

# Communication and Behavioural Change for Waste and Recycling

**Alan Dodge**

**Contracts Service Officer**



## **Rother District ~ What's the District Like?**

- **Covers 505 sq. km. of mainly AONB**
- **43,100 properties: 87,600 population**
- **50/50 urban/rural**
- **Tourism and Service**
- **Elderly and retired**
- **Deprivation exist in areas**
- **Wealth in some areas**
- **Ethnic <2%**

## Waste History

- **1988 CCT regulations**
- **DSO: client/contractor arrangement 01 April, 1989**
- **Private contractor since 1995**
- **Back door skip collection**
- **Network of Bring Sites ~ good performance ~ 11%**
- **Curtilage paper to 63% of District since 2003 ~ 17%**
- **Severe constraints on budgets and threat of capping had prevented expansions**

## Current Position

- **New contract started 01 April 2007**
- **New contractor**
- **Service changed June '07**
- **New service:**  
**AWC/curtilage collection/recycling/green waste**
- **“Big Bang” across District**

## Current Performance

### Recycling (including green from Sep 07)

<b>April 2007</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>September 2007</b>	<b>24%</b>
<b>October 2007</b>	<b>37%</b>
<b>June 2008</b>	<b>39%</b>

### Coverage (BVPI 91a)

<b>September 2007</b>	<b>89%</b>
<b>July 2008</b>	<b>96%</b>

## **How Was the Change Managed?**

### **Member/Officer Working Group set up:**

**Service requirements;**

**Specification;**

**Procurement Process**

**Budget Strategy built over three years**

**Additional staff to deal with increase in enquiries**

## **NEED FOR COMMUNICATIONS PLAN**

## **Member Buy-In to Communications Plan**

- **Major service change required change in habits**
- **Build awareness of the scheme**
- **Engagement of and expectations on residents**
- **Existing service had 94% satisfaction survey**
- **High percentage of Residents +65 and +85 age groups**
- **Assisted collections and bin options**
- **Potential for confusion with multi-containers/materials**

# ***DODGY EMPIRICAL DATA***

- Bring Centres recycled @ 11%
- Bring Centre within 1 km of 85% of the population
- “Empirical estimates” suggest 1 in 6 used Bring Centres
- Introduction of kerbside paper ~ 16%
- “I recycle everything”
- Seems to be a gap in the figures!

Most people weren't “recycling everything”

About 50% were “recycling nothing”!

## Member Buy-In to Communications Plan

- **Collection round/day changes**
- **General “Recycling” message**
- **A large amount of complex information to disseminate across a varied population**
- **Limited resource capacity and capability**
- **Professional, high quality presentations geared to Rother residents**

## **Member Buy-In to Communications Plan**

- **New contract estimated ~ £20-26m over life of contract**
- **Very large investment on very limited budget**  
**must demonstrate Value for Money return on investment**
- **Need to maximise the opportunities change can bring**
- **Council Priority to improve waste management**

## Budgeting for Communications Plan

- **Budget Strategy for service included Comms Plan**
- **Wanted “proper job” not a cheap “fix”**
- **Sustained campaign**  
**build up - change period - post introduction period on**
- **Spending profile**  
**slow build - peak at launch/implementation - drop off**
- **Build in flexibility to review/redirect at drop off phase**

## Budgeting for Communications Plan

- What did we go for?

Year 1	£150k
Year 2	£150k
Year 3 (option)	£150k
Total	£450k

**BIG** money

**BUT** less than **2%** overall contract investment

## Agency Selection

- **Open selection process**  
trade journals, local press and OJEU
- **Submissions of Applications of Interest**
- **Select list drawn up**  
capacity, financial, experience, technical capability
- **Submissions received from selected Agencies**  
proposed programme and costs

## Agency Selection

- **Final short list drawn up from most suitable submissions: similar selection process**
- **Interviews held by Waste Management Working Group**
- **Recommendations for appointment to Cabinet**
- **Important impressions:**  
**“We’ll do a leaflet”**  
**capable, innovative, responsive, accessible,**  
**enthusiastic, accountable, professional,**

## Local Media

FRIEND

or

FOE

## Local Media

- **Indifferent relationships with local press**
- **However: engaged for extensive advertising and promotional campaign ~ the right media for the District**
- **Courted, entertained and encouraged local press; indifferent response at times**
- **Result: Some poor media coverage at start of scheme**  
**BUT it could have been a lot worse!**

## Outcomes

**LOVEROTHER  
LOVERECYCLING**

**Brand well known and  
recognised across the District**

- **Raised awareness for new service**
- **Increased levels of recycling prior to start of new scheme 1-1.5%**
- **Early stages of campaign very good**
- **Delivery problems on media for scheme implementation: some initial service problems**

## Outcomes

- **Early campaign established a hunger for information and service**  
**Subsequent problems increased that hunger**
- **Increased demand helped us focus on information considered important by residents**
- **“Rescue Package” was successful, satisfied demand**
- **Initial problems settled after three months, performance good after six months now very good**

## Outcomes

- **Recycling performance established and sustained**
- **Information is being read and understood –  
How do we know this? It's quoted back at us!**
- **Christmas Newsletter very well received –  
full of positives and helpful information**
- **Targeting of information**

## Outcomes

What would we change?

Not very much