



London **Waste &**
Recycling Board



Flats Recycling Programme Evaluation Report

Date: August 2013

Version Control: Final Report

Background to LWARB

The London Waste and Recycling Board (LWARB) was established by the GLA Act 2007 to promote and encourage the production of less waste, an increase in the proportion of waste that is re-used or recycled and the use of methods of collection, treatment and disposal of waste which are more beneficial to the environment in London. LWARB has a fund to further these objectives, comprising of money from Government (the Department for the Environment Food and Rural Affairs, DEFRA) and the Greater London Authority to improve waste management in the capital.

Flats Programme

The LWARB Flats Recycling Programme was launched in July 2010 and provided funding aimed at helping London boroughs overcome common barriers that affect recycling performance in flats and high-rise properties. The Programme funded new recycling collection infrastructure and schemes to boost and maintain participation in existing services.

Following the distribution of funding to all of the projects, LWARB appointed LRS Consultancy to evaluate the Programme. This included collating information from all funded projects and incorporating key aspects of the communications support delivered through Recycle for London (RfL) to produce a report on what has been achieved and what lessons have been learned.

Note on Data

Data on tonnages collected for recycling is derived from monitoring information provided by the boroughs. In some cases, estimates have been made where information was not available or of insufficient quality. Where the boroughs were unable to provide performance data for the schemes they implemented, various methodologies have been used to estimate the impact of these schemes to provide an estimated overall performance of the Flats Recycling Programme. These methodologies include the use of average performance data from other LWARB funded schemes and WRAP performance data.

Unless otherwise stated, total CO₂ and tonnage diversion is provided on the assumption of a 4 year scheme life and that schemes would not have been introduced without LWARB support over this period; recycling increase and CO₂ avoidance¹ is therefore regarded as additional. Where schemes had a phased roll out, the tonnage collected during the first year of the scheme has been extrapolated to give the 4 year figure. In most cases it is anticipated that schemes will run for longer than 4 years. In some cases, particularly reusable bag schemes, the effect of the scheme will diminish naturally with time unless new bags are distributed. Some schemes may be withdrawn prematurely, although there appear to be no current plans to withdraw any of the funded schemes. For these reasons the use of the 4 years scheme lifetime seems a prudent, but conservative assumption.

Written by: LRS Consultancy and LWARB

¹ Greenhouse gases are reported as an equivalent value of carbon dioxide (CO₂eq).

Contents

Background to LWARB		i
1.	Background	1
1.1	Recycling for flats in London	2
1.2	LWARB Programme funding	2
1.3	Project evaluation	2
2.	Programme Summary	3
2.1	Headline achievements	4
2.2	Results by scheme type	5
2.3	Summary of key outcomes	5
2.4	Key Lessons Learned	6
3.	Individual Scheme Achievements	8
3.1	Food waste collection schemes	9
3.1.1	Introduction	9
3.1.2	Implementation	9
3.1.3	Communications	9
3.1.4	Key metrics	10
3.1.5	Lessons learned	10
3.2	Reusable bag schemes	11
3.2.1	Introduction	11
3.2.2	Implementation	11
3.2.3	Communications	11
3.2.4	Key metrics	12
3.2.5	Lessons learned	12
3.3	Signage improvement schemes	13
3.3.1	Introduction	13
3.3.2	Implementation	13
3.3.3	Communications	13
3.3.4	Key metrics	14
3.3.5	Lessons learned	14
3.4	Dry recycling improvement schemes	15
3.4.1	Introduction	15
3.4.2	Implementation	15
3.4.3	Communications	15
3.4.4	Key metrics	16
3.4.5	Lessons learned	16
3.5	Other schemes	17
3.5.1	Introduction	17
3.5.2	Key metrics	18
3.5.3	Lessons learned	18
4.	Conclusions	19
5.	Case Studies	21

Flats Recycling Programme
Evaluation Report

1. Background

1. Background

1.1 Recycling for flats in London

Most London boroughs now have comprehensive recycling and composting collection systems in place for kerbside households². Traditionally services for flats have been based on dry-recycling bring schemes which tend to have lower recycling rates than kerbside services.

The Mayor's Municipal Waste Management Strategy states that recycling rates in the region of 10% were being achieved from flats in 2010 and that this will need to increase to about 40% to help London achieve an overall recycling and composting rate of 60% by 2031. LWARB's Flats Recycling Programme was established to help London boroughs meet this challenge.

1.2 LWARB Programme funding

To address the low recycling performance in flats, LWARB launched a £5 million Flats Recycling Programme infrastructure fund in 2010 to improve recycling for flats in London. The fund was available to London boroughs who wished to:

- Introduce a new flats recycling service
- Expand an existing flats service and
- Improve the performance of an existing flats service.

In addition, Recycle for London³ (RfL) provided communications support in the form of funding and/or advice to all the boroughs that received the LWARB funding.

In July 2010, LWARB issued guidance to bidders, that detailed the application process, evaluation criteria and timetable⁴. Applications were invited for two rounds of bidding, in September and December 2010. It was anticipated that funding would be committed by March 31 2011, and that all funded schemes would be operational by 31 March 2012. The funding was provided on the condition that projects were supported by boroughs for at least four years.

A committee of the LWARB Board (the Flats Committee) was created to agree the application process, assess applications for funding, and make funding recommendations to the LWARB Board. The Flats Committee included representatives from LWARB, WRAP, London boroughs, the National Housing Federation, London Councils and the Greater London Authority.

1.3 Project evaluation

LWARB officers evaluated each application to the Programme and assessed projects according to proposed tonnage diversion, CO₂ avoidance, costs, deliverability and value for money. Where possible, standard tonnage expectations were applied, derived from studies and data collated by WRAP. This normalisation process allowed comparisons between projects to be made. In some cases, following the evaluation and clarification process, projects were amended before being awarded funding. In addition LWARB developed and managed a joint procurement programme for boroughs purchasing similar equipment. Reusable bags, bins, kitchen caddies, liners and food waste bin housing units were all procured in this manner delivering collective savings of c.£200,000.

Boroughs were able to apply for RfL communications support to assist with the communications for each project. All boroughs, whether receiving funding support from RfL or not, were required to develop and implement a communications plan to support any infrastructure changes. Communications plans and subsequent materials were reviewed and approved by RfL.

Following approval of funding, boroughs were required to sign a funding agreement and provide quarterly monitoring information on all aspects of the project.

² WRAP Local Authority Waste and Recycling Information Portal <http://laportal.wrap.org.uk/>

³ Recycle for London (RfL) is a communications programme delivered in partnership by the GLA and WRAP and funded by LWARB

⁴ Details of the application process can be found at <http://www.lwarb.gov.uk/page/?identity=flatsrecyclingprogramme>

Flats Recycling Programme
Evaluation Report

2. Programme Summary

2. Programme summary

LWARB funded 26 boroughs to deliver 29 projects across four main scheme types; reusable bags, improvements to signage, food waste bring banks and improvements to dry recycling services. In addition funding was provided for an incentive scheme and a mobile recycling centre. RfL provided support and advice for all 29 projects and funded communications activity for 18 projects. RfL also conducted joint procurement of door to door canvassing for boroughs to support the funded projects.

Scheme type	Description	Boroughs funded (* denotes those receiving RfL funding)
Reusable bags	Provision of reusable bags to residents to aid transport of recycling from their home to communal bring banks	Camden*, Croydon*, Hackney, Lambeth*, Waltham Forest*
Food waste	Roll out of bring bank food waste collection services	Bexley, Bromley, Croydon*, Enfield*, Hackney*, Islington*, Merton*
Signage	Improvements to signage at bring banks	Ealing, Hounslow, Lewisham*, Redbridge*, Wandsworth, Westminster*
Dry recycling improvements	Improvements to dry recycling services including service change and new roll outs	Barking and Dagenham, Brent, Hammersmith and Fulham*, Harrow*, Haringey, Hillingdon, Islington*, Lambeth*, Newham*, Richmond*, Tower Hamlets
Other	Incentive scheme (Bexley) and mobile recycling centre (Southwark)	Bexley*, Southwark

4

2.1 Key achievements

In total LWARB distributed £4,162,806 through the Flats Programme, supported by £348,308 of RfL funding and over £1,500,000 of internal funding from the funded boroughs. The 29 projects provided new or improved recycling services to 522,718 households.

After analysing individual borough monitoring information it is estimated that the Programme will achieve the following:

- Recycle an additional 60,236 tonnes;
- Achieve an average increase in recycling of 28.81 kilograms per household covered by the schemes;
- Avoid 40,147 tonnes of CO₂ eq.

2.2 Results by scheme type

An evaluation of the programme performance by scheme type shows where greatest impact was achieved. This is detailed in Table 1 below.

Scheme type	Number of households served	LWARB funding distributed	LWARB spend per tonne	LWARB spend per household	Total RfL funding distributed	RfL spend per household	Additional Recycling (tonnes)	Additional Recycling (Kg/hh/yr) ⁵	CO ₂ eq avoided (tonnes)
Reusable bags	143,113	£89,733	£7.49	£0.63	£76,556	£0.53	11,984	20.94	8,681
Food waste	78,490	£1,653,677	£202.31	£21.52	£96,175	£1.23	8,174	26.04	302
Signage	128,923	£304,853	£32.12	£2.36	£32,400	£0.25	9,490	18.40	6,676
Dry recycling improvements	147,454	£1,956,925	£64.28	£13.82	£30,224	£0.45	30,443	51.62	24,036
Other	24,738	£157,618	£1093.05	£6.37	£60,093	£2.43	144	1.46	152
TOTAL	522,718	£4,162,806	£69.12	£7.94	£348,308	£0.73	60,236	28.81	40,147

Table 1: Table to show the results of the Flats Recycling Programme by scheme type

2.3 Summary of key outcomes

The most successful projects combined a number of different ways of communicating with householders with strong pre-project planning, good monitoring programmes and the development of effective working partnerships. Those projects that engaged in face to face contact with residents and rolled out their communications programmes in tandem with service changes, (ensuring that residents receive messages and the infrastructure at the same time), have reaped the best returns.

In addition to the headline achievement on recycling increase, CO₂ diversion and households served detailed in 2.1, the Programme resulted in some very positive outcomes for the participating boroughs; some of the most significant are summarised below.

Recycling

- The majority of boroughs for which reliable data was available diverted more tonnage than predicted.

- The highest increase in recycling came from dry recycling improvements, followed by the food waste schemes. This is because, in these areas, boroughs tended to roll out large scale changes and new services, such as borough wide collections of food waste.
- Higher performance than expected was achieved for food waste schemes as a result of significant investment in communications and also where there was the free provision of liners.
- Reusable bags provided the best return on investment for LVARB. However, not enough data is available to assess whether recycling increases would be sustained over the long term, and the additional costs of new bag re-distribution over the four year cycle are not assessed in this report.

Costs

- The schemes cost 36% less than anticipated and as a result the Flats Recycling Programme spent c£800,000 less than anticipated. This was as a result of;

⁵ Total RfL spend within the category against total households served

⁶ Calculated on total tonnes and total households for each scheme type

- the joint procurement of equipment such as reusable bags, which was managed by LWARB and which led to average savings of 10% (c. £200,000).
- additional efficiencies and savings achieved by boroughs during implementation e.g. through the purchase of refurbished rather than new containers and vehicle fleet optimisation.
- changes to schemes during implementation and roll out e.g. due to fire safety advice.

The saving from the Programme was reinvested into other LWARB borough services.

- The reusable bag projects had the lowest spend per household and per tonne. This was because the majority of boroughs used the bags to support existing schemes, meaning large investments in collection infrastructure were not needed. The reusable bag projects also achieved relatively high recycling per household as a result of increases in recycling captured through existing banks and the roll out of new recycling banks by some boroughs.
- Food waste recycling schemes had one of the highest spends per household and per tonne, this was because they focused on introducing new services to householders. However, the food recycling schemes recycled the second highest amount per household.
- The highest cost per tonne was within the 'other' category and is mainly due to the innovative nature of the projects and lower than anticipated capture of materials.

Further benefits

- A number of boroughs anecdotally reported other benefits including; decreases in contamination where existing services were enhanced, reduction in residual waste and positive feedback from residents and managing organisations.

2.4 Key Lessons Learned

There were some important lessons learned from the Programme, which can be classified as financial, process management, partnerships, communications and monitoring. These are summarised as follows.

Costs

- The joint procurement of items, such as reusable bags resulted in significant financial savings.
- The use of refurbished equipment reduced costs for some projects.

Process management

- Good planning in advance of implementation is essential to achieving better levels of performance.
- Carrying out surveys and assessments in advance of scheme roll out can help identify areas of highest potential and ensure that infrastructure is fit for purpose. For example accurate address and block information and on site assessment at the outset will help to ensure a smooth roll out.
- Aligning the delivery of communal bins, caddies, liners with communications materials is essential to ensuring a smooth service roll out.
- Having a contingency plan in place enables key risks, such as staff absences, to be managed.
- Where ground works are required, planning permission should be considered in advance of project roll out.
- Phasing the roll out of a project allows for comments and lessons learned to be fed back into the process to ensure that any issues can be ironed out as early on as possible and that mistakes are not repeated.
- Whilst most projects were fully rolled out by 31 March 2012, there were a few projects that slipped slightly. This was as a result of a variety of implementation issues such as resident consultation taking longer than expected, delays in equipment deliveries and changes in the scheme.

Partnerships

- Engaging with housing managing organisations from the outset is key as it helps to reduce roll out delays and can encourage them to support and promote the schemes.

- Working with caretakers in blocks of flats can improve the process of identifying suitable bin locations, ensures they are supportive of the changes being implemented and can assist with communicating the scheme effectively with residents.
- Rolling out a borough-wide project often requires engagement with a large number of different managing organisations. Setting up a Board or steering group with representation from stakeholder organisations can be an effective way of communicating and disseminating information.
- Joint working can strengthen relationships between the borough and the housing providers on other non-waste related programmes.

Communications

- A good communications plan and delivery of it are essential for ensuring that services are used correctly from the outset and are taken up by as many residents as possible.
- Door to door canvassing of residents is an effective method of delivering equipment and communication messages to ensure that residents understand what the scheme is and how to use it correctly.
- Attending community groups and forums can be a good way to get feedback and address issues and concerns raised by residents. However arranging meetings specifically about a flats project can be resource intensive and are less likely to be well attended.
- Using community recycling champions can assist with the smooth roll out of services and provide a point for feedback for residents regarding services.
- Providing training and information to internal team members who will be the front line for resident enquiries allows for better communication with householders.

Monitoring

- When designing and implementing schemes it is important to consider how they will be monitored in order to assess their impact and performance. Challenges faced by boroughs in monitoring included;

- the resources and cost associated with assessing fill levels or undertaking dedicated collections.
- reliability of fill rate monitoring recording from crews.
- how to assess flats recycling performance when the same vehicle also collects material from other services such as kerbside.
- technical problems associates with weighing equipment.
- Conducting baseline monitoring of services prior to project implementation is essential to build an accurate picture of the impact of service changes.
- Using the collection crews and caretakers to provide feedback on sites and issues can be an effective way of monitoring success and reporting issues. However they should always be used in conjunction with an effective tonnage monitoring methodology.

Some useful lessons were learned about the funding process in general are summarised below:

- The application processes should be simple and easy to complete and should be appropriate to the level of funding available to individual beneficiaries to maximise take up.
- The monitoring regime should be agreed with beneficiaries in advance and the results provided by the beneficiary should be analysed by the funder during the funding period to ensure that the data provided is robust for future reporting. The beneficiary should also be required to report issues with monitoring as the project proceeds.
- The frequency of reporting requirements needs to be fit for purpose to ensure that information is provided in a timely manner and is not onerous for the beneficiary to complete.
- Flexibility in the use of funds post award of funding helps to ensure that design changes that improve the projects can be easily implemented as lessons are learned during the implementation of the project.
- Helpful, knowledgeable and supportive individuals within the funder's organisation are appreciated by the beneficiaries and can result in stronger working relationships and better outcomes.

Flats Recycling Programme
Evaluation Report

**3. Individual Scheme
Achievements**

3. Individual Scheme Achievements

3.1 Food waste collection schemes

3.1.1 Introduction

Seven boroughs received funding to implement new or expand existing food waste collection schemes to 78,490 households. All the schemes introduced food waste collection services via communal wheeled bins located close to the block of flats or inside bin rooms, with most authorities using metal housing units to contain the wheeled bins as shown in Figure 1a. Four boroughs provided housing units for all sites and two provided housing units depending on local circumstance (e.g. housing units were provided where vandalism of un-housed bins was likely to be an issue) and one did not use housing units (Figure 1b). The borough that did not use housing units reported that they experienced no problems in doing so, and that, given that housing units are expensive, they thought that consideration should be given to only using wheeled bins.

Residents were provided with either 5 or 7 litre kitchen caddies and LVARB funded up to a six-month supply of liners for each borough and encouraged boroughs to continue to provide liners free of charge to residents.



Figure 1 (a): A housing unit in use



Figure 1 (b): wheeled bin for food waste without a housing unit in situ

3.1.2 Implementation

Three boroughs introduced flats food waste collection schemes to all suitable blocks of flats in their boroughs, two boroughs used the funding to support the expansion of existing flats food waste collection schemes and two boroughs introduced new food waste collection schemes to a limited number of blocks of flats in their boroughs. One food waste scheme was unique in the sense that it was an opt-in scheme, enabling residents that requested a food waste collection to be part of the scheme (up to the capacity of the service, which was 9,000 households).

In most cases, the boroughs used their own staff to deliver the communal bins to the blocks of flats and then either the boroughs or UK Container Maintenance (a company employed to install the food waste housing units by Matussi, the supplier selected by LVARB through the procurement of the housing units) installed the housing units. The kitchen caddies and liners were usually delivered along with communications materials about the scheme. Boroughs that received RfL funding for door to door canvassing had the door knocking staff deliver communications materials. One of the boroughs delivered communications materials through its local "community pay back scheme" (where offenders undertake community work). The borough using the community pay back scheme experienced some behaviour issues, which were resolved with closer supervision.

3.1.3 Communications

The key communication activities used to promote the food waste schemes included leaflets/guides and door to door canvassing with some boroughs also using posters, council websites and local newsletters and magazines. Letters, "sorry we missed you" cards, press advertising, road shows and container stickers were used to a lesser extent. As part of the door to door canvassing campaign one scheme recruited a Recycling Champion at each block to assist with the roll-out and report any issues.

3.1.4 Key metrics

Total Tonnes	Average recycling Kg/hh/yr	Average LWARB spend/hh (£)	Average Communications spend/hh (£)	Average LWARB spend per tonne (£)
8,174	26.04 range 15.86 – 41.38	21.52 range 8.22 – 30	1.51 range £0.26 – £2.64	202.31 range £49.69 – £385.98

- The scheme that had the highest diversion per household invested the greatest amount in communications and provided liners free of charge from estate offices and libraries. The schemes that collected the least amount of food waste invested the least per household in communications and also charged residents for liners following an initial delivery of free liners.
- The schemes that had the lowest LWARB spend per household and per tonne were those extending existing schemes as they did not need to procure additional collection vehicles and in addition one scheme did not require food waste housing units. The schemes that had the highest spend per household and per tonne were new schemes, procuring new vehicles.
- As part of the application evaluation process, predicted tonnage for all applications was based upon the WRAP's expected food waste diversion performance from flats guidance available at the time, which was 15.08 kilograms per household per year. The average performance of the LWARB funded scheme was 73% higher than this. WRAP has since revised its figures. The revised WRAP guidance⁷ indicates that capture of food waste from flats bring banks will average 34.32 kilograms per household per year (which is slightly higher than the LWARB schemes average), with scheme performance ranging from 15.6 to 55.64 kilograms per household per year. This is based upon actuals and estimates from eight schemes. Given that the London data is based upon seven schemes with actual tonnages, this would suggest that the WRAP performance table is indicating a tonnage that might be too high, and may need to be revised downwards.

3.1.5 Lessons learned

Performance

- Provision of free liners and higher investment in communications can result in higher performing schemes.

- The provision of bin housing units did not seem to affect performance. Of the two highest performing schemes, one provided housing units while the other did not. Given the cost of housing units, their use should be considered carefully. Food waste housing units can be more attractive than un-housed bins, and can reduce odour and the possibility of vandalism. Where it is considered that any of these factors may be of concern, housing units should be considered.
- Scheme performance was 73% higher than initially estimated using national guidance that was available when the schemes were planned. Subsequent revised national estimates suggest that the schemes introduced are performing within the expected range, albeit slightly below the expected national average. LWARB will share the performance information from these schemes with WRAP.

Implementation

- Undertaking surveys of blocks jointly with managing organisations helps to alleviate any concerns they have regarding the scheme as well as enabling blocks of flats that are not suitable for food waste collections to be identified.
- Delivering communal bins, caddies and liners at the same time as communications materials ensures that residents understand how to correctly participate in food waste schemes from the outset. Combining door to door canvassing with delivery of equipment and communication materials in particular seems to be a sensible approach. Requesting keys and fobs from managing organisations makes sure that staff can access blocks of flats to deliver equipment and communications.
- Providing an opt-in scheme for food waste can result in delays while sufficient blocks of flats opt in to receive the scheme to make the operations efficient.

Communications

- Rolling out a scheme in phases allows the effectiveness of communications approaches to be evaluated and changed as appropriate.
- Providing training and information to internal team members who will be the front line for resident enquiries allows for better communication with householders.
- Effective methods of addressing contamination include using contamination information stickers on communal bins, writing letters to residents and door to door canvassing.
- Recruiting recycling champions at each block of flats can be another useful way of informing residents, monitoring local issues, and receiving feedback on the scheme.

3.2 Reusable bag schemes

3.2.1 Introduction

Five boroughs provided reusable bags for 143,113 households to store dry recyclables in their home and transport them to the communal bring banks. In addition, one scheme also updated signage at recycling sites and one scheme provided some permanent recycling units that residents could place under their sink to store recyclables. As boroughs were using the bags to enhance the performance of existing recycling schemes, significant infrastructure changes were not required, lessening the requirement for stakeholder engagement and meaning that surveys of blocks of flats were not required.

Seven other boroughs also provided reusable bags as well as making other changes to dry recycling services. These schemes are considered in sections 3.3 and 3.4 of this report.



Figure 2(a): Reusable bag in use



Figure 2(b): Reusable bag recycling poster

3.2.2 Implementation

The two methods used to deliver the bags were delivering bags in conjunction with door to door canvassing or delivering them using either borough staff or a delivery company. In most instances communication materials (leaflets or booklets) were delivered with the bags, although in one borough access problems encountered when delivering bags meant that the booklet (delivered by Royal Mail) that accompanied the bag was received in advance of the bags.

3.2.3 Communications

The key communication activities used to promote the reusable bag schemes included leaflets/guides/booklets with some boroughs also utilising local newsletters and magazines and door to door canvassing. Posters, websites, road shows, letters, press advertising, social media, vehicle livery and neighbourhood meetings were also used but to a lesser extent.

3.2.4 Key metrics

Total Tonnes	Average recycling Kg/hh/yr	Average LWARB spend/hh (£)	Average Communications spend/hh (£)	Average LWARB spend per tonne (£)
11,984	20.94 range 7.67 – 30.49	0.63 range 0.54 – 0.94	0.56 range 0.31 – 1.10	7.49 range 4.92 – 17.53

- Of the two boroughs that were able to provide actual (as opposed to estimated) performance data, the higher tonnage increase could be as a result of coinciding the introduction of the reusable bag scheme with the roll out of a recycling incentives scheme, which was communicated within the same booklet as the bag.
- The data suggests that reusable bags may have a greater impact where supported by wider communications such as signage or an incentive scheme.

3.2.5 Lessons learned

Performance

- Reusable bags may have a greater impact on the amount of material collected where supported by wider communications such as recycling bank signage or an incentive scheme.
- Greater investment per household in schemes supporting reusable bag distribution such as incentive schemes or signage for sites may result in a lower cost per tonne as a result of increased capture of materials.

Implementation

- As reusable bag schemes tend to not involve major changes to on-site recycling infrastructure, extensive consultation with stakeholders is not generally required.

- The joint procurement of bags significantly reduces the costs of a scheme, with the costs of bags being more than halved in some instances. LWARB placed a high weighting on quality when procuring the reusable bags and as a result the bags used were durable and looked good. We are not able to say whether the look of the bags contributed to their use, but there are some officers who have speculated that the look and feel of the reusable bag is important.
- Feedback from residents in the borough that looked to install permanent under sink recycling bins in residents kitchen showed that many residents did not want them. This suggests that residents are not keen on having permanent recycling containers installed in their homes. These residents were provided with reusable bags instead.

Communications

- Delivering bags via door to door canvassing helps to ensure that residents receive the bag at the same time as receiving information about how to use it correctly.
- Attending community groups and forums can be a good way to identify and address issues related to the service, but arranging specific meetings can be resource intensive and are less likely to be well attended.

3.3 Signage improvement schemes

3.3.1 Introduction

6 boroughs introduced improved signage at their dry recycling sites to better communicate sites to residents and make recycling sites more prominent and attractive. The majority of these boroughs also made additional improvements as follows:

- One increased the number of materials accepted at the bring sites to include plastic pots, tubs and trays and cartons and residents were provided with reusable bags to transport material to the recycling banks.
- One designed and installed metal A4 colour recycling signs at refuse chute hoppers and bin chamber doors, to encourage people to recycle.
- One installed new recycling sites at blocks that had not previously been provided with a service and dropped kerbs at some existing sites to make it easier for operatives to safely manoeuvre recycling bins to the collection vehicle.
- One replaced old bins and stickers at existing sites, and introduced new recycling signs.
- One improved the appearance of bins, introduced new sites, and extended the range of materials accepted through the scheme.

3.3.2 Implementation

Since the projects involved installation of permanent signage at sites, consultation with managing organisations was undertaken by all boroughs implementing this type of scheme and approval from managing organisations was sought before signs were installed.



Figure 3: Recycling site with improved signage

3.3.3 Communications

Boroughs used the installation of new and improved signage along with the other improvements as an opportunity to promote the dry recycling service overall. The key communication activities used to promote the schemes included leaflets/booklets and door to door canvassing. Posters, websites, road shows, neighbourhood meetings, letters, press advertising were also used to a lesser extent.

3.3.4 Key metrics⁸

Total Tonnes	Average recycling Kg/hh/yr	Average LWARB spend/hh (£)	Average Communications spend/hh (£)	Average LWARB spend per tonne (£)
9,490	18.4 range 1.22 – 33.34	2.36 range 0.87 – 15.29	0.33 range 0 – 0.86	32.12 range 9.76 – 574.78

- Of the three boroughs that were able to provide reliable performance data the highest kg/hh/yr were achieved for the schemes in which signage was complemented with reusable bags and expanding the range of materials.
- The scheme in which signage was supported by reusable bags achieved a three times greater tonnage increase in recycling than where signage was used alone.
- The scheme that had the greatest cost per household was as a result of installing dropped kerbs at some sites so that recycling collections could take place as well as introducing signage.
- The scheme with the highest cost per tonne was due to the low amount of material captured rather than the total cost of the scheme. The scheme with the lowest cost per tonne was due to a relatively low cost per household and high capture of materials.

3.3.5 Lessons learned

Performance

- The impact of signage can be increased through accompanying other service changes to recycling schemes such as provision of reusable bags or the inclusion of additional material.
- Use of signage does positively influence recycling captured.
- It is important to robustly monitor performance of the bring sites, through fill rate monitor or a similar method in order to identify areas of low performance.

Implementation

- Monitoring the performance of individual sites during the planning stages of a project can identify those sites that would gain most benefit from signage (e.g. that are low performing in terms of capture) and therefore get the best value for money for the investment.
- Undertaking site visits can identify additional changes that could be made to sites to enhance performance or operations (e.g. dropped kerbs or refurbishment of containers).
- It is important when planning schemes to allow adequate time and staff resources for activities such as overseeing installation of signage and engaging with managing organisations.

Communications

- Offering the opportunity to improve recycling signage to the managing organisations can result in the installation of signage at more sites.
- Signage should be consistent with other recycling communications (e.g. any existing signage, leaflets distributed and bin stickers).
- Engagement and communication with managing organisations and householders can help minimise objections and contribute to a smooth roll out of the scheme.

⁸ The information in the table in this section is based on the performance of the four boroughs that were able to provide robust performance data

3.4 Dry recycling improvement schemes

3.4.1 Introduction

Eleven boroughs received LWARB funding to make substantial improvements to their dry recycling schemes.

There were a range of changes made by each borough which included;

- Roll out of new dry recycling bring banks
- Increasing density of bring banks
- Conversion of banks from source separated to commingled
- Conversion of banks from commingled to twin stream
- Conversion of refuse chutes to recycling
- Mini banks on individual floors and underground banks.

Some boroughs who implemented new dry recycling schemes also provided households with reusable bags to store recyclables in their homes.

3.4.2 Implementation

Since the schemes introduced involved significant changes to recycling infrastructure at blocks of flats all the boroughs either undertook site assessments and/or engaged with caretakers to identify suitable locations for containers at sites. All boroughs consulted with managing organisations before schemes were introduced at sites. Consultation with residents was undertaken by five boroughs in a variety of ways; workshops, letters, feedback cards, on-site meetings and presentations to residents groups and associations.

3.4.3 Communications

The key communication activities used to promote the dry recycling improvement schemes included leaflets/guides/booklets, websites and signage at the sites. Letters, posters, local newsletters/press releases, door to door canvassing and local events/meetings were also utilised but to a lesser extent.



Figure 4(a): Mini Bank on floor at a recycling site



Figure 4(b): Underground recycling bank

3.4.4 Key metrics⁹

Total Tonnes	Average recycling Kg/hh/yr	Average LWARB spend/hh (£)	Average Communications spend/hh (£)	Average LWARB spend per tonne (£)
30,443	51.62 range 6.13 – 193.63	13.82 range 3.03 – 110.50	0.52 range 0 – 0.54	64.28 range 10.48 – 626.09

- Limited robust data was available from the boroughs due to a variety of problems with monitoring.
 - The differences in the type of schemes introduced means that performance is not directly comparable. Those boroughs that introduced new services recycled more kg/hh/yr than those who did not since the introduction of new containers for recycling captured new material.
 - Those projects that had high costs per households tended to be those making large infrastructure changes. For example one borough introduced a new underground collection scheme for recycling, which included purchasing containers and a new specialist vehicle.
 - Despite making relatively large changes to recycling infrastructure, one of the boroughs was able to reduce its cost per household significantly through purchasing refurbished containers.
- Additional infrastructure changes may be required at certain blocks of flats in order to implement a scheme safely (for example dropped kerbs). It is important to identify if a budget will be required for these changes when planning schemes.
 - Tailoring the scheme to the individual blocks is important. For example, considering different schemes or container sizes as appropriate to different blocks of flats.
 - It is important that suitably trained staff from the borough and managing organisation oversee the installation of permanent equipment or undertake follow up visits to ensure that equipment is installed and located correctly.

3.4.5 Lessons learned

Performance

- New flats recycling schemes result in a higher capture of material. Although improving existing schemes delivers less return on investment, it is crucial to continue to invest to maintain and improve the amount of material captured.
- Cost savings can be achieved through joint procurement and through use of refurbished rather than new equipment.

Implementation

- Site surveys are an important way of identifying if a scheme is suitable for a block of flats as well as identifying any site specific requirements.

Communications

- Joint working with managing organisations can lead to more effective engagement with residents regarding service changes, for example, by using managing organisation's newsletters to place recycling communications and training of caretakers.
- The establishment of project boards or steering groups who meet regularly can be a useful way of engaging with a range of stakeholders during the introduction of new or improved services.
- Where access to flats is problematic, letters should be used to ensure they reach the intended recipients. Managing organisations may also assist with access.

⁹ 11 boroughs implemented significant improvements to their dry recycling services however the information in the table is only based on the performance of the three boroughs that were able to provide robust performance data.

3.5 Other schemes

3.5.1 Introduction

One borough received funding to introduce of a Mobile Recycling Centre (MRC) service to estate based residents to collect items not collected through the commingled bring bank recycling service such as household wood (small off cuts), textiles, scrap metal, WEEE and batteries. The specialised 7.5 tonne MRC (pictured in Figure 5 below) visited estates on weekends on a rotating schedule.

The MRC was communicated through letters and leaflets, posters, website information and social media, local press releases and promotions at events and meetings. Training was provided for frontline staff.



Figure 5: Mobile recycling centre

One borough received funding to assist in the introduction of the London Green Points (LGP) scheme to all households in flats. LGP is a reward scheme aimed at stimulating recycling, waste prevention and reuse. Target behaviours are incentivised by offering residents points, which can be donated to a range of local community projects, or spent on products, services or experiences at local participating businesses. Residents earn green points by first registering as a member and then by increasing their recycling. Points are earned across an area and divided among the number of households within that area.



Figure 6: Screen shot from the London Green Points website for Bexley

The scheme rolled out in two phases and was communicated to residents through launch events, leaflets, information packs for residents, website information, chute stickers, packs to encourage local retailers and charities to join the scheme, social media, three door to door canvassing campaigns and posters and banners which were displayed in different areas around the borough.

3.5.2 Key metrics

Scheme Type	Total Tonnes	Recycling Kg/hh/yr	LWARB spend/hh (£)	Communications spend/hh (£)	LWARB spend per tonne (£)
Mobile Recycling Centre (MRC)	13	0.36	5.25	2.8	3,668.77
London Green Points (LGP)	131	2.12	7.04	5.18	830.91

- Both schemes had the highest cost per tonne compared to other schemes funded through the Programme. This is because both schemes captured less material than anticipated in their initial applications. Since both scheme types are relatively untested there was little data available for the boroughs to predict the performance which may have led to the differences in the estimated and actual amounts.
- It should be noted that the costs per tonne are presented only for the four year funding period and since the MRC will operate over a longer period of time the cost per tonne will reduce. The borough is also identifying locations for the vehicle that should result in higher use of the scheme.
- The MRC is targeting materials that are not captured through the commingled collection scheme. As these materials tend to arise in relatively low amounts, this is likely to be a key factor in the lower capture of materials than other schemes.
- The success of the MRC communication activities was disappointing as this was the main avenue that the borough had to get residents to use the new service. As the service has had limited attendance and has collected small tonnage volumes the communications activities were not seen to be successful.
- The LGP scheme is focussed on encouraging waste reduction and reuse as well as recycling and the borough has reported a small decrease in waste tonnages. This suggests that further benefits beyond the amount of recyclables captured are likely to be achieved through the scheme. In addition the scheme was introduced initially to an area that was poorly performing in terms of recycling capture which may have contributed to the lower than expected performance (i.e. due to the challenges of service provision within that area).

3.5.3 Lessons learned

Performance

- The performance of innovative schemes can be lower than expected.
- On going monitoring of scheme usage and performance can assist in identifying ways of increasing performance.

Implementation

- Close working with service contractors during the planning and provision of a scheme can help ensure that schemes are effectively monitored and delivered. This was the experience of both boroughs.
- Ensuring effective monitoring of schemes is important, particularly if target households are serviced by a number of collection rounds.

Communications

- Effective communications are important to ensure the uptake of a scheme, for example direct promotions such as door to door canvassing and a mailshot for residents increased uptake of the LGP scheme in Bexley.

Flats Recycling Programme
Evaluation Report

4. Conclusions

4. Conclusions

The LWARB Flats Recycling Programme has played a key role in helping London boroughs to address low recycling performance in flats. The Programme (coupled with RfL communications support) funded projects that provided: reusable bags; improvements to signage; roll out of food waste bring banks, improvements to dry recycling services, incentive schemes and a mobile recycling centre.

In total, the Programme provided 522,718 households with new or improved recycling services, and is estimated to achieve an additional 60,236 tonnes of recycling and avoid 40,147 tonnes CO₂ eq.

Data shows that the LWARB funded dry recycling schemes achieved the highest kilograms per household per year in diversion, the reusable bag schemes had the lowest cost per tonne, and that greatest diversion can be achieved through funding services for flats that do not currently have a collection. However, although some conclusions can be drawn from the schemes that provided the greatest return for investment it was the flexibility of the funding provided by LWARB that allowed boroughs to improve recycling services for flats in a way that suited their existing local services and demographic. This adaptability in approach to improving and funding services is an important way of maximising the quality and quantity of materials collected from flats in the long term but means that comparisons between schemes are not always easy to make.

The most successful projects combined a number of different ways of communicating with householders with strong pre-project planning, good monitoring programmes and the development of effective working partnerships. Those projects that engaged in face to face contact with residents, and rolled out their communications programmes in tandem with service changes, ensuring that residents receive messages and the infrastructure at the same time, have reaped the best returns.

Lessons that have been learned during this Programme are valuable not only to London and its boroughs and residents, but are applicable to authorities looking to increase flats recycling across the UK.

It is hoped that the information contained within this report will provide both a benchmark and a tool for others who seek to develop funds and /or to implement projects that will raise the levels of flats recycling nationally.

Further information regarding each scheme type can be obtained on request from LWRAB by contacting info@lwarb.gov.uk.

5. Case Studies

Case studies to supplement this report are available as follows:

Food waste: Croydon

Reusable bags: Camden

Dry recycling improvements: Harrow

Other: Bexley London Green Points incentive scheme

Flats Recycling Programme
Evaluation Report

5. Case Studies

CASE STUDY 1

London Borough of Croydon Food waste collection service roll out

Background

The London Borough of Croydon (Croydon) received LWARB (£339,616) and RfL (£27,688) funding to assist in the implementation of a new food waste collection service to 17,484 flats in the borough.

The issue

Croydon was planning to implement a food waste collection service to all kerbside properties. However, at the time, the borough did not have sufficient internal funding to also provide the food waste service to flats. The drivers for applying for the Flats Recycling Programme funding were to provide a uniform service to all residents in Croydon irrespective of the housing stock and to improve the recycling rate.

The approach

The borough decided to only provide the food waste scheme to blocks of flats that contained 18 or more households. This was because the borough felt it was not financially viable to provide the scheme to smaller blocks due to the cost per unit of the bins and housing units. The remaining householders outside the scope were provided a food waste recycling service through council funding.

Once Croydon received the funding, its project officers undertook site visits in order to survey and determine the most appropriate bin sites at each block of flats. During the site visits the following issues were identified:

- It was not possible to identify suitable locations at a number of blocks.
- Managing organisations at a number of blocks refused to allow food waste collection bins at their blocks.

These two issues resulted in 1,831 fewer flats receiving the scheme than initially planned. Since the end of the project a number of these flats have been persuaded to take part in the food waste collections service.

The food waste scheme was rolled out to flats during February and March 2012, which was shortly after the borough implemented its kerbside food waste collection scheme. All blocks of flats receiving the scheme were provided with a communal 240 litre food waste bin housed within a metal housing unit. The individual households were provided with a 7 litre internal kitchen caddy and a one year supply of caddy liners i.e. 200 liners.

RfL provided Croydon with communications funding and advice to assist the borough in promoting the scheme to residents. Croydon communicated the scheme by distributing a pre-scheme flyer, undertaking a door to door canvassing campaign, distributing instructional leaflets and updating the borough's website. The project officers also attended housing partnership meetings to promote the new scheme.

The kitchen caddies and liners were delivered along with the instructional leaflet by the door to door canvassing team. This happened before the communal containers were installed at the block of flats. The borough committed to having the communal container in place at the block of flats within 48 hours following the door to door canvassing and was able to achieve this in the vast majority of cases.

LWARB funded the communal bins, housing units, kitchen caddies and initial supply of caddy liners as well as two full time and one part time project officers for 12 months to support the scheme roll out.



Figure 7: Food waste housing unit in situ

The result

The key outcomes of the LWARB funded flats scheme in Croydon are presented in the table below.

Households served	Kg/hh/yr diverted	Tonnes diverted per year	LWARB spend per household	LWARB spend per tonne over four year funding period	Total communications spend per household
15,659	38.88	609	£21.69	£139.44	£1.77

In order to compare food waste projects at the application stage, LWARB based all the food waste projects performance targets on achieving the WRAP food waste diversion targets, which at the time (2010) was 15.08 kilograms per household per year. Croydon's scheme performed over 150% higher than this. Since then following further data collection, WRAP have brought out revised guidance¹ which indicates that capture of food waste from flats bring banks should average 34.32 kilograms per household per year, ranging from 15.6 to 55.64 kilograms per household per year. On this basis Croydon's performance is slightly above average.

LWARB undertook a joint procurement exercise for boroughs purchasing containers and liners. In Croydon this resulted in a saving of £84,393.

Key lessons

- The door stepping campaign was key to getting residents on board with the new system and afforded the opportunity for any issues / questions to be resolved before the service started.
- Despite the infrastructure selected by Croydon to provide the food waste scheme being expensive the quality and appearance of the bin housing units helped in gaining residents buy in to the service.

- Gaining support for food waste collection schemes from managing agents can be difficult. Opposition to the installation of food waste recycling bins can lead to proposals being rejected. In Croydon's experience it was difficult to agree new locations once one had been opposed.
- The joint procurement of equipment saved the project money.

What Croydon said

Without LWARB and RfL funding we would have been unable to introduce the food waste service to flats within the borough, which has been an outstanding success. We appreciated the additional funding for this service, but were also impressed with the guidance provided which supported a well-planned, effectively resourced and efficient service introduction leading to significant landfill diversion from these properties.

In delivering new services unexpected issues can arise which can impact on the implementation timetable. Both LWARB and RfL demonstrated an excellent level of collaborative working in making amendments and demonstrated a sensible approach to managing the project.

CASE STUDY 2

London Borough of Harrow Communal recycling service roll out

Background

The London Borough of Harrow (Harrow) received LWARB (£329,740) and RfL (£4,983) funding to assist in the expansion of its existing comingled communal bring bank recycling service to an additional 8,000 flats in the borough.

The issue

Harrow wanted to roll out a recycling scheme to all flats in the borough to;

- Ensure that all properties had access to a recycling service
- Respond to requests from residents living in flats for a service and improve the overall recycling rate in the borough.

The approach

The scheme was an extension of the borough's existing recycling scheme for blocks of flats, which historically was provided through 1,280 litre communal recycling bins located near to the blocks of flats. The LWARB funding was used to purchase new recycling bins and fund a project manager to undertake the roll out. The new containers were collected utilising spare capacity within the existing collection rounds.

Once funding was awarded, Harrow carried out site visits at all blocks of flats that were to receive the scheme to identify suitable bin locations. Where possible the visits were undertaken in partnership with a representative of the relevant managing organisation in order to agree locations for the recycling bins and the number of bins to be provided. At sites where landlords or building managers were not available, residents were asked, through letters and leaflets distributed by the borough, to provide input to bin locations and numbers required.

By undertaking the site visits, the borough identified that not all blocks of flats had space to locate 1,280 litre bins and as a result the borough negotiated with its bin supplier to replace some of the 1,280 litre bins it had ordered with 240 litre bins.

RfL provided Harrow with communications funding and advice to assist the borough in promoting the scheme to residents. Harrow communicated the scheme by distributing introductory letters and leaflets (delivered in the same envelope). These informed residents of the change and invited them to contact the council to discuss specific site issues. A further delivery of a more detailed booklet was made when the new bins were installed. A dedicated page on the borough's website was also provided.

Collection crews carried out visual inspections of each bin prior to collection to ensure that levels of contamination were within acceptable limits. Where contamination was an issue, bins were referred to the residual waste crews for collection and residents were provided with a re-issue of communications materials. The borough is unable to provide the number of times this action was taken although it did note that this happened on relatively few occasions.

The result

The key outcomes of the LWARB funded flats scheme in Harrow are presented in the table below. The diversion indicates the diversion achieved through the LWARB funded scheme that was rolled out to 8,000 households and not than the overall flats scheme provided in Harrow.

Households served	Kg/hh/yr diverted	Tonnes diverted per year	LWARB spend per household	LWARB spend per tonne over four year funding period	Total communications spend per household
8,000	193.63	1,549	£41.84	£54.02	£0.62

The kilograms collected per household per year reported by Harrow is higher than the national average for commingled bring banks identified by WRAP as 132 kilograms per household per year and in line with the higher quartile of performance identified by WRAP as 190 kilograms per household per year¹. This suggests that the scheme in Harrow is high performing, which may be due to the quality of the service provided, demographic influences e.g. larger household producing more materials to recycle and the communication activities undertaken at the launch of the scheme.

LWARB undertook a joint procurement exercise for boroughs purchasing equipment and containers. In Harrow this resulted in a saving of £51,260.

Key lessons

- Carrying out site surveys at an early stage allowed for the identification of issues, which impacted on the overall design of the scheme.
- Due to the variety of circumstances at blocks of flats, a range of container types and sizes needed to be considered as part of the scheme design in the early planning stages of a project.
- The joint procurement of equipment saved the project money.

What Harrow said

The Flats Recycling Programme funding meant that the Council could roll out the flats recycling scheme to all households in the borough. Without the LWARB funding Harrow would not have been able to do this due to a lack of internal capital finance.

CASE STUDY 3

London Borough of Bexley London Green Points Incentive Scheme

Background

The London Borough of Bexley (Bexley) received LWARB (£87,346) and RfL (£65,883) funding to assist in the introduction of the London Green Points (LGP) incentive scheme to all households in flats in the borough. LGP is a reward scheme aimed at stimulating recycling, waste prevention and reuse.

The basis of the scheme is that target behaviours are incentivised by offering residents points, which can be donated to a range of local community projects, or spent on products, services or experiences at local participating businesses. Residents earn green points by first registering as a member and then by:

- Increasing their recycling; points are earned across an area and divided among the number of households within that area.
- Purchasing products in the LGP green shop using cash.
- Reviewing products that have been purchased so that other members can benefit.

The issue

Bexley wanted to launch an incentive scheme to improve recycling capture and reduce waste in an area of challenging demographics with low recycling rates. The scheme would act as a demonstration project and be rolled out to all flats across the borough in the future.

The approach

Bexley initially introduced the scheme to 1,823 households in flats in Thamesmead during July 2011. This area was selected as it had a high proportion of flats as well as a history of poor recycling rates. Bexley worked in partnership with its partners Gallions Housing Association, Local Green Points LLP and Serco (Bexley’s collection contractor) to plan, deliver and monitor the scheme.

Following an evaluation of the key learnings from communication, engagement and data monitoring activities, from the initial roll out, the borough rolled the scheme out to the remaining 13,638 households in flats across borough in July 2012. During this roll out Bexley used established meetings held with the main housing associations in the borough as a forum for engaging with managing organisations about the scheme.

RfL provided Bexley with communications funding and advice to assist the borough in promoting the scheme to residents and local retailers. The scheme was communicated through launch events, leaflets, information packs for residents, website information, chute stickers, packs to encourage local retailers and charities to join the scheme, social media, three door to door canvassing campaigns, posters and banners which were displayed in different areas around the borough.



The result

The key outcomes of the LGP scheme in Bexley are presented in the table below. The diversion indicates the diversion achieved through the LWARB funded scheme rather than the overall performance of the scheme.

Households served	Kg/hh/yr diverted	Tonnes diverted per year	LWARB spend per household	LWARB spend per tonne over four year funding period	Total communications spend per household
15,438	2.12	33	£7.04	£830.91	£5.18

In addition Bexley reported a small decrease in residual waste tonnage however the borough is awaiting further results. As the scheme is a voluntary one, it relies on residents activating their LGP accounts. The borough found that the activation rate seven months after the phase one roll out was 30% and 20% after the second phase. There are 3 charities and 62 independent Bexley based retailers involved in the scheme.

Key lessons

- The collection of data provided the biggest challenge for the project, particularly since the households within phase one were served by a number of different recycling and waste collection rounds. Aligning schemes to collection rounds where possible can help to address this.
- Bexley found that many people were using the scheme in phase one without activating their online account and so could not claim their points. The welcome pack for the phase two roll-out was changed slightly to include just an information booklet and did not include the membership card. This was designed so that households only received their card once they had activated their online account for the scheme. This method had the adverse impact of having less people register for the scheme.

- The internal funding and LGP's contribution to the scheme has increased slightly due to the number of green points payments required. Before the scheme was implemented it was difficult for the borough to estimate how much funding would be required to cover the green point payments as the payment amount is dependent on scheme usage.

What Bexley said

We have enjoyed working with LWARB on the flats infrastructure fund and want to thank them for the help and support that they have given to us throughout the process. Thank you also to them for their recognition of the dynamism of the scheme and willingness to accept suggestions of variation throughout the process.

CASE STUDY 4

London Borough of Camden Reusable bag roll out

Background

The London Borough of Camden (Camden) received LWARB (£19,107) and RfL (£31,468) funding to assist in the procurement and delivery of reusable bags. This was to support Camden's borough wide, twin stream dry recycling scheme provided to flats through communal recycling containers.

The issue

Camden wanted to expand the provision of reusable bags to all its flats that had access to the dry recycling scheme. This was to:

- Increase the recycling rate
- Increase participation in the recycling scheme for flats
- Respond to requests from residents that cannot have the kerbside recycling boxes.

The approach

LWARB funding was used to procure 30,000 reusable bags.

RfL provided Camden with communications funding and advice to assist the borough in promoting the scheme to residents. Camden communicated the scheme by distributing scheme leaflets, scheme posters (displayed on notice boards in relevant block of flats), delivering a door to door canvassing campaign and updating the borough's website, Facebook page and Twitter account. Officers also participated in road shows that promoted all the recycling schemes that the borough provides to residents.

The borough's waste data management system 'Contender' was used to identify households that had access to the communal recycling scheme and were therefore appropriate to receive a reusable bags.

The reusable bags, along with scheme leaflets were delivered by Waste Watch between September and October 2011 as part of the door to door canvassing campaign. The reusable bags were either delivered to residents directly or when residents were not available the bags were left on residents door steps.

The result

The key outcomes of the LWARB funded flats scheme in Camden are presented in the table below. The diversion figure (kg/hh/yr) indicates the additional recycling tonnage diverted as a result of distributing the reusable bags and communications and not the overall performance of the flats scheme provided in Camden.

Households served	Kg/hh/yr diverted	Tonnes diverted per year	LWARB spend per household	LWARB spend per tonne over four year funding period	Total communications spend per household
33,258	7.67	255	£0.54	£17.53	£0.95

Note: Although only 30,000 reusable bags were purchased a total of 33,258 households received a leaflet promoting recycling.

The additional kilograms collected per household per year in Camden illustrated that the delivery of the reusable bags and the supporting communications campaign had a positive impact on the performance of the recycling scheme. Other boroughs that also distributed reusable bags experienced a greater increase in performance, however these boroughs also implemented other initiatives at the same time as delivering the reusable bags e.g. installed signage at the communal recycling bins or launched an incentive scheme.

LWARB undertook a joint procurement exercise for boroughs purchasing reusable bags. In Camden's case, this resulted in a saving of £8,393.

Key lessons

- The borough felt that the road show event was a success as it had a relatively high turn-out and it provided Camden with the opportunity to receive feedback on the schemes use.
- The delivery of the reusable bags and door to door canvassing campaign resulted in a peak of recycling captured by the scheme however; this performance was not sustained over the following year and in fact steadily dropped throughout the year. This suggests that ongoing communications is required to maintain a high performing scheme.
- The joint procurement of equipment saved the project money.

What Camden said

The project ran without any problems. Anecdotally we received good feedback through our event at Regents Park Estate during July 2011. The main issue for the future is how to sustain recycling performance on estates; further campaigns will be needed.



London Waste and Recycling Board (LWARB)
169 Union Street, London, SE1 0LL

Telephone: 020 7960 3680

Email: info@lwarb.gov.uk

www.lwarb.gov.uk