

<b>Report Title</b>		Report WR_RL_05-06-2015
Dense Urban Recycling Project		
<b>Report by</b>	Antony Buchan	
<b>Job Title</b>	Head of Programme	
<b>Date of Decision</b>	Written Resolution issued: 05/06/2015 Deadline for responses/Date of Decision: 11/06/2015.	

<b>Summary</b>
This paper presents recommendations for the allocation of the £105,655 of Resource London's (WRAP allocation) programme funding to fund London's contribution towards the national Dense Urban Recycling project, in line with proposals set out in the Resource London programme plan and budget.

<b>Reason for Written Resolution</b>
This paper is being presented through the written resolution procedure to prevent delays to the project timetable as the next Resource London Partnership Board meeting is not scheduled until 13 July.

<b>Recommendation</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To approve the allocation of the £105,655 of Resource London's WRAP programme funding to fund London's contribution towards WRAP's national Dense Urban Recycling project.</li> </ul>

<b>Risk Management</b>	
<b>Risk</b>	<b>Action to mitigate risk</b>
The Partnership Board do not approve commitment of funding to the Dense Urban Recycling project.	Improving the yield of dry recycling from flats is a key focus for Resource London. The Dense Urban Recycling project is identified within the Programme Plan as a key deliverable within the programmes innovation and development workstream. Officers have worked with WRAP colleagues to review the project proposal to ensure that London receive the maximum value from this project.

<b>Implications</b>
<b>Legal</b> The LWARB SODA requires that any programme spend >£100,000 receives Resource London Partnership Board approval.

**Financial**

The proposals outlined in this report would lead to the allocations of £105,655 of Resource London's WRAP programme funding.

**Equalities** None

**Originating Officer**

Antony Buchan  
Head of Programme

**Contact details**

[antony.buchan@lwarb.gov.uk](mailto:antony.buchan@lwarb.gov.uk)  
020 7960 3678

**Supporting Report**

**Report**

Resource London has recognised improving the yield of dry recycling from flats and increasing the quality of dry recycling as critical foci in order for the programme to achieve the target that London recycles 50 percent of local authority collected waste by 2020.

However it is also acknowledged that further work is needed to understand which intervention have the greatest impact potential. The Resource London programme plan (and budget) include provision to invest in research of strategic importance to the capital and that contributes towards the programme target.

One such piece of research identified within the programme plan is the '*Dense urban recycling*' project. This project seeks to increase understanding of the options to maximise performance and increase capture in dense urban environments. This is national research is being managed by WRAP and the Resource London budget includes an allocation of £100,000 to contribute and up-weight it for London.

Since the programme plan was approved by the Partnership Board on 13 April 2015 Resource London officers have worked with colleagues in WRAP to define the scope of the dense urban recycling project and the benefits for London. A more detailed project proposal has now been written (Appendix 1) on the basis of this officers are seeking the Partnership Board's approval to commit funding to the project.

The project will be delivered as a partnership between WRAP, Zero Waste Scotland and Resource London. The total budget for the project is £480,250 for 2015/16 for which officers are seeking approval to commit £105,655 of Resource London funding (from the WRAP allocation). The project will be delivered throughout 2015/16, with the project conclusions drawn together in 2016/17, although key sub-project findings will be disseminated throughout the project.

**Project description:**

- Research to identify good practice in recycling services in dense urban areas from across the UK, EU and internationally.
- Consumer research in London and the rest of England and Scotland to better understand the barriers to residents in urban properties recycling more at home.
- Development, roll out and monitoring of a number of pilots (proposing 7: 1 in Scotland, minimum of 2 in London, 4 in England) which will aim to demonstrate how recycling in dense urban areas can be maximised through good scheme design and therefore contribute towards recycling targets.

Officers consider that this research is of strategic importance to London with 19 boroughs having over 40% flatted and multi occupancy dwellings, and ten of those having over 70% flatted and multi occupancy dwellings. However, the research will go beyond just looking at flatted properties and will also review approaches to recycling in low-rise dense urban environments (such as terraced housing or housing with little or no frontage) which also makes up a large proportion of London's dwellings. Known barriers to participation in recycling in these dense urban areas (known to be particular issues for London) include greater transience of residents, often higher levels of deprivation, limited access to recycling services and physical restrictions on space for storing recyclable materials prior to collection.

The Partnership Board is therefore asked to approve the allocation of funds detailed above to support this project.

**Further information**

Appendix 1: Optimising recycling performance from urban households. WRAP Project Initiation Document



# Project Initiation Document (PID)

Delivery of the project is subject to approval of the PID by the relevant Programme Board. This document is created by the Project Manager (role, not necessarily job title) and updated to reflect changes at this level of detail, and re-approval obtained (see authority limits).

Please fill in all sections highlighted in blue. Text in italics can be deleted as it is meant as guidance.

Project Name (40 char max): <b>Optimising recycling performance from urban households</b>	Project Manager: Lindsay Silver
Project Description (if req): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Research to identify good practice in recycling services in dense urban areas from across the UK, EU and internationally.</li> <li>Consumer research in England and Scotland to better understand the barriers to residents in urban properties recycling more at home.</li> <li>Development, roll out and monitoring of a number of pilots which will aim to demonstrate how recycling in dense urban areas can be maximised through good scheme design and therefore contribute towards recycling targets.</li> </ul>	
Programme Area Name: Collections and Recycling	Programme Area Code: RCY104
Head of Programme: Linda Crichton	Programme Area Manager: Sue Reed

Version	Date	Changes	Made by	Approval Status
1	20/4/15		CM	
2	8/5/15		LS	

Details of PID approval routing, authorisation limits and expectations on approval turn-around can be found [here](#) [link to ops model].

## Contents & Document RACI

Please enter the names of appropriate internal staff for the three tasks below; 'Project Business Case', 'Project Definition' and 'H&S Risk Identification'.

Responsible - Is responsible for doing the work, typically one person per task.

Accountable - Has authority to approve or disapprove the work, one person.

	Responsible	Accountable	Consulted	Informed
Project Business Case	Chris Mills	Linda Crichton	Marcus Gover, Peter Maddox, Charlie Devine, Resource London, DEFRA	Recycling Collection advisers, Core Cities group- England, Keith Patterson, Dick Perry, Evaluation, Behaviour Change Team
Project Definition	Lindsay Silver	Chris Mills	Charlie Devine, Resource London, Evaluation, Grants Officer	Recycling Collection advisers, Dick Perry Keith Patterson, Evaluation, Behaviour Change



				Team
Health & Safety Risk Identification				

---

## Project Business Case - Why do the project?

### Project Rationale, Background & Context

Please provide **one paragraph** on why the project should be undertaken – including **how the project fits into the Programme Area Plan**. Who are the main beneficiaries, who will fund the project and who is the customer? Please provide **a link** to the Programme Area Plan document in the relevant SoonR folder.

Please also provide a statement on what steps have been taken to avoid duplication of the work proposed in this project.

All UK Governments are progressing policies and support mechanisms to help their respective Local Authorities contribute to the achievement of national recycling targets in 2020 and beyond.

Regardless of current performance levels it is clear from WasteDataFlow (WDF) reported information that a key challenge facing all UK Local Authorities is how higher levels of capture of recyclables from dense urban areas can be achieved.

Known barriers to participation in recycling in urban areas, identified through previous WRAP studies are wide-ranging. They include higher levels of deprivation, greater transience of residents, limited access to recycling services and physical restrictions on space for storing recyclable materials prior to collection. Data from high density collection rounds in particular is limited given the constraints of housing types, absence of collections data at a property level and how collection rounds are deployed to service the properties.

This project seeks to increase understanding on the options to maximise performance and provide clear benchmark performance data which will be important in understanding the potential to improve national performance as well as performance in highly urban areas.

The principle beneficiaries for this project are the Resource Management team in WRAP operating in England, Resource London and ZWS. The conclusions drawn from the project will enable RM teams to develop their programmes to better support Local Authority collections operating in dense urban areas. It will also help inform further actions Governments may take to increase recycling.

The project will be split into several phases including primary and secondary research: sub-projects which WRAP, Resource London and Zero Waste Scotland have committed to fund elements of. WRAP has consulted with funders and relevant research bodies and trade associations (including WRAP/Defra evidence catalogue, CIWM, consultants and LARAC) to ensure there is no duplication of research activity.

### Allocated Budget

Please provide overall project expenditure budget. This will be broken down further in the Project Expenditure Application Form (PEAF)

[free text]

---

## The Project Definition – What, how, when and who?



## Approach and Resourcing Strategy - How will you do the project?

*Describe briefly how the project will be undertaken and any other approach options that were considered. Stages/phases - local/regional – pilot/feasibility/test? This should include your resourcing and procurement strategies; both internal and external. For larger projects, consider how to break work down into subprojects. Please include a print out of the Resource Scheduler profile for this project,*

The project is broken down into 6 phases initiated throughout 2015/16. Each phase consists of a number of sub-projects with specific milestones, as set out below, and will be delivered by a combination of in-house staff working across nations and use of framework contractors and selected pilot authorities.

Project conclusions will be drawn together in 2016/17, although key sub-project findings will be disseminated throughout the first year.

**Phase 1 – A review of good practice recycling activity in dense urban environments.** The initial phase is comprised of 2 sub-projects from which key findings will help shape what interventions might be considered in successive pilots (Phase 4). An initial review will be undertaken to identify UK, EU and wider international high performing recycling schemes in urban settings to help scope a second stage more in-depth review. The second stage review will focus on detailing performance data, reviewing the specifics of the scheme design which has influenced performance and highlighting opportunities to adapt elements of scheme design to a UK setting. Given the differences in housing type and co-collection activity prevalent in some EU states some extrapolation to remove commercial waste will be required.

The initial review will be undertaken by a recycling adviser supported by a data analyst. The second stage review will be undertaken by a framework contractor.

**Phase 2 – A short review of recycling performance by UK urban housing types and any relevant site inventory work is initially required to derive a classification system for housing type.** Deriving a classification is important to collate project data since Local Authority collection rounds typically service different housing stock which it is known, through the barriers research, to sometimes inhibit householder participation. The classification system will inform and stratify how the qualitative and quantitative data will be collected from different housing stock in phase 3 and phase 4. Depending on their relative proportions it may be that not all property classifications are included in the pilot phase. Relevant PAMs from the nations will be consulted in the development of the classifications to be used and the types of urban properties to be included in the following phases.

The review will be undertaken by a recycling adviser (tbc) supported by a data analyst. The classification system will be developed by a recycling adviser and staff from WRAP's Evaluation team.

**Phase 3 - A review of barriers and opportunities to maximise recycling from urban properties.** This sub-project aims to collect primary data from households in dense urban areas to inform the design of the pilots (Phase 5) and ensure the pilot schemes / interventions are fit for purpose. Local authority areas with significant proportions of properties identified in phase 2 will be approached to take part in this phase of the project. A series of surveys and interviews with residents (to be defined but likely to be doorstep surveys and focus groups) will be undertaken to understand the barriers and challenges from the residents' perspective and seek views on improvements to service design/delivery which would encourage their participation and maximise capture of recyclable materials. Report of the key findings produced and proposals for the pilot programme will be developed. ( Q2)

The surveys will be undertaken by a framework contractor working across the nations. Evaluation Team will help steer the design of the research.

**Phase 4 – Design of the interventions for each of the property types classified in phase 2.**

The PM will convene a workshop with PAMs, key advisors and representatives from RL and ZWS to discuss the research findings and agree the scheme design principles to be taken forward. The

design principles will determine the scope of the pilots to be supported to maximise the chance of success and will include method of containment, materials to be collected, service frequency, in-home storage, onus on residents using the service, and communications interface with consumers. Using the experience of WRAP staff and partners combined with findings from Phases 1 and 3 a series of interventions will be proposed to be taken forward in a series of Local Authority pilots, as well as the approach to monitoring. The pilots may vary in design according to the property types and interests of partners but it is anticipated that broad design principles and approach to monitoring will be consistent.

The PM will keep PAMs informed of relevant research and set up a workshop to enable stakeholder views to be included in the design of pilots.

**Phase 5 – A series of pilots will be undertaken with financial and technical support provided to the pilot local authorities.** A number of pilots (proposing 7: 1 in Scotland, 2 in London, 4 in England) will be undertaken to test the interventions identified in Phase 4 with monitoring systems put in place to capture relevant data.

Local Authority partners will be recruited through an application process to identify suitable projects which have the appropriate conditions to maximise the chance of success in delivery. Technical support, including design of implementation plans and communications materials, and the provision of funding to the selected Local Authorities under agreement, will help to increase the quality of implementation of projects in line with the options highlighted in the design phase.

WRAP grants team will co-ordinate the awards to the selected pilot Local Authorities. A recycling advisor (Jenny Robinson) will communicate the design principles to all pilots to ensure consistency in the design and delivery of projects and to advise on implementation issues. It is proposed that recycling advisors in the regions/nations maintain contact with the pilots in their areas.

**Phase 6 – All project data will be reviewed and analysed and a good practice guide produced.** A proforma will be designed to ensure that all relevant data sets can be captured from the pilots. A good practice guide will be produced and published on WRAP and partner websites. Existing good practice guide on flats recycling will be reviewed and updated and/or relevant sections incorporated in a new guide. Workshops will be developed to disseminate the findings of the pilots during 2016/17.

Project data will be reviewed and analysed by data analysts and the Evaluation Team. A short summary report will be written internally and co-ordinated by PM. A copy writer will then be appointed to help develop the good practice guidance.

## Project Deliverables/Outputs

*List the outputs and deliverables that will occur **during** and at closure of the project. Success measures (such as 'event held by Q4' and 'Report disseminated to key stakeholders in London') should be realistic and measurable. Please ensure you have referenced the Output Planning Toolkit and Guidance and consulted the relevant support function teams before submission. Outputs, and their milestone dates will be tracked on a regular basis using the [Project Plan Report \[link model\]](#).*

Deliverable/ Output/ Milestone	Milestone Date	Impacts /Success Measure
Phase 1 - Initial review to identify high performing urban schemes for further investigation	6/15	Summary review completed and issued internally to project stakeholders
Phase 1 - Report detailing international good practice and reasons for high performance	8/15	Report completed and issued to stakeholders / funders
Phase 2 - Classification system developed	6/15	Agreement from Evaluation and partners in Zero Waste Scotland and Resource London
Phase 2 - Decision point on property types to be covered in pilots	7/15	Sign off e-mail from partners

Phase 3 - Agreed method and approach to consumer research in dense urban areas	6/15	Agreement from Evaluation
Phase 3 - Agree questions to be included in surveys	7/15	Sign off e-mail from partners
Phase 3 - Tender for contractor to undertake surveys	6/15	Contractor appointed
Phase 3 - Select and recruit LA research partners	7/15	LA areas recruited
Phase 3 – Completion of barriers research	8/15	Summary report completed and issued to partners
Phase 4 - Workshop to agree criteria for good practice and design principles and monitoring approach	9/15	Design principles agreed
Phase 5 – Call for pilot LA partners	9/15	Pilot local authorities selected
Phase 5 - Agreement with partners re: scope of pilots.	10/15	Grant agreements awarded
Phase 5 – Agreement of project implementation plans	12/15	Plans approved by WRAP
Phase 5 - Mobilisation of pilots	2/16	Pilots initiated
Phase 6 – Analysis of project data	6/16	Analysis of all project data completed
Phase 6 – Dissemination of findings	From 8/16	Publication of good practice guide; dissemination events held

### Project Benefits/Outcomes

List the benefits and impacts the project will have **after** it is complete/implemented. Most of these are long term and cannot be measured at the end of the project, (confirm whether they will be measured by the programme). Please state if you are involving WRAPs Research and Evaluation Team. This may not equate to the Programme Area Business Case target if this project crosses financial years. These will be measured over a longer timeframe than the project, and are the responsibility of the PAM.

Benefit/Outcome/Impacts	Nation or Funder Beneficiary	Success Measure and Evaluation – how, by whom and when will these be measured?
Understanding of scheme design and services that are likely to raise participation in urban property types covered in the study	All funder nations and regions	Yield performance/uplift data from controlled pilots from specific property types.  Understanding of contribution to national recycling performance from urban property types adopting new scheme designs.
Overview of costs of delivering high performing urban recycling collections	All funder nations and regions	Costs derived per household, per tonne and per communal site. Pilot data reviewed and adjusted for economies of scale in wider roll outs.



## High level Risk

List the key risks here. Detailed risks should be logged during the planning phase in the project management plan report. If there are existing internal controls show these in the risk response column.

Likelihood	1=Unlikely	Impact	1=Minor	Risk Score = Likelihood Multiplied by Impact	1 to 3
	2=Possible		2=Moderate		4 to 5
	3=Almost certain		3=Major		6 to 9

Risk Description and consequence	Likelihood	Impact	Risk Score	Responses: Mitigation / Contingency Tolerate, Treat – what actions	Residual Likelihood	Residual Impact	Risk Score	Risk owner
Cannot attract suitable research/pilot partners	1	3	3	Early EoI process started with targeted communications in urban areas to spell out project benefits. Communications through LA Ezine, LARAC online, workshops and website.	1	1	1	Lindsay Silver
Potential Pilot Authorities have specific views on design of pilots that are counter to WRAP objectives	2	3	6	Sharing and walk through of evidence from research phase will help clarify rationale for design principles. Recruitment of likely partners through selection criteria will clarify project requirements and WRAP expectations. In event of disagreement identify alternative partners from applications.	1	2	3	Chris Mills
High performing urban schemes from across the world have scheme design elements that are not transferable to a UK setting	3	2	6	Initial in-house review of schemes using criteria set by PAM and Special Adviser by experienced staff will ensure that only schemes with some level of cross-over are included. The FTID for further review will include reviewing scheme types for transferable elements.	2	2	4	Lindsay Silver
Data poor or not useful to other L.A.s thereby reducing the impact of the pilots	2	3	6	Monitoring budget will be secured within grant agreement to ensure quality data sets are returned. Early consultation with partners will identify useful monitoring data sets required. Close contact with recycling adviser will highlight any early concerns and enable issues to be quickly addressed.	2	2	4	Giles Prowse



It costs too much to deliver pilots	2	2	4	Scoping of project support elements and early indication of budget available to Authorities as part of EoI process will help manage expectations regarding funding available . Adviser technical support for each project will look for efficiencies in pilot delivery and review project size accordingly (adjust number of households on the pilot, reduce non-essential capital or revenue items included in bids)	1	2	3	Chris Mills
			0				0	
			0				0	



### Assumptions, Constraints, Dependencies and Consequences

*Is this project dependent on any other projects for completion, or are any projects dependent on it? If this project changes in scope or timing, what will be the consequences?*

[free text]

### Project Initiation Approval

*Who is responsible for approving this project at each level? Please refer to the [Approvals Matrix](#) **[link to ops model]** for more information.*

Submitted for authorisation to;	Submission Date;	Authorised by;	Authorised Date;
HoP			
Accountable Director/Exec			

*Who has been consulted in the support functions (including Communications & PR, Research & Evaluation, Procurement, Finance, Resource Manager)?*

Support Function	Submission Date;	Authorised by;	Authorised Date;
eg Communications			
eg Research & Evaluation			