scheme has benefited by being promoted in the hospitals and employed a full time hospital liaison officer. - All literature, booklets, and posters are printed on 100% post consumer recycled paper. - Nappy starter packs are sent to parents directly from the nappy suppliers, and local partners carry out visits to antenatal classes, to reduce transport mileage.
Legacy – lasting impacts and seeding of further activities
The project is continuing to develop with, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - work with representatives from BTCV to set up a Waste Prevention Advisors Scheme in West Sussex; and - work to expand contacts and partners, for example they have started working with Sure Start . <p>One of the official aims is to develop the West Sussex Real Nappy Initiative as a sustainable Best Practice methodology for increasing the use of real nappies.</p>

WWF UK ranking power companies project

Description and background/history

This project ranks the UK's six big power companies on the basis of their efforts to reduce carbon dioxide emissions, and invest in renewable energy programmes and energy efficiency measures. The ranking was produced in the form of a report on the UK's big power companies, called 'UK power giants: generating climate change' and now is being repeated with the aim of developing an annual benchmarking exercise. The ranking was publicised and used as a campaigning tool, with the main aims of:

- raising the profile of this issue in the public and political domain;
- engaging the power companies with the issue of climate change, and with the WWF climate change team; and
- affecting consumer and shareholder choice and company behaviour.

The project is part of a major UK climate change campaign aimed at the UK power sector. Most of the work done by WWF UK's climate change team is focused on the power sector, as it is the largest contributor to carbon dioxide emissions in the UK. The project followed research looking at the potential for UK Power companies to reduce carbon dioxide emissions within the current regulatory framework. They found that it would be possible in theory for them to reduce CO2 emissions by 60% with an estimated £4 million of savings for the UK economy. As a result they developed the ranking project to highlight differences between the companies and try and drive improvements through competition to be top ranked.

The project also sits within a wider international WWF campaign aimed at the reducing carbon dioxide emissions from the global power sector. This campaign, 'Power Switch', had also used a ranking report of the largest global power companies as a campaign tool.

Context – e.g. location, scale, type of organisation

The project covers the major companies in the UK Power sector.

Target audience

The key target audiences were the power sector, financial institutions, DTI, Defra and the Treasury. The public were also a less explicit target.

Nature of behaviour change targeted

The initiative targeted the following behaviours:

- reduction of carbon emissions, and investment in more renewable energy generation, by power generating companies
- consumer and shareholder choice of power supplier, and where to invest.

Delivery mechanism

1. Auditing the performance of the UK's largest six power companies in relation to:

- greenhouse gas emissions, namely: historic carbon intensity of production; total greenhouse gas emissions, improvements in carbon emissions;
- energy efficiency measures, including: energy efficiency training for consumers; incentives for consumers; energy efficiency improvements; and
- renewable energy, including: total renewable energy investment; planned investment in renewable energy; improvements in renewable energy.

2. Publicising the results and using these as a campaigning tool, with specific, published, demands on power companies and Government. Also calls for banks, insurance companies, pension funds and other asset managers to lobby Government and influence the corporate sector on the basis of the financial risks of climate change.

Who leads and who delivers

The ranking exercise was part of a wider WWF UK Campaign. The ranking exercise was carried out by an independent research consultancy, with informal peer review, in order to give it greater credibility.

Funding – cost and sources of funding

The project was funded from internal WWF UK resources as part of their climate change campaign.

Any lessons reported?

- All of the companies have become much more committed to the process as a result of the campaign, and resulting engagement with WWF. The companies have become more willing to share company data, driven by the desire to improve their ranking. This may also have been driven by the fact that ‘transparency’ was used as a criterion of the ranking assessment.
- The fact that WWF used an independent consultant to carry out the ranking has helped give the project legitimacy. They plan to build on this with a formal peer review process for the second round of ranking.
- The top ranked company used the report as a publicity tool. The WWF team felt that none of the companies were doing well enough and that this message had perhaps got a bit lost in relation to who was the top of the ranking. They feel that they need to learn lessons about media management as a result.

Behaviour change outcomes achieved

The exercise achieved its aim of raising the profile of the issue of power company carbon dioxide emissions, and engaging the companies. All of the companies involved have had confidential and frank discussions with WWF as a result of the exercise. The WWF team hope to build on these new relationships to engage at least one of the companies in a formal partnership.

It is hard to assess direct changes in emissions, but the companies do seem to see their ranking as significant and those involved in the campaign in WWF feel that it has influenced the companies in terms of their willingness to take action on climate change.

Legacy – lasting impacts and seeding of further activities

The report has improved WWF’s standing as an expert in this area, helping with lobbying. The team are hoping to develop the ranking into an annual benchmarking exercise.