

---

# LIFE+ Up and Forward Project: Case Study

---

B1-B3  
Households (Deprivation)  
Date: September 2015

---



LIFE11 ENV/UK/000389

---



# Contents

		<b>Page</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Key Facts</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>The Approach</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4.</b>	<b>Results</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>5.</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>6.</b>	<b>Key Learning Points</b>	<b>14</b>

## Section 1: Executive Summary

### 1.1 Background to the Project

As part of the EU LIFE+ Project, Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority (GMWDA) has carried out a 42 different communications campaigns across nine Districts within Greater Manchester (Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Stockport, Tameside and Trafford). Each campaign has had slightly different focus, targeting sections of the community that have traditionally been hard to reach, making the success of recycling schemes in these areas particularly challenging. This Project enabled GMWDA to target smaller groups, generally around 1500 households, with much focused recycling messages. This allowed a variety of communication methods and messages to be piloted and the impact of each to be monitored.

The Project started in June 2013 and ran until January 2015 across nine Greater Manchester Districts. The Project is split into 12 campaigns covering one of the four following themes:

- a) Households - focused on communities in disadvantaged areas;
- b) Students and Short lets - focused on those areas with a high level of rental properties or student rental accommodation;
- c) Faith and Culture - focused on those areas with a strong religious or cultural background;
- d) Apartments - focused on those areas with a high level of low rise or high rise apartments.

### 1.2 B1-B3 (Household) Actions

The campaigns outlined under Actions B1 to B3 (Households) were developed in the light of evidence that waste recycling is low in deprived areas as a result of residents in these areas being unable to prioritise recycling. There were 3 campaigns carried out under the Households (Deprivation) theme:

- a) Recycling Rewards - a community based rewards used to encourage residents to participate by tagging bins (with a Golden Ticket) that were presented on the correct day with the correct materials inside. Tickets were exchanged as a reward for their local primary school.
- b) Celebrating Recycling Achievement - feedback has the potential to be a cost effective mechanism to achieve behavioural change, as people may not always fully understand either what they are being asked to do, the reasons for doing it, or the impact their actions may have. This campaign used feedback from the community and the establishment of a group of volunteers to help local residents to more clearly understand why they are asked to recycle and how to recycle correctly through a fun, family orientated community event.
- c) Business and Community - deprived communities are often reliant on local services, and this campaign looked to harness that connection by delivering campaigns through local shops and community centres, and with other stakeholders that have regular dialogue with communities.

Individual case studies for each campaign are available for download on the Up and Forward website. Case studies include:

- a) selection of campaign area;
- b) demographic and Acorn data;
- c) campaign approach, results and key learnings;

d) breakdown of costs.

Website: [www.recycleforgreatermanchester.com/upandforward](http://www.recycleforgreatermanchester.com/upandforward)

### 1.3 Overall objectives

The aim of each campaign was to support and reinforce kerbside recycling of garden and food waste, cans, plastic bottles and paper/card.

Key objectives were as follows:

- a) increase the level of recycling for all of the current materials collected;
- b) raise awareness of the importance of recycling; and
- c) embed good recycling behaviour within identified low performing areas.

### 1.4 Selecting the campaign area

Campaign areas were selected based on the following data sets:

- a) weight of waste (tonnages) collected at the kerbside for the various waste streams (to select a waste collection round with a low yield);
- b) socio-demographic profile of the area using ACORN data to select a waste collection round suited to the Action (in a deprived/low income area); and
- c) District knowledge.

### 1.5 Monitoring the impact of campaigns/targets

Monitoring the impact of the deprivation campaigns took place in a variety of ways. The number of households that were actively recycling was monitored and any change in the yield of recyclable materials collected in the area was calculated. Targets were set to increase both the set out rates in the study area and the weight of recyclable waste collected. These targets, and the formula used to set them for all of the GMWDA/EU LIFE+ Projects are explained in more detail in the Project handbook.

### 1.6 Results

The overall picture for the Households (Deprivation) theme is a positive one. Increases in both participation rates (between 33%-61%) and tonnages collected (2 tonnes-60 tonnes) have been recorded across the three recycling streams (pulpables, commingled and organics) in both participation and tonnages. A reduction in residual waste of 23 tonnes was also recorded.

### 1.7 Conclusions

Over the Project lifetime, the greatest level of success has been observed in the deprivation campaigns (B1-B3), so it is reasonable to suggest that in the future these are the ones that are most likely to be taken forward to the next Phase and replicated in other areas.

## Section 2: Key Facts

### *By theme*

- 2.1 The total cost of delivering the activities in the Household (Deprivation) theme (12 campaigns) was €172,268 of which €97,476 was personnel costs. GMWDA received 50% towards the total cost of this activity from the EU LIFE+ programme.
- 2.2 On the ground activities were delivered in 22 weeks (per campaign); with an average of 460 hours spent on each campaign.
- 2.3 Increases were recorded in participation rates (between 33%-61%) across the three recycling streams (Pulpables, Commingled and Organics).
- 2.4 Increases were recorded in tonnages collected (2-60 tonnes) across the three recycling streams (Pulpables, Commingled and Organics).
- 2.5 84 recycling ambassadors were recruited from the local community.

### *By individual campaigns*

- 2.6 B1: 22,173 reward tags distributed with 13,938 redeemed (63%). Increase in participation and tonnages across all 3 recycling waste streams (Pulpables, Commingled and Organics).
- 2.7 B2: 4 recycling themed family events took place. Increase in participation across all 3 recycling waste streams (Pulpables, Commingled and Organics). Increase in tonnages across 2 waste streams (Commingled and Organics).
- 2.8 B3: 26 businesses signed up to be key information points; with 1,194 bags for life distributed. Increase in tonnages across all 3 recycling waste streams (Pulpables, Commingled and Organics). Increase in participation across 2 waste streams (Commingled and Organics).

## Section 3: The Approach to the Campaigns

- 3.1 The factors associated with deprivation - low incomes, lack of access to education and opportunity generally lead to a lack of prioritisation for recycling. In addition, it has been recognised that there are difficulties reaching this group of residents with the traditional approach of door knocking and/or awareness raising promotional activities. A combination of children within the household and a busy lifestyle means that this group may not have time to engage with a doorstep canvasser trying to deliver a recycling message. Often, door step campaigns engage with the group of people that are already committed to recycling and are interested in finding out more about recycling, rather than those that do not understand or are not aware of the recycling collections available in their area.
- 3.2 To overcome these associated factors, campaigns under the Household (Deprivation) theme were developed within the community using a combination of surveys/focus groups to develop an in-depth understanding of the issues affecting the underperforming groups. The outcomes were used to maximise the benefits of the campaign by incorporating the views of residents into the campaign messages, and working with members of the community to deliver 'face to face' communications and organise events.
- 3.3 B1: Recycling Rewards - The aim of the B1 action was to involve the community in promoting recycling through a financial reward to schools which would in turn increase knowledge and participation in recycling. As the campaign was based on recycling rewards that were linked to work carried out in local primary schools, the age profile of the area was also assessed to ensure that there was a high proportion of primary school age children living there. The scheme encouraged residents to present their recycling bins correctly by offering a cash reward to local primary schools. Reward tags were attached to recycling bins of residents that presented their bin on the right day with the right materials inside. Residents were asked to donate their tags to one of the participating local primary schools. At the end of the campaign reward tags were counted and prize money allocated in proportion to the number of tags collected by each school.

**Photo:** Prize cheque presentation in Bury



- 3.4 B2: Celebrating Achievements - The B2 Action trialled a new approach; refocusing the recycling message and moving into the community, with the help of local community groups and volunteers in the target area. A resident-led family event was organised to celebrate the community's achievements, moving the message assimilation into the community. As part of this action the B14 'Getting Wasted' mobile game application was also showcased and received positive feedback.

**Photo:** Recycling Superhero meets junk modellers at Radcliffe event



- 3.5 B3: Community and Business Recycling - This action involved the support of local businesses that were used as a catalyst for promoting recycling at the point of sale. This was seen as an effective method to trial as it was assumed that low income families (many without cars) are reliant on local services. To enhance the campaign and encourage local businesses to participate, a 'LIFE+ Bag for Life' promotion was developed with the community. If residents purchased goods at a local shop and produced our leaflet, shop owners would hand out the bag which contained further information about recycling along with promoting recycling at the point of sale.
- 3.6 In Tameside, the campaign also looked to promote the donation of WEEE (Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment) through a two week campaign involving local schools and community groups; four locations acted as WEEE collection points. £100 educational prize money was awarded to St. Joseph's primary school for collecting the most WEEE items.

**Photo:** One of our free bags for life being used in a local shop.



- 3.7 It was expected that over the life time of the campaigns residents would understand why they were being asked to recycle and then continue to recycle as part of their normal routine.
- 3.8 To identify a low performing collection round waste collection data was analysed for a period of 12 months prior to the campaigns commencing. GMWDA maintains waste data (recycling rates, facility tonnages etc.) as part of its contract monitoring procedures and analyses waste to support its overall strategy. In order to select an appropriate intervention area existing data was made available to the Project and used to identify low performing rounds to target within each of the campaigns

delivered. The Tonnage Data assessment ranked the rounds depending on the yield (amount of recycling captured) per household. Yield was chosen rather the recycling rate because the three recycling rounds and residual waste round do not sufficiently overlap to calculate the recycling rate.

- 3.9 ACORN data was used to determine the demographic profile of each study area. ACORN is a segmentation tool which categorises the UK's population into demographic types. ACORN combines geography with demographics and lifestyle information, and the places where people live with their underlying characteristics and behaviour to create a tool for understanding the different types of people in different areas throughout the country. ACORN segments households, postcodes and neighbourhoods into 6 categories, 18 groups and 62 types. Each area selected for delivery of Objective 1 (B1-B3) was identified as low yielding for the amount of recyclable materials collected at the kerbside and had high levels of deprivation; with high proportions (66-84%) of ACORN category 4 (Financially stretched) and 5 (Urban adversity) households.
- 3.10 A final intervention zone of approximately 1500 properties was selected in each campaign area from the identified low performing streets; based on the baseline findings provided. In essence, this tailored the intervention zones that were most in need of communications, the campaign then focused on these campaign zones.
- 3.11 Set out rate monitoring was carried out in order to establish whether there had been a change in the number of households presenting recyclable waste for collection. This was performed in the study area before the campaign started and was repeated soon after the campaign concluded. Calculating the set out rate involved monitoring the number of recycling (or waste) containers presented for collection on two consecutive collection days. If a household presented containers for emptying at least once during the two collection days that were monitored they were counted as participating. For example, if 60% of households participated, this means 60% of households set out their container at least once during the monitoring period (over the two collections).
- 3.12 To measure the success of each campaign, tonnage data was also collected in the three kerbside recycling streams (pulpables, commingled and organics) before activities commenced and compared to what had been collected after.

Round information was provided by each individual district (using gate weigh data) 2 weeks prior to the campaign and 2 weeks after. The information provided was specific to the targeted campaign area as each intervention area was selected based on one recycling round (where feasible).



## Section 4: Results

### 4.1 Actions B1-B3 Households (Deprivation)

Actions B1-B3 Households (Deprivation)		Results (SUM OF ALL CAMPAIGN DATA B1-B3)
Participation*	Pulpables:	+56%
	Commingled:	+33%
Tonnages*	Pulpables:	+1.6 tonnes
	Commingled:	+17.4 tonnes

\*Data for residual and organics waste streams are not shown as full data could not be achieved across all campaigns due to seasonality and inconsistencies in round data. Please refer to individual case studies for available data.

### 4.2 B1: Recycling Rewards

The communications successfully engaged the community raising the awareness of the campaign and the importance of recycling. The communities valued the schools in their area as in most cases they acted as the only community focal points. Feedback was positive with many neighbouring collection rounds asking if they could also run a similar campaign. The schools which took part fed back that their pupils had been spreading the word of recycling at home encouraging parents to recycle better. This campaign illustrated how it is essential to engage with schools when trying to communicate effectively with deprived hard to reach communities. In particular the competition element between the schools helped to drive the campaign forward as each area competed to collect the most rewards for their own school.

#### Achievements

B1 Recycling Rewards	Results (SUM OF INDIVIDUAL CAMPAIGN DATA)	
Recycling Ambassadors recruited/trained		23
The number of surveys, events and meetings held by Recycling Ambassadors		356 surveys 17 events
Days spent door knocking by Ambassadors		41
The number of reward tags distributed		22,173
The number of reward tags redeemed		13,938
The number of schools rewarded		10
Changes in participation*	Pulpables:	+34%
	Commingled:	+29%
Changes in tonnages*	Pulpables:	+4.1 tonnes
	Commingled:	+4.3 tonnes

#### Targets

The campaign in Oldham exceeded the targets set in the both the pulpables and commingled waste stream. The campaign in Bury exceeded the set target for participation in the pulpables waste stream and also tonnage targets in both the commingled and pulpables waste streams. The campaign in Manchester also exceeded the target set in the commingled waste stream.

Please refer to individual cases studies for specific target information.

\*Data for the organics waste streams is not shown as full data could not be achieved across all campaigns due to seasonality and inconsistencies in round data. Please refer to individual case studies for available data.

### Campaign costs

	<b>Personnel</b>	<b>€</b>
	<b>Cost</b>	<b>32,516</b>
	<b>Travel and Subsistence</b>	
	Mileage costs of Project Team	702
	Travel Expenses	116
	<b>Cost</b>	<b>818</b>
	<b>Consumables</b>	
	10 x Hand held survey tablets	3,753
	34,000 bin reward tags	7,899
	200 x Adult t-shirts	1,268
	Ambassador Posters x 40	57
	Ambassador leaflets x 650	133
	Ambassador Note Pads x 30	93
	Dibond signs x 50	1,763
<b>B1</b>	Don't miss out cards x 1000	182
	Gazebo x 1	48
	Campaign leaflets x 11,760	1,788
	Sorry we missed you cards x 800	87
	Stationary/crafts for events	41
	<b>Cost</b>	<b>17,114</b>
	<b>External Assistance</b>	
	4 x Community Project Delivery	1,303
	<b>Cost</b>	<b>1,303</b>
	<b>Other Costs</b>	
	Reward Prize Fund	4,851
	Trips to GMWDA Education Centres	2,381
	<b>Cost</b>	<b>7,232</b>
	<b>Total Cost of Campaign Delivery</b>	<b>58,983</b>

### 4.3 B2: Celebrating Recycling Achievement

The communication materials and strategy successfully engaged with the community, helping them to understand how to recycle correctly via a team of dedicated Recycling Ambassadors. Insights gathered during the campaigns were incorporated into campaign materials and in the development of a community led family fun event. The community events were promoted through leaflets, posters and social media; and were all well attended. In Bury, the Council felt the format of this campaign was successful and are looking at replicating the template to engage with other hard to reach communities. In Stockport 87% of residents said the event made them think more about recycling, 76% in Trafford, 96.5% in Bury and 87.9% in Rochdale.

#### Achievements

B2 Celebrating Recycling	Results (SUM OF INDIVIDUAL CAMPAIGN)	
The number of Recycling Ambassadors recruited and trained	35	
Surveys, events and meetings held by Recycling Ambassadors	407 surveys, 14 committee meetings, 6 focus groups	
The number of days spent door knocking by the Recycling Ambassadors	14	
The number of people engaged in staging the event	1360	
The number of people that attended the event	620	
The format of the event has been agreed and planned by the community	Yes x 4	
The event has taken place	Yes x 4	
Changes in participation	Pulpables:	+3%
	Commingled:	+8%
	Organics:	+24%
Changes in tonnages*	Pulpables:	-4.5 tonnes
	Commingled:	+12.8 tonnes

\*Data for the organics waste stream is not shown as full data could not be achieved across all campaigns due to seasonality and inconsistencies in round data. Please refer to individual case studies for available data.

#### Targets

In the commingled waste stream two of the four B2 Celebrating Recycling campaigns exceeded the tonnage targets set for participation and tonnages (Stockport and Rochdale).

In the pulpables waste stream none of the campaigns met the set targets for increases in tonnages and only one campaign (Rochdale) exceeded the participation target.

Two campaigns (Stockport and Rochdale) exceeded the targets set in the organics waste stream.

Please refer to individual cases studies for specific target information.

### Campaign Costs

	<b>Personnel</b>	<b>€</b>
	<b>Cost</b>	<b>33,572</b>
	<b>Travel &amp; Subsistence</b>	
	Mileage costs of Project Team (see note 7.1.7)	702
	Travel Expenses	142
	<b>Cost</b>	<b>844</b>
B2	<b>Consumables</b>	
	2 x Outdoor Banners	382
	200 x Ambassador Leaflets	100
	30 x Ambassador Note Pads	93
	135 x Ambassador Posters	181
	3,900 X Bin Stickers	1,046
	150 x Community Posters	397
	500 x lapel stickers	146
	7,500 x Leaflets	982
	3,400 x Newsletters	1,312
	1,500 x Partington Cards	211
	2,500 x Reusable bags	4,437
	800 x sorry we missed you cards	87
	1 x Superhero costume	1,297
	Crafts/stationary for events	312
	1,000 x Children's t-shirts	4,337
	<b>Cost</b>	<b>15,321</b>
	<b>External Assistance</b>	
	4 x Community Project Delivery	11,608
	Venue Hire	596
	Stall Hire	948
<b>Cost</b>	<b>13,151</b>	
<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>62,889</b>	

#### 4.4 B3: Business and Community Recycling

The campaigns successfully engaged with local businesses in the target areas. To help residents recycle correctly the businesses provided recycling information points with a display of leaflets and guides. As an incentive to help residents take part and raise awareness, free reusable bags for life were also distributed. Feedback was positive and all businesses agreed to stock communication materials throughout campaign delivery, and in some cases after the campaign had finished.

### Achievements

<b>B3 Business Recycling</b>	<b>Results (SUM OF INDIVIDUAL CAMPAIGN DATA)</b>	
The number of shop owners recruited	26	
Recycling Ambassadors recruited and trained	24	
The number of shop visits undertaken	86	
Number of shops that fully embrace the campaign with point of sale material.	26	
Shops reporting positive feedback	26	
Changes in participation	Pulpables:	+19%
	Commingled:	-4%
	Organics:	+29%
Changes in tonnages*	Pulpables:	+2.0 tonnes
	Commingled:	+0.3 tonnes
	Organics:	+30.8 tonnes

### Targets

In the commingled waste two of the four B3 Business Recycling campaigns exceeded the targets set for participation (Bolton and Stockport) and one campaign (Tameside) exceeded the tonnage target.

In the pulpables waste stream three of the campaigns met/or exceeded the targets set for participation and tonnages (Bolton, Stockport and Tameside). However, only Tameside also exceeded the tonnage target set.

Half of the campaigns (Bolton and Stockport) exceeded the organics participation targets set.

Please refer to individual cases studies for specific target information.

### Campaign Costs

<b>Personnel</b>	<b>€</b>
<b>Cost</b>	<b>31,338</b>
<b>Travel &amp; Subsistence</b>	
Mileage costs of Project Team	702
Travel Expenses & Parking	298
<b>Cost</b>	<b>1,000</b>
<b>Consumables</b>	
130 x Ambassador Leaflets	63

30 x Ambassador Note Pads	93
135 x Ambassador Posters	82
3,000 x Bin Tags	1,118
2,700 x Booklets	688
1 x ink stamp	114
12,400 x leaflets	2,053
2,500 x Reusable Bags	4,437
2 x Shop Pop-up display	254
200 x Shop Window Stickers	239
1,000 x white paper bags	18
800 x sorry we missed you cards	87
Refreshments for focus group	4
<b>Cost</b>	<b>9,532</b>
<b>External Assistance</b>	
4 x Community Project Delivery	8,467
Venue Hire	49
<b>Costs</b>	<b>8,516</b>
<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>50,386</b>

## Section 5: Conclusion

- 5.1 The overall picture for the Households (Deprivation) theme is a positive one. Increases in both participation rates (between 33%-61%) and tonnages collected (2 tonnes-60 tonnes) have been recorded across the three recycling streams (pulpables, commingled and organics). Recruited volunteers continue to be active in the communities targeted, leaving a lasting legacy of the campaign and allowing behaviour change to become sustainable.
- 5.2 B1 Recycling Rewards - The level of engagement, participation and the results achieved (participation rates have increased by over 34% in certain waste streams) has shown that this methodology clearly can work. For a relatively small financial investment which included the prizes the campaign was able to reach groups traditionally difficult to engage with on recycling issues, and who would have resisted contact at the doorstep for traditional recycling awareness and educational programmes.
- 5.3 B2 Celebrating Recycling Achievement - All 4 campaign events achieved high levels of attendance and a positive change in behaviour; increase in participation of 24% for organics, 8% commingled, and 3% pulpables. Increases in tonnages were also recorded of 12.8 tonnes for commingled. A decrease of 4.5 tonnes was seen in the amount of pulpables waste collected. However, this decrease was found in one campaign area (Trafford), all of other B2 campaign areas recorded a slight increase or stable tonnages for pulpables. The decrease in Trafford could be due to a number of factors including peaks and troughs in seasonality; pre monitoring was carried out in February 2014 and post monitoring in October 2014.
- 5.4 B3 Business and Community - Increase in participation was seen across 2 recycling waste streams of up to 29%, with an increase in the weight of pulpables of 2 tonnes and an increase in the weight of organics of 30.8 tonnes. Commingled participation decreased by 4%, however, this could be due to more accurate participation by existing recyclers, which may increase tonnages without necessarily increasing the participation rate.

## Section 6: Key Learning Points

- 6.1 With campaigns such as these that are limited to a very short time period (i.e. 22 weeks for 'on the ground' delivery) it is difficult to measure the impact of the activities on the surrounding area. This is not necessarily a problem, and can in fact be seen as a positive in that additional households are receiving campaign information. There does, however, need to be an awareness that there is this possible crossover so that campaign communication materials do not contain information that is too area specific.
- 6.2 It is good practice to avoid any monitoring for both set out rates and weight monitoring during the two weeks before and immediately after the Christmas and New Year holidays because of the impact this holiday season has on people's waste and recycling behaviour. Due to the scheduling and short timescales of these campaigns, it was not always possible to avoid monitoring during this period.
- 6.3 Careful consideration needs to be given to the target area. To measure the recycling rate in the most economical way waste vehicle collection weights were used. However, recycling and residual waste collection rounds cover a different number of properties so did not match exactly. It was therefore necessary to draw a boundary and exclude some properties from the calculation.
- 6.4 The recruitment of Recycling Ambassadors did not go as well as anticipated despite the introduction of an incentive scheme. It was also assumed that volunteers would be willing to carry out door step engagement surveys, in reality volunteers preferred to use informal chats and carry out surveys at school gates. However, where volunteers were recruited from the community this did allow for improved engagement. The campaigns found that residents were more likely to listen and respond to people within their own community.