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Overview summary

I Introduction

On behalf of Defra, Brook Lyndhurst is undertaking a three year review of the Environmental Action Fund (EAF) 2005-8, to assess and determine behaviour change impact and key factors for success.

This Interim Report presents key findings from Year 1 and is supported by a separate descriptive report of Outputs and Outcomes. The interim report examines approaches to behaviour change within the EAF programme, project organisation and delivery, and evaluation and learning.

The Year 1 review assesses the current state of play in projects, flags risks and opportunities for Year 2, and highlights emerging questions to be answered by the end of the review in 2008.

Three work streams fed into this year’s review: site visits and discussions with all 35 projects; an electronic survey of project managers; and discussions with Defra’s EAF team. This work will be repeated in Year 2 together with, in addition, primary research with project participants.

The Environmental Action Fund

The EAF is a Defra fund which helps voluntary and community sector groups to further the Government’s sustainable development objectives within England. The current round (2005-8) has allocated £6.75 million to 35 projects that:

- Contribute to the sustainable consumption agenda identified in the Government’s Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP) Framework;
- Influence more sustainable patterns of consumption within communities¹;
- Move away from awareness of consumption challenges into action for more sustainable consumption behaviours;
- Go beyond single issues and look at consumption issues across the board; and
- Attempt to make some leap of innovation in social or market activity (as distinct from innovation in technology).

II Progress in Year 1

Our headline conclusion at the close of Year 1 is that EAF is indeed an innovative test bed of approaches that will make both a significant and timely contribution to the SCP evidence base (as well to sustainable development practice in general). Nonetheless, we do note there is considerable variation in both progress and performance across the projects, with some notable successes alongside potential weaknesses.

For example, in come cases projects have already undertaken a significant amount of work on the ground, are well advanced in their work programme and have recorded considerable success. Examples of projects that fall into this category include the Marine Stewardship Council, Eden LA21, Global Action Plan and Envision.

¹ “Communities” can be physical communities at local or regional levels; or communities defined by common features of a social, demographic, religious or cultural kind (Defra, 2005)
In contrast, other projects have spent much of the first year undertaking the preparation and groundwork for their work. In some cases such planning is a fundamental and necessary part of the approach given the nature of the project, while for others it represents a positive response to challenges that have arisen.

However, in our judgement there are cases where this cannot be explained by either of the above and will, unless addressed, significantly reduce the amount of time projects will spend influencing behaviours and, with it, their ability to contribute meaningfully to the EAF programme.

**Emerging lessons – project processes**

The review has identified a number of project process successes, most notably:

- The range of formal and informal partnership arrangements which have emerged (with the exception of exchange across the EAF network itself which is weaker).

- The valuable experience gained by projects in relation to the recruitment and deployment of volunteers and champions, in particular the time and resources required to identify these individuals and equip them with the requisite skills.

Other aspects of the project process in Year 1 have been less successful, for example:

- There is an underutilisation of the behaviour change literature – both the theory and the good practice – and we judge this represents a missed opportunity for projects to hone and refine their approaches and learn from the experiences of others.

- Weaknesses in capacity around both monitoring and evaluation are a particular concern. The lack of clarity on outputs and outcomes, in addition to the absence of formative evaluations across many of the projects, is a risk to the programme.

**Emerging lessons – behaviour change**

Some projects – a relative minority at the current time - are relatively advanced in their work programmes and have recorded notable successes in changing behaviour. Others have yet to demonstrate the same level of success but are well placed to do so, assuming they can make sufficient progress in the next 6 months.

The review has identified **four factors** that help explain the variation in performance so far in achieving behaviour change:

- Organisations who were already well versed in behaviour change approaches and had developed their own approach prior to EAF funding – such as Envision, Global Action Plan and the Marine Stewardship Council – appear to have hit the ground running and been more successful than those which have less experience and organisational capacity in this respect.

- Many projects are yet to fully capitalise on the potential of their projects and may benefit from guidance from the behaviour change literature, both in terms of theory (e.g. “moments of change”) and existing good practice.

- Many projects need to move beyond awareness raising measures towards deeper forms of engagement. Much of the purported success in Year 1 concerns “light” engagement and awareness raising, and where deep engagement has been secured it does appear to have been successful in changing behaviours.
• Projects also need to retain a focus on sustainable lifestyles in the round and systematic behaviour changes, rather than be overly distracted by ‘quick wins’ on single issues.

**Opportunities and risks**

The progress of some projects on behaviour change – as well as the potential of others to make progress – has already provided lessons about behaviour change success factors. The programme continues to have the potential to make a significant contribution to UK understanding on behaviour change practice.

Nonetheless, in our judgement there are two major risks to the programme:

• The ability of projects to go beyond awareness raising and “light touch” engagement to trial “deep engagement” techniques; and

• Even if projects do deliver behaviour change, there remain serious questions about the ability of the individual projects (and by extension ourselves) to capture the evidence and make the case to others.

**III EAF 2005-8: Organisations, projects and programme**

The organisations delivering this round of EAF are very diverse in terms of size, funding sources, areas of activity/market sectors, and prior experience of working on SCP, or with communities.

The review indicates that such organisations indeed exhibit key strengths in their dynamism, innovation and ability to target those areas/issues which are either yet to be mainstreamed by statutory agencies or those which fall ‘between the cracks’ in existing delivery. Nonetheless, they face challenges in terms of their capacity and their relationship/compatibility with their statutory counterparts.

Reflecting the diversity of organisations, the scope of the projects selected is similarly very diverse. SCP issues covered include transport, consumer goods, resource use, waste, housing/construction, and liveability. A sizeable number of the projects embrace all these issues within an overall ‘sustainable lifestyles’ approach. A key challenge for groups is whether or not they can achieve systematic change across lifestyles as a whole, or whether certain behaviours will be easier to shift than others.

Projects similarly span a broad array of target audiences, from individual consumers/households, to stakeholders in supply chains, to wider ‘influencers’ in business and government. Some have a very local focus; others are operating on a national scale. Likewise, some have a very specific focus on one audience, whereas others have adopted a ‘whole chain’ approach to behaviour change with a focus on producers, manufacturers, retailers and consumers.

Such diversity presents both opportunities and challenges for the EAF programme overall. On the one hand, the range of projects is such that it will be in a position to test many different behaviour change approaches, across different SCP issues, and with many different audiences. It is also well placed to contribute to learning against both the 4 E’s of the Sustainable Development strategy and the 4 priority areas – homes, food, transport and tourism – identified by the Sustainable Consumption Roundtable.

This notwithstanding, producing comparable data on outcomes across the projects will be challenging, particularly where they are working to different spatial scales, target audiences and objectives.
To address this issue, and to guide the research going forward, we have provisionally grouped projects into four types – those having direct engagement with individuals/households; those working via intermediaries to engage with individuals/households; those working with organisational stakeholders rather than the public; and those seeking to influence the wider policy/practice landscape. There is a degree of overlap between the categories, particularly where the projects have different elements to their programme (e.g. targeting households and businesses).

The review has established that most projects have had a positive experience of EAF in Year 1. There is widespread praise for the Defra team as being approachable and helpful, and many projects value the fairly ‘light touch’ approach that Defra has taken with them and their willingness to allow innovation, experimentation and change.

IV Behaviour change

Application of behaviour change knowledge

One of the key aims of this round of EAF is to develop approaches which go beyond environmental awareness raising, in recognition of the now well documented attitude-behaviour gap (i.e. the assumption that changing individuals’ awareness/attitudes of environmental issues will automatically produce more sustainable behaviour).

Most projects are expanding on previous activities - for example, with different audiences or on a wider scale - or developing novel approaches of their own creation. A very small number appear to be using EAF funds to support pre-existing core activities.

Very few have self-consciously built their work on ideas developed from the behaviour change literature, and only a minority are well informed about recent research/policy work in this area. Only seven projects, in fact, said they felt very well informed about current behaviour change thinking, while others conceded they lack organisational capacity and knowledge around the behaviour change agenda.

Widespread lack of explicit knowledge about behaviour change thinking need not be a particular concern in itself, since many of the projects are unconsciously undertaking activities that fit with the Sustainable Development Strategy 4E’s framework and in the four sectors identified by the Sustainable Consumption Roundtable.

A majority of projects did, however, express interest in knowing more about the theory, as long as it can be translated straightforwardly for them into specific ‘to do’ suggestions. Furthermore, we judge that projects are missing some insights that would enhance their abilities to move beyond awareness raising (for example, to capitalise on lifestyle change points, to identify specific behavioural ‘blocks’ for particular audiences).

Approaches to behaviour change

Taking on board the insights from recent behaviour change research, project approaches have been classified as being of seven different types:

- Increasing awareness/knowledge – e.g. via events, demonstration projects, leaflets, or home/lifestyle audits.
- Developing participant skills – e.g. training on hard and/or soft skills to enable individuals to take control and initiate their own actions on SD/SCP.
- Promoting tangible benefits – e.g. promoting either personal or community benefits as reasons for participating.
• **Enabling activities** – e.g. providing participants with the means to change, such as energy saving light bulbs or new recycling services.

• **Exemplifying activities** – e.g. encouraging and training projects’ own staff to be more sustainable to help them engage better with participants.

• **Community engagement** – e.g. developing/facilitating communities to help them take on change together in a mutually supportive environment, or using community leaders or champions to bolster trust and buy-in to projects’ aims.

• **Choice editing** – e.g. working with stakeholders in supply chains to remove unsustainable choices for consumers or expanding sustainable choices.

Awareness raising remains the most common activity across projects, though community engagement is also well represented. Promotion of ‘hard’ skills or enabling access to more sustainable products/services are the least well represented.

**Approaches to engagement**

The EAF covers a very wide array of different approaches to engagement. Taking community engagement first, this is a strong feature of the EAF programme and three main approaches have been adopted:

• **Engaging an existing membership** – e.g. a few projects are working specifically with their memberships, using their influence as a trusted brand and capitalising on their access to a large, established and receptive audience.

• **Engaging existing communities** – e.g. a majority of projects are tapping into existing community groups and networks, either with communities of location (e.g. a street or neighbourhood) or communities of interest (e.g. faith groups).

• **Creating new communities** – several projects are seeking to establish ‘new’ community groups specifically based around SCP issues.

Many EAF projects are trying to go beyond the ‘usual suspects’ and engage a broader base of the public. Furthermore, several projects are trying to instigate wider behaviour change ‘transfer’ from key individuals to the wider community.

The use of “intermediaries” to engage the public is a feature of several projects. These include professionals (such as midwives), community figures of trust (such as religious leaders), community champions/volunteers drawn from the community.

Other projects are not concerned with the public and instead are focusing on other ‘targets of change’ across businesses, industry sectors or local authorities. Some projects have adopted a ‘whole supply chain’ approach to change, targeting producers, manufacturers, retailers and consumers.

**Successes**

Encouragingly, most projects say that they have found it generally easy both to engage their intended audience and to recruit intermediaries. A sizable minority, however, have experienced difficulties with recruiting either, or both (6-8 projects).

An important caveat to this apparently positive picture is that projects have generally been more successful at developing “light touch” approaches (e.g. one-off contacts with no follow-up) than deeper engagement models, where repeat contact was originally anticipated, or where participants are being signed up for continuous intervention. Setting up entirely new communities, or new community groups, has similarly proved challenging in some cases.
Projects appear to have made good progress on developing communications approaches that heed recent best practice advice on the tone and content of environmental messages, moving away from the worthy to a more consumer focused approach (which was one of the aims of this EAF round).

There is also evidence that some projects have been able to capitalise on political or media momentum – for example, driving forward on the “Jamie Oliver effect”.

**Barriers**

The principal barrier to delivering behaviour change in Year 1 has been the length of time it has taken for many projects to get up and running, and to alter their delivery plans in the light of barriers encountered early on. Some projects have found recruitment of participants, intermediaries or partners more time consuming than anticipated.

Specific barriers in relation to community intermediaries and champions, in particular, relate to identifying individuals with sufficient time or enthusiasm, especially where projects are seeking long-term commitment. Some projects also experienced problems with the personalities or skills of potential champions.

Our analysis also suggests that some projects were, perhaps, overambitious in their original project plans and so have not been able to deliver all the elements they promised (though many could catch up by Year 3 as long as momentum continues in Year 2).

We also raise concerns in the report about the extent to which projects have a clear understanding of their audience. The Community Based Social Marketing literature suggests that this is a crucial element in delivering successful outcomes but our impression is that some projects do not have a clear sense of whose behaviour they are trying to change, or why participants have been attracted to their projects (e.g. is it because they are already ‘green’ converts?). From a programme level point of view, lack of knowledge about audiences could undermine the ability to identify why and how particular approaches work, and thus potential for replication.

**V Organisational issues and project delivery**

**Organisational issues**

The EAF programme is currently providing paid work for over 210 staff, which equates to an average of 2.5 people per project (on a full time equivalent basis).

Many projects have increased their core capacity by using volunteers (the vast majority of projects), external consultants (mainly to help with evaluation) and support from Defra (particularly on marketing and communications).

Very few are using intermediate labour market workers, and we suggest it would be worth examining further in Year 2 the social economy benefits being delivered through EAF, including ILM workers and disadvantaged individuals as volunteers.

Key weaknesses in projects’ existing skills bases are in evaluation/measurement and knowledge of behaviour change theory and best practice (as flagged earlier). Evident weaknesses on evaluation were brought to Defra’s attention following our site visits and are now being addressed with the offer of one-to-one consultancy support to projects. Defra should continue to monitor progress on this aspect closely.
Some projects have also suffered from a lack of relevant skills in their project managers who have, by their own admission, undergone a crash course in some aspects of project delivery. A number of projects have also experienced turnover of project managers which has slowed down progress.

Where projects have gaps in expertise, some of this is being plugged by telephone support from Defra. However, there is a noticeable lack of exchange between EAF projects on lessons that they are learning about particular barriers (e.g. recruiting intermediaries, carrying out surveys).

Funding is a constant worry to many projects, both in terms of finding match funding and thinking about continuation (which a few have started to do). These issues are generic to the community sector and it is hard to see what additional support Defra could provide, although some projects called for signposting to possible funding sources. A few – but not many - are also developing self-financing activities or beginning to explore opportunities for mainstreaming when the project ends.

EAF groups have developed a large number of partnerships and/or networking opportunities in Year 1. Relationships with local authorities emerged as especially important; but a 'silo' distribution of service responsibilities within local authorities has sometimes made it difficult for all-encompassing SCP projects to engage with them.

Where they have developed a niche service (e.g. on recycling), a few EAF projects are potentially at risk of competition from new local authority services. Few have the capacity or financial standing to be able to compete. This is not a major risk to the EAF programme as a whole but is an issue to monitor in a small number of projects.

**Project management and delivery**

While a few projects are ahead of their Year 1 targets, most have taken more time to set up than originally planned. Somewhere between a third and a half of the projects were behind schedule in June 2006.

Principal reasons for delay are staff turnover or project managers working part-time; the steep learning curve involved in many projects; the time required to recruit partners, intermediaries or champions; and early barriers encountered.

Twenty of the 35 projects found it necessary to change tack to some extent during Year 1. Change has generally been managed adequately or well, and projects praise Defra’s flexible and supportive approach.

Given the innovative nature of projects in this EAF round, substantive change to original project plans was perhaps always inevitable, and should by no means be seen as a weakness of the projects selected. Most projects have the potential to catch up but Defra should pay close attention to progress in the next two quarters. Particular aspects to watch are projects that appear to be rolling over the same outputs and not clearly demonstrating onward movement in the project.

Most projects have (so far) had a positive experience of the EAF. Where criticisms exist, these relate to the demands placed on projects by reporting requirements, and lack of networking opportunities with other EAF projects.

**VI Evaluation and learning**

In addition to the normal requirement to monitor project progress and account for spending, it is hoped that EAF 2005-8 will provide useful data for evaluating the *behavioural impact* of these kinds of activities.
Methodologies for measuring behaviour change in the SCP arena are in their infancy and there are a number of general issues that need to be taken into account when assessing how far EAF projects have progressed on evaluating behaviour change.

These issues relate to the complexity of defining behaviour change, of devising appropriate impact metrics, of capturing spin-offs (e.g. enhanced social capital or community cohesion), and the usual evaluation issues of attribution, diversion and additionality.

The current situation within the EAF is, in fact, no different from practice elsewhere in evaluating community behaviour change projects, and there are huge opportunities for the EAF projects to set the standard, if the issues identified in Year 1 can be addressed successfully.

Towards the end of Year 1 we alerted Defra to the very significant risk that many projects would not be able to demonstrate behaviour change impacts because evaluation was not being built in early enough, or adequately enough, to produce robust evidence. Defra has responded by offering evaluation consultancy support to each project.

Key evaluation issues identified in the Year 1 review were:

- Few groups have set research based targets;
- There is (so far) heavy reliance on anecdotal evidence to demonstrate outcomes;
- Many projects do not differentiate clearly between outputs and outcomes, and there is evidence of confusion about what Defra means by ‘outcomes’;
- Outcomes are often not clearly reported in returns to Defra, and few projects (as yet) provide quantified outcome measures;
- Many are still not making the distinction between awareness raising and behaviour change;
- Few have plans to capture evidence on the wider social benefits of their projects;
- Some have thought about, but are struggling with, methods to capture the ‘diffusion effect’ within their target communities;
- Some projects lack the technical ability to evaluate behaviour change effectively (and may need on-going support);
- Few projects are yet in a position to monitor or measure sustained behaviour change;
- Few are using best practice guidance on evaluation or research techniques;
- Projects are not sharing learning amongst themselves.

On the basis of current plans, it appears that most projects will be relying heavily on participant surveys to generate evidence, though a number will also use ‘hard’ evidence such as utilities bills or product sales.

At a programme level, data on behaviour change will therefore be heavily dependent on the quality and comparability of projects’ surveys. In our view, this supports an argument for further support to projects on questionnaire best practice (including, perhaps, a shared question bank), signposting to best practice guidance (e.g. WRAP), and facilitation of greater sharing between projects of survey designs and methods – and measurement more generally. Progress on surveys and data will be a particular focus of our Year 2 review.
VII Interim recommendations

In view of the interim findings of the review, we make the following recommendations:

**Recommendation 1:** A better system for capturing information from the projects is required. We recommend a simplified quarterly report which has minimum requirements, separates outputs and outcomes, includes quantitative data and, providing this captures both the quarterly information as well as a cumulative total for the year, we see no reason for the annual report.

**Recommendation 2:** Defra should retain its "light touch" system of monitoring but, drawing on the new data capture system (proposed under Recommendation 1) alongside their own dialogue with projects, should adopt a stronger reign with projects where progress is either unclear or known to be weak (which may include, for example, calling in projects to demonstrate their progress).

**Recommendation 3:** Defra should consider further opportunities for networking among the projects. Such opportunities may be virtual as well as physical, and we recommend Defra consider an internet forum for projects to access remotely.

**Recommendation 4:** The Defra SCP team should develop and/or disseminate existing material that bridges the gap between the behaviour change literature and the project, in the form of short guides that flag issues in the vein of "key considerations from the behaviour change theory", "key behaviour change case studies" and so on.

**Recommendation 5:** We support the work Defra has commissioned to support projects in undertaking monitoring and evaluating and this needs to be monitored on an ongoing basis to ensure the projects have the capacity to contribute to the evidence base. In particular we recommend that Defra highlight to the projects the importance of monitoring participants over time, where appropriate, to measure longevity of impact. A specific weakness in the evidence base – and therefore an area where EAF 2005-8 can make a crucial contribution – is deciphering whether an intervention leads to sustained change as opposed to short lived and temporal behavioural responses.

**Recommendation 6:** Defra need to re-emphasise to projects the need to move beyond awareness raising activities alone and test a wider array of behaviour change tools including, in particular, forms of deeper and more sustained engagement.
1 Introduction

In October 2005, Brook Lyndhurst was commissioned by Defra to conduct a three year review of the Environmental Action Fund (EAF) 2005-8, to assess and determine behaviour change impact and key factors for success.

This Interim Report presents key findings from Year 1. It is the first of three analytical reports.

1.1 Background & Objectives

This section briefly outlines the background and objectives of EAF, the Brook Lyndhurst review and this first Interim Report.

The Environmental Action Fund

The EAF is a Defra funding scheme which helps voluntary and community sector groups to further the Government’s sustainable development objectives within England. The current round (2005-8) has allocated £6.75 million to 35 projects that:

- Contribute to the sustainable consumption agenda identified in the Government’s Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP) Framework;
- Influence more sustainable patterns of consumption within communities;
- Move away from awareness of consumption challenges into action for more sustainable consumption behaviours;
- Go beyond single issues and look at consumption issues across the board; and
- Attempt to make some leap of innovation in social or market activity (as distinct from innovation in technology).

Further supporting information can be found from www.defra.gov.uk/environment/eaf.

The Brook Lyndhurst Review

The purpose of the review is to assess the effectiveness of the EAF programme in influencing behaviour. In doing so, it offers a unique opportunity to achieve two “headline” objectives:

Strengthen the behavioural change evidence base - despite the wealth of theory and a growing number of practical projects on the ground, the evidence base on behavioural change remains weak, without which it is difficult to ascertain “what works” and, just as crucially, “what doesn’t”. The review will ensure that the lessons and experiences of the EAF programme are fully captured and contribute to the evidence base.

Providing the “How to…” operational information - our experience of numerous best practice/exemplar case studies is that local practitioners looking to replicate these projects cannot readily access the ‘right’ information. Along with recent initiatives such as ChangeLab, the research programme is designed to deliver robust and systematic evidence that practitioners can use, in a variety of settings, to devise successful programmes for promoting sustainable consumption and production.

---

2 “Communities” can be physical communities at local or regional levels; or communities defined by common features of a social, demographic, religious or cultural kind (Defra, 2005).

3 ChangeLab is a European funded project to bring together best practice examples of behaviour change approaches. See www.changelabproject.org for more details.
The review is set against a backdrop of growing interest at many levels of government in the role of the community and voluntary sector as a delivery partner; in community based approaches as a means of engaging public interest and action; and in ‘behaviour change’ strategies to complement traditional policy tools.

This review, over the three years, will investigate project performance and impact from different perspectives, in order to arrive at a rounded, triangulated, judgement about the behaviour change impact of the programme and key factors for success at project level. These perspectives include:

- Projects themselves;
- Participants/beneficiaries of the projects, and;
- The EAF team within Defra.

For the purposes of Year 1 the focus has been on the projects themselves, whereas in subsequent years the involvement of participants will become more prominent.

**The Year 1 Interim Report**

This report examines project approaches to behaviour change as well as organisational and evaluation issues arising in year one, which have the potential to impact upon a project’s success. More specifically, it is intended to identify:

- The current ‘state of play’ amongst EAF projects, e.g. activities undertaken so far, or how far they have considered and/or begun any monitoring and evaluation;
- Issues for review and discussion moving forward into year two, e.g. if any obstacles have been identified as potential barriers to success or whether processes are firmly in place for the evaluation to proceed; and
- Key issues we hope to answer by the end of the review in 2008, such as ‘which projects work best?’ and ‘can they be replicated or transferred elsewhere?’

Given this is the first year of the programme it is not the intention of this report to try to answer all outstanding and pressing questions concerning behaviour change. Rather, it will provide emerging lessons and issues that will form the basis for ongoing discussions and research in Years 2 and 3.

It is also important to note how this Report ‘sits’ within the reporting framework for this review. As we have already noted, this is the first of three analytical reports to Defra. It will be complemented by subsequent research outputs within this three year time frame, namely:

- Annual summary report of projects’ outputs and outcomes (2006, 2007 and 2008);
- Interim research report in year 2 (2007);
- Final research report in year 3 (2008); and
- A “how to” guide for dissemination of results (2008).

These reports, as part of the EAF programme, will also be accompanied by developments and additions to the wider behaviour change literature.

### 1.2 Methodology

Reflecting the importance of the EAF projects, the methodology is comprehensive and intends to deliver an assessment of the projects as a whole – rather than an assessment of each individual project per se - and to gain an understanding of different ‘groups’ of projects (for example, those targeting householders or communities of interest).
In order to establish an organising framework for the review, Brook Lyndhurst first employed an Advisory Group\(^4\) to assist with and steer the review at key points, drawing upon expertise from academia and practitioners. This group has played a particularly key role in the initial stages of the work in developing a framework to measure behaviour change among participants.

The Year 1 research process designed for this study is described below:

- **Discussions with all 35 project managers** (February to April 2006) which involved visiting projects offices to get a sense of the organisation and people who work there (not just project leaders but also volunteers, interns, accountants, board members and CEOs). The purpose of these discussions is to determine approaches and to identify successes and barriers so far in terms of both project process and behaviour change. The interviews will be repeated each year.

- **An e-survey of all 35 project managers** (June 2006) to complement the qualitative discussions and provide a degree of quantification across the EAF programme as a whole. It also provides an indication of how practice links into existing theory and the level of monitoring and evaluation currently undertaken. It will act as a baseline assessment of projects (to be repeated each year).

- **Discussions with the Defra EAF team** (May 2006) to discuss views from the perspective of Defra on the EAF projects. This involved detailed consideration of perceived successes and failures in both project process and behaviour change (to be repeated each year).

Research with participants did not form part of the work programme in Year 1 but will be a feature in both Years 2 and 3.

### 1.3 Interpreting the Findings

This report presents the findings of both qualitative and quantitative research, which have been used as complementary research methodologies in the review in Year 1. It is therefore important to note the differences between the two and the findings we can reasonably draw from them.

The qualitative discussions with projects were an interactive process between researcher and project staff: it allowed respondents’ attitudes and opinions to be explored in detail. While comparisons can be drawn across projects, the discussions are most effective at the level of individual projects and understanding the context within with they are working.

By contrast, the quantitative data from the electronic survey provides data at the programme level across the 35 projects as a whole. From this it is possible to quantify observations and infer them to the programme, for example ‘eight projects have adopted approach x to behaviour change’. Nevertheless, the sample of 35 projects is fairly small and there is a danger of ‘spurious accuracy’ in presenting percentages. Indeed, the reader should be aware that one project response is equivalent to 3 percentage points. Furthermore, as with all quantitative research there is a danger that nuances of the project approaches can be lost in the attempt to reduce them to single responses and this also needs to be borne in mind.

---

\(^4\) The current membership of the groups, incorporating a mix of both practical and theoretical expertise, is as follows: Stewart Barr (University of Exeter), Jo Butcher (Encams), Edward Kellow (Environment Council), Paul Steedman (National Consumer Council), Tracey Bedford (Defra). We may add to the membership of this group in the future depending on the skills and experience required at various stages of the project.
On a general note when interpreting the data presented in this report, where percentages do not sum to 100, this may be due to computer rounding, the exclusion of 'don’t know' or 'not stated' categories, or multiple answers. An asterisk (*) denotes any value of less than half a percent but greater than zero.

1.4 Report Structure

The paper has six main sections:

Section 2: EAF 2005-8: organisations, projects and the programme – outlining a brief, descriptive overview of the 35 EAF organisations and projects, alongside their reaction to the programme itself in Year 1.

Section 3: Behaviour change – exploring the extent to which projects have influenced behaviour in Year 1 and their plans to do so in Years 2 and 3, covering six core themes.

Section 4: Organisational issues & project delivery – discussing the organisational issues that have emerged in Year 1 and how these have influenced project management and delivery.

Section 5: Evaluation and learning – Outlining the progress made so far in monitoring and evaluating project outputs and behaviour change outcomes, and discussing the further steps required in Years 2 and 3 to ensure the evidence is available to ascertain what works and what doesn’t.

Section 6: Interim Conclusions and Recommendations – drawing together the analysis in order to arrive at both conclusions about the EAF programme in Year and key actions required moving forward into Year 2.

A series of supplementary Appendices includes:

- Discussion guide
- Electronic survey results
2  EAF 2005-8: Projects, Organisations and Programme

This section sets the scene for the report by providing an overview of EAF 2005-8 - in terms of the EAF organisations, projects and their views of the EAF programme as a whole. It specifically explores the diversity of the programme, which in many respects is a defining feature, and looks at issues such as size, scale, reach and capabilities. Subsequent sections of the report then pick up and explore the issues in greater depth. The section is presented under the following three headings:

- The EAF organisations (2.1);
- The EAF projects (2.2); and
- Projects’ views of the EAF programme (2.3).

2.1 The EAF Organisations

The recipient organisations of EAF are diverse and vary widely across a range of features. Firstly, organisations vary in terms of their size, ranging from large ‘corporates’ stationed in bespoke offices employing hundreds of staff (e.g. WWF, National Trust, The Soil Association) to small groups of individuals operating out of small or shared premises (e.g. Cornwall Sustainable Building Trust, Envision, Somerset Trust for Sustainable Development). Indeed, the electronic survey (Figure 1) reveals that the number of permanent employees across the organisations varies from less than three (in 6 cases, or 14%) to more than 50 (in 8 cases, or 23%).

**Figure 1: Size of Organisations**

There is also considerable diversity in the nature and function of the organisations, which ranges from providers of social housing (e.g. Devon & Cornwall Housing Association), to Wildlife Trusts (e.g. Wiltshire Wildlife Trust), National representative bodies (e.g. National Federation of Women’s Institutes) and registered charities (e.g. Soil Association), among others.
Accordingly, there is likewise considerable diversity in funding sources and financial models – some projects rely predominantly on grants such as EAF (e.g. Blooming Futures) while other receive numerous funds from a variety of established public or corporate sources (e.g. National Energy Action, Marine Stewardship Council); whereas a different model entirely clearly applies to organisations such as WWF and National Trust.

The review, over the course of the three years, will explore the role of the voluntary and community sector in delivering SCP objectives amongst other statutory and non-statutory local delivery agents. As an overarching comment at the end of Year 1, the review indicates that the sector indeed exhibits key strengths in its dynamism, innovation and ability to target those areas/issues which are either yet to be mainstreamed by statutory agencies or those which fall ‘between the cracks’ in existing delivery. Nonetheless, the organisations face challenges in terms of their capacity and their relationship/compatibility with their statutory counterparts.

2.2 EAF Projects

The diversity in organisations is reflected in the projects themselves. This is most notable in terms of the following (which are picked up in more detail in Section 3):

- **Issue** – taken together the projects provide wide coverage across the spectrum of SCP issues: some focus on food (e.g. Soil Association, Sustain), others on construction (e.g. BioRegional) and others on waste (e.g. Green Alliance). Furthermore, it is evident that some projects have a strong single-issue focus (e.g. Carplus Trust on transport) whereas others have a thematic approach to consumption (e.g. Global Action Plan, Action for Sustainable Living) which encapsulates elements of waste, energy use and consumerism, for example.

- **Approach** – whether consciously or not, the projects are testing a range of approaches to behaviour change. While raising awareness and knowledge remain tenets for the majority of projects, accompanying approaches include the promotion of tangible benefits (e.g. Sponge’s attempt to make the ‘business case’ to property developers); enabling change (e.g. StudentForce providing energy saving light bulbs); and exemplifying leadership (e.g. The National Trust’s showcase of SCP on its flagship estates). Moreover, and although the focus of fewer projects, the development of participant skills (e.g. Cornwall Sustainable Building Trust’s training in sustainable construction) and ‘choice editing’ (e.g. the Marine Stewardship Council’s work re school meals) are also very interesting tools.

- **Target audience** – the vast majority of groups have a focus on the public, but it is evident the point of engagement varies between people in their home (e.g. Global Action Plan), as consumers (e.g. Forest Stewardship Council), as part of a local community group/social network (e.g. WWF), as visitors (e.g. Youth Hostels Association) or as a member of an organisation of a group (e.g. National Federation of Women’s Institutes). Other projects target individual businesses or business sectors (e.g. BioRegional, Sponge) or their own workforce (e.g. National Trust). Many use intermediaries – whether professionals, volunteers or local community champions - to target their audiences.

Some EAF projects have a very clearly defined audience (e.g. Envision, exclusively focus on 16-19 year olds), some aim to engage several different groups (e.g. Eden Local Agenda 21 target households, local community groups and local authorities), while others have adopted a ‘whole chain’ approach (e.g. Marine Stewardship Council engage with stakeholders throughout the food ‘chain’ from manufacturers and processors through to end consumers in schools and restaurants).
• **Socio-demographics** – among those projects focusing on the public there is a notable diversity in audiences, whether according to age (e.g. Envision with teenagers), faith (e.g. London Sustainability Exchange) or ethnicity (e.g. Community Service Volunteers). Sometimes the targeting is on the basis of sport and recreation (e.g. Royal Yachting Association).

• **Geographic focus** – the electronic survey (Figure 2) demonstrates how some of the projects are working at a very local spatial scale i.e. in a town/village or the local district (9 cases, or 26%), in contrast to others who are working regionally (9 cases, or 26%) or nationally (17 cases, or 49%).

**Figure 2: Geographic Focus of the EAF Projects**

This diversity presents the programme with both opportunities and with challenges. On the one hand, the range of projects is such that it will be in a position to test many different behaviour change approaches, across different SCP issues, and with many different audiences. As such, it is an innovative “test bed” of ideas and approaches to which others will undoubtedly look to and learn from over the 3 years. It is also well placed to contribute to learning against both the 4 E’s of the Sustainable Development strategy and the 4 priority areas – homes, food, transport and tourism – identified by the Sustainable Consumption Roundtable.\(^5\)

This notwithstanding, however, the diversity of the projects does hinder the ability to make comparisons across the programme and establish, for example, in which circumstances a particular approach works and where it doesn’t. There is little opportunity, for example, in trying to compare the impact of, say, the Green Alliance project (looking at waste reduction/‘closing the loop’ at the policy level) with a deep engagement project like GAP’s EcoTeams. They are working to different spatial scales, target audiences and objectives.

---

\(^5\) *I will if you will*, Sustainable Consumption Roundtable 2006
Nonetheless, the review does need to have an element of comparison if it is to assess which approaches work more or less effectively than others. Therefore, as part of the early work we began to develop a ‘project typology’ by which to classify projects. This comprises four categories as follows and outlined in Figure 3:

- Those projects where there is **direct engagement with individuals/households**, for example through household visits, working with local groups, or holding events;
- Those projects where there is **indirect engagement with individuals/households**, via “intermediaries” such as midwives, charity shops or local community champions. The end target remains the wider public, but the engagement is conducted through these individuals;
- Those projects where there is **engagement with stakeholders other than the public**, for example local businesses, manufacturers, procurement officials and so on; and
- Those projects where the goal is a **broader change in policy frameworks and the current “landscape”**, for example work to influence policy makers.

**Figure 3: Project Typology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individuals/households</th>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Wider Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indirect</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action for sustainable living</td>
<td>Association of Charity Shops</td>
<td>BioRegional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSV</td>
<td>BabyGROE</td>
<td>Forest Stewardship Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon &amp; Cornwall Housing Assoc</td>
<td>Carplus Trust</td>
<td>Green Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden Local Agenda 21</td>
<td>Conservation Foundation</td>
<td>Sponge Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Action Plan</td>
<td>LSX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFWI</td>
<td>National Energy Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Trust</td>
<td>WWT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Child</td>
<td>WWT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PECT</td>
<td>Envision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Yachting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset Trust for Sustainable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Hostels Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such a typology is subject to a degree of overlap between the categories as some projects fall into more than one category and may have aspects of direct and indirect engagement (e.g. Soil Association), or engagement with both the public and local businesses (e.g. Eden LA21). The boundary between direct and indirect engagement of households is particularly porous and, in such circumstances, we have made a value judgement as to which is the main focus. Nonetheless, it provides a useful conceptual framework for the review and for understanding where it is possible to make comparisons across different projects and where it is not.
2.3 Projects’ Views of the EAF programme

The review has established that most projects have had a positive experience of EAF in Year 1. There is widespread praise for the Defra team as being approachable and helpful, and many projects value the fairly ‘light touch’ approach that Defra has taken with them and their willingness to allow innovation, experimentation and change.

This is reflected in strong ratings in the electronic survey (Figure 4) for advice given during the project (29 projects, or 83%, rate this as either ‘good’ or ‘very good’), and similarly for latitude to experiment (28 projects, or 79% consider this ‘good’). The programme is also rated highly - by around two thirds of the projects - in terms of hands-on support and guidance on key issues and advice at the beginning of the project. The only aspect not rated highly is the opportunities for networking. Only 13 (37%) projects consider this to have been ‘good’ in Year 1.

Figure 4: Experience of EAF in Year 1

Q. Based on your own experience of the EAF process in this round (2005-8) how good or poor have you found the following...?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Fairly good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advice and information during the project</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility for you to innovate/experiment</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands-on support and guidance on key issues</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice and information at the beginning of the project</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reporting process</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The application process</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of what you are being asked to report on</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for networking</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In terms of how the EAF compares to other funding streams and grants, around three quarters of projects feel EAF “compares favourably” (25% ‘very favourably’ and a further 47% ‘quite favourably’). By contrast, five projects (16%) rate EAF “about the same” as other grants, while four (12%) consider that it compares unfavourably.
3 Behaviour change

The extent to which the projects influence and change behaviour is the “mission critical” objective for EAF. This section, with a view to setting the scene for Years 2 and 3, establishes six core aspects of projects’ behaviour change work as follows:

- The different SCP issues (3.1);
- The different audiences (3.2);
- The different approaches (3.3);
- The different models of engagement (3.4);
- Emerging successes in Year 1 (3.5); and
- Emerging barriers (3.6)

3.1 The Different SCP Issues

As we have already touched upon in Section 2, the EAF projects are, collectively as a programme, covering a wide range of SCP issues. Eight core theme areas have emerged through the course of the Year 1 review, as follows:

- **Consumer goods (e.g. food, household goods)** – these projects are trying to influence the purchasing decisions of consumers with the aim of either reducing consumption or shifting it in favour of more sustainable alternatives. For example, The Soil Association are seeking to increase the appeal of organic products across a wider cross section of consumers, while Somerset Trust for Sustainable development are attempting to establish local “consumer clubs” that collectively take part in purchasing local vegetable box schemes, green energy tariffs or sustainable products. Food is a key issue for many of the projects, including Common Ground, Sustain and – in terms of growing food locally – Community Service Volunteers.

- **Resource use (e.g. energy, water)** – These projects aim to reduce either waste or energy consumption. Examples include Wiltshire Wildlife Trust who, as part of their “Climate Friendly Communities” project, are encouraging reductions in energy use; National Energy Action, who are installing “smart” electricity meters in the home; National Trust who are conserving water on their estates and encouraging visitors to do likewise, and Devon and Cornwall Housing Association who are seeking to improve the energy performance of its housing stock. Other projects also have a more indirect impact on energy, for example BioRegional by advocating one construction product over another because of its inherent energy saving properties.

- **Transport** – There are several projects tackling transport, although there are some interesting differences between them. For example, Carplus Trust is working to establish car clubs in York in order to reduce private car journeys; Blooming Futures is focusing on reducing the impact of haulage companies by converting diesel engines to run from bio-fuel; while Wiltshire Wildlife Trust is seeking to bring about a shift from private to public transport. In spite of such nuances between projects, the focus is largely on road transport and few are looking in any level of detail at issues such as aviation.

- **Waste & recycling** – With the exception of one or two projects, water and recycling are not treated as standalone issue, but rather as integral aspects of wider lifestyle projects. So, for example, a range of projects – including Global Action Plan, Action for Sustainable Living and Peterborough Environment City Trust – incorporate waste and recycling as a core ‘lifestyle module’ in their work. Significantly, these often address both recycling and reduction. Some projects do have a more explicit focus on waste, including the Association of Charity Shops in terms of reuse and – from the policy perspective on waste reduction – Green Alliance.
• **Lifestyles in general** – many projects are seeking to develop “sustainable lifestyles” among their target audiences, providing advice ranging from ethical finance to responsible tourism. This includes Action for Sustainable Living who provide “lifestyle advice” as part of their home visits and events, and Westden who are looking to develop a “green village” which would embody the principles of sustainability in its entirety rather than for a specific issue.

• **Construction/building/design** – several projects are focusing on construction and design, either to equip local residents with innovative (fitting solar panels) and traditional (‘wattle and daub’) building skills (e.g. Cornwall Sustainable Building Trust) or to ‘make the case’ to property developers (e.g. Sponge).

• **Neighbourhood/street issues (e.g. litter, vandalism, parks)** – Projects embracing this agenda are tackling very localised impacts, sometimes resulting from consumption (e.g. litter) but also encouraging community engagement in order to preserve local green spaces. For example, Community Service Volunteers run a ‘street champions’ programme combating environmental crime, while part of the Envision programme in schools encourages local action to improve the quality of the immediate environment. There are strong linkages here to the ‘cleaner, safer, greener’ agenda.

• **Biodiversity & conservation** – These issues are generally not covered in depth by the projects (partly because this was addressed by the previous round of EAF), although several do address them in varying detail. For example, Studentforce covers biodiversity and local heritage through its ‘local checks’ project, while the National Trust also touch upon these issues through several of its schemes with its own estates and with its members.

The electronic survey provides an indication of the spread of projects across each of these eight themes (Figure 5). It demonstrates that as many as four in five projects (80%) say they are addressing the consumption of goods such as food and household products, while close to three quarters (74%) say they are looking at resource use. Other ‘big’ areas include waste and recycling (66%) and, reflecting the thematic nature of many projects, the same proportion (66%) say they are focusing on lifestyles in general. Fewer projects focus on biodiversity and conservation (37%) or neighbourhood/street issues (20%)\(^6\).

---

\(^6\) As highlighted in Section 1.3, the percentages do not add to 100% because multiple responses were allowed given projects are often focusing on more than 1 issue
In keeping with the EAF criteria for this round, projects tend not to be 'single issue' but rather have a broader, thematic approach based upon the 'sustainable lifestyle'.

"We are attempting to reduce CO2 emissions by 20% through waste minimisation and recycling, transport, energy efficiency and local food”

A key question for many groups is whether or not they can achieve systematic change across lifestyles, or whether certain behaviours will be easier to shift than others. Several projects have initially adopted a narrower approach on one or two issues in the hope that this will catalyse change in other areas in subsequent years.

### 3.2 Different Audiences

The projects are engaging a diverse range of audiences. Some of these are common across the EAF programme, while others are the focus of only a few projects. Taking the most common audiences first, the review identifies the following:

- **The general public** – the vast majority of projects have some focus on the public. However, as we have already noted in Section 2, the point and nature of the engagement varies considerably. The following models of engagement are evident:

  - **As households** – a number of projects are explicitly targeting the public in their homes (e.g. through home visits) or are providing advice in relation to the house as a unit of consumption. For example, Peterborough Environment City Trust is focusing on those people who have recently moved in to their houses, while National Energy Action’s project relates specifically to household energy use.

  - **As consumers** – other projects are targeting the public in their capacity of consumers of ‘stuff’. So, for example, the Soil Association is working to broaden the appeal of organic products, while the Association of Charity Shops is working to re-brand the culture of reuse within the charity shop setting.
As part of a group – several projects have a focus on engaging members of the public not as individuals but as part of a defined group. WWF, for example, are engaging three local groups including the parish council, a schools group and a church group. Similarly, the Conservation Foundation’s EcoCongregation project engages the public as part of their religious networks.

As visitors - this category applies to those projects who engage with individuals outside the confines of their home, for example the Youth Hostels Association who are aiming to influence visitors, and likewise the National Trust.

It is worth noting that even within these categories there is also a range of sub groups worthy of attention. Indeed, at face value the EAF programme has impressive coverage across most groups. Based on the electronic survey, for example:

- 13 projects (43%) are specifically focusing on children and young people, while 11 (37%) are targeting older people;
- 12 projects (40%) say they are targeting disadvantaged groups compared to 9 (30%) who identify affluent groups; and
- Eight projects (27%) have a focus on BAME communities.

However, the number of project who answered “other” (14 projects) is instructive, since most say they are targeting the public “in general”. This does raise an issue about the projects’ understanding of their audience and extent to which some EAF projects are segmenting their audience and focusing their efforts. The Community Based Social Marketing literature suggests that this is a crucial element in delivering successful outcomes and, in our judgement, some groups appear to have done little in this respect.

Of those who have, the Soil Association is targeting certain groups (such as ‘mother and baby’) and, in more general terms, ‘light green’ consumers to try to establish organic purchasing as a mainstream activity. However, even here there is little sophistication in terms of who these ‘light green’ consumers are, where they are and how they can be reached.

Individual businesses and trade groups – a number of projects are seeking to engage with the business sector. In some instances this is about market/product development, for example Blooming Futures work to develop the market for biofuels, the Sponge Network’s work to make the business case to property developers, or the Forest Stewardship Council’s work to promote the FSA label. In other cases it is about improving the environmental performance of individual businesses, for example StudentForce’s eco-check programme or Sustain’s programme with BAME food manufacturers and restaurants.

In addition to these audiences, we noted other audiences which are being targeted by a smaller number of EAF projects. These are as follows:

- Staff within the organisation – only few projects are focusing on staff or (where applicable) volunteer behaviour, although notable exceptions include the Youth Hostel Association and National Energy Action, where most employees/managers complete training on sustainability issues. Furthermore, The National Trust has undertaken a significant amount of work in Year 1 engaging with estates managers and its own workforce to bring about change. This category appears to relate more to larger organisations in receipt of EAF, which may say something about organisational capacity (an issue we return to in Section 4).
- **Local authorities** – while most projects are working with or close to local authorities, in reality only few are directly seeking to influence their behaviour. Among those who are, the Marine Stewardship Council are engaging procurement officials in order to influence school meals, while the StudentForce building checks could apply equally to local authority’s estates as to local businesses.

- **Policy makers** – as we have already noted in Section 2, a few EAF projects are less concerned with engaging the public or specific business sectors, and more concerned with the wider policy domain for SCP. The objective is not behaviour change among individuals but a change in the political or policy landscape that will then provide the infrastructure to deliver behaviour change among the public or businesses. For example, Green Alliance is seeking to influence policy on ‘closing the resource loop’.

- **“Intermediaries”** (e.g. midwives, school teachers) – this group is not strictly an end target audience since their function is a means of engaging the public (e.g. school teachers a way of engaging with children). Nonetheless, several EAF projects argued that they first need to change the behaviour and attitudes of the intermediary in order that they can then go on to change the behaviour of the public. More commentary on the role of intermediaries in relation to behaviour change is provided in Section 3.3.

The electronic survey in Figure 6 provides some indication of the relative focus given to each audience (although we note that the distinction between audience, intermediary and partner appears confused, requiring some caution in interpreting the findings). By some margin, the largest audience is individuals/consumers (26 cases, or 74%), followed by local community groups (21 cases, or 60%), voluntary organisations (19 cases, or 54%) and households (18 cases, or 51%). Local authorities and businesses are also key audiences - 49% and 40% respectively (although we remain unconvinced by the former who appear to function as partners/recipients of the work rather than a specific target of behaviour change).

**Figure 6: Target Audiences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals/Consumers</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community groups/workers</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other voluntary organisations NGO's</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authorities</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Businesses</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy makers</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Sector professionals (e.g. teachers/midwives)</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business decision-makers/ influencers</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff within your own organisation</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith leaders</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade federations</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just as with the target SCP issues, so it is the case that some of the EAF projects have a specific focus on one or just a few audiences, whereas others have multiple audiences. For example, the Envision project is exclusively focused on 16-19 year olds, in contrast to the Marine Stewardship Council who have adopted a “whole chain” approach which includes food manufacturers’ right through to procurement officials and, ultimately, restaurant chains and schools (itself including teachers, children and parents).

Combining how many SCP issues each project is focusing on with the number of audiences it has targeted, it is possible to develop a typology that shows the degree of specificity of each project (Figure 7). This shows, for example, that there are 6 projects in the top left quadrant which have a very specific focus, in contrast to the 3 projects in the lower right quadrant that have a wider reach.

Figure 7: EAF Project Specificity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of SCP areas</th>
<th>0 - 3</th>
<th>4 - 5</th>
<th>6 +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of target audiences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 3</td>
<td>Association of Charity Shops Federation of City Farms and Gardens Sponge BioRegional Envision Environmental Association of Universities and Colleges</td>
<td>National Federation of Women’s Institutes Royal Yachting Association Action for Sustainable Living</td>
<td>Devon &amp; Cornwall Housing Association WWF Youth Hostel Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>National Energy Action Sustain Soil Association Carplus</td>
<td>Forest Stewardship Council The National Trust Peace Child StudentForce for Sustainability Community Service Volunteers Green Alliance</td>
<td>Peterborough Environment City Trust Somerset Trust for Sustainable Development Westden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3 Approaches to Behaviour Change

This section explores the approaches and techniques being used by the projects. It starts by considering the underlying rationale behind the approaches and how they were selected, and then moves on to the specific techniques being tested and trialled.

**The Underlying Rationale behind the Approaches**

From the discussions with projects it is clear that some projects are testing an existing approach on a wider scale or with different audiences, while others are trialling a new approach for their organisation. On a more worrying note, some projects conceded that EAF is allowing them to fund certain ‘core’ aspects of their work or for non-qualifying activities.

Very few cited behaviour change theory as an influencing factor in deciding upon their approach. Of the exceptions, Studentforce have drawn on social marketing, WWF are testing learning theories and Envision have developed a bespoke model that encapsulates their own approach. These findings are substantiated by the electronic survey (Figure 8) which found that:
Almost half (17 cases, or 49%) of the projects say their project is building on approaches and methods used by the organisation in previous projects (the most common response by some margin);

Eight projects (23%) say they are developing and testing completely new/novel approaches to behaviour change;

In contrast, only four projects (11%) say they are explicitly seeking to specifically test elements of the 4E’s framework in the UK Sustainable Development Strategy, while a further two cite the behaviour change literature more generally;

Perhaps more surprisingly, only four (11%) say they are testing approaches which have been developed by others, which may say something about information transfer and attempts to replicate different approaches.

Figure 8: Behaviour Change Approaches

The underutilisation of the behaviour change literature in project design can partly be attributed to a gap in organisational capacity and knowledge (a further discussion on this issue can be found in Section 4). Indeed, while virtually all projects (95%) say they have either a ‘significant’ or ‘fair amount’ of knowledge concerning the sustainable agenda in general, the same is true of only 15 projects (46%) in terms of behaviour change theory and 12 projects (34%) in terms of behaviour change good practice.

Furthermore, when directly asked about their knowledge of the literature produced by Defra and others (Figure 9), only six projects (17%) say they feel ‘very well informed’, while eight (23%) feel ‘fairly well’ informed. In contrast, almost half (46%) say they are ‘a little informed’ while five projects concede they are ‘not well informed’.

Q. Thinking about the model of behaviour change your project is using, which one of the following best characterises your approach?

- Building on approaches and methods used by your own organisation in previous projects: 49%
- Developing and testing completely new/novel approaches and methods to deliver behaviour change: 23%
- Seeking to test specifically elements of the "Enable, Encourage, Engage, Exemplify" framework from the UK Sustainable development Strategy: 11%
- Applying/replicating approaches and methods which have been tested by others: 11%
- Testing approaches and methods developed from theoretical research on behaviour change: 6%

However, this does not reflect a lack of interest. Indeed, in the electronic survey over half of the projects (54%) say they would be ‘very interested’ to find out more, and a further 40% ‘quite interested’. Only 2 projects say they are ‘not very/at all interested’. This was also reflected in the discussions with the projects, where projects often took down websites or names of publications as they were mentioned in conversation. However, time and capacity constraints inevitably play a role, with many projects unable to sift through the documentation or attend (often London-based) conferences.

Furthermore, there was a strong demand for someone to perform a “translation role” that bridges the gap between theory and general practice on the one hand, with project relevant material for them on the other.

“*We would really welcome things like the [October] workshop, if you could convert some of that research into user friendly tips. Otherwise, it takes time to absorb a paper and then have to decide what it means for your daily work*”.

**Specific Approaches**

Even with the apparent underutilisation of the behaviour change literature, the Year 1 review established that projects are using a range of approaches. The review identified seven core activities, which are now discussed in turn and outlined in Figure 10:

- **Increase awareness/knowledge** - raising awareness and personal agency remain important tenets for the vast majority of EAF projects. Many projects see this as a pre-requisite for behaviour change. Awareness raising is taking several forms, including events (e.g. SCP-themed sermons as part of the Conservation Foundation’s eco-congregation programme); demonstration projects (e.g. Eden LA21); leaflets and flyers (almost all projects have materials); websites (e.g. Soil Association); point of use signage (e.g. art-based reminders/instructions for water conservation at National Trust estates); and ‘hard’ information on energy usage as part of a ‘home audit’ (e.g. National Energy Action, Studentforce).
Notwithstanding its importance as a means of generating interest, one of the core objectives of EAF is to go beyond raising awareness (in recognition of the now well documented ‘attitude-behaviour gap’). While many projects appear to have heeded this to an extent, there are still some instances, in our judgement, where the belief that attitudes will lead straightforwardly into behaviour change continues to prevail. For example, some projects still believe that simply by having a website people will use it, and that website hits is in itself a demonstration of success.

- **Develop participant skills** – providing people, either in the home or in their profession, with the skills and capacity to put SCP into practice is a key element of the behaviour change literature and a feature of some EAF projects. For example, Cornwall Sustainable Building Trust provides members of the public with training in sustainable construction, whereas part of the WWF programme is based on ‘softer’ and transferable skills around leadership and facilitation. Nonetheless, this is an area where there is notably less coverage across the EAF programme.

- **Promote tangible benefits** – many of the EAF projects appear to be striving to promote personal or professional benefits to their target audience, shifting the messages away from those of responsibility and obligation towards benefits in terms of, variously, health, money, time, leisure/enjoyment and pleasure. For example, Peterborough Environment City Trust emphasise personal home cost savings, Westden the benefits of local food to the local economy/area, Devon & Cornwall Housing Association focus on providing ‘better’ homes and, from the perspective of business, the Sponge project is explicitly building the ‘business case’ for developers to build more sustainable buildings.

- **Enabling activities** - some projects are providing tools to facilitate the transition to sustainable lifestyles, e.g. providing energy saving light bulbs (e.g. Studentforce) and wormeries (e.g. Eden Local Agenda 21). Of concern, we did detect an assumption among some groups that simply by handing out energy efficient light bulbs that households will both use and replace them. A further enabling function provided by many EAF projects is signposting participants to other sources of information or grants (e.g. Wiltshire Wildlife Trust) and, going further, brokerage - the Environmental Association of Universities and Colleges, for example, link procurement individuals with sustainable suppliers.

- **Exemplify** – many groups have at least some elements of exemplification in their approach in terms of ‘practising what they preach’. However, relatively few are focusing on this as a core aspect of their approach. Of those who are, Devon & Cornwall Housing Association has pledged to change staff attitudes (e.g. advertising car sharing) and the Youth Hostel Association has held training sessions for hostel managers. Furthermore, several projects have specifically developed demonstration aspects to their programme, for example the National Trust are showcasing SCP in practice at its flagship estates.

- **Community engagement** – perhaps unsurprisingly given many projects’ expertise in this area, community engagement is a strong feature of the EAF programme (which we discuss in more detail in Section 3.4). Several projects are bringing together groups – whether existing or ‘new’ – to encourage collective action and add an element of peer group change/competition (e.g. GAP’s EcoTeams, and Wiltshire Wildlife Trust’s Climate Friendly Communities programme). Other projects are using community ‘champions’ as intermediaries to engage the wider public (e.g. Community Service Volunteers), while in a few instances projects are piloting a self-learning process (e.g. WWF is working with three community groups to construct an environment in which the public can meet and share information about sustainability issues, but without guidance or direction from WWF).
In some cases there is “deep engagement” with prolonged and repeated engagement over time, although these projects are in a minority and “light touch” engagement is the norm.

- **Choice “editing”** – some projects, or perhaps more accurately some aspects within projects, are focused on editing the choices that people have. For example, BioRegional and Marine Stewardship Council only provide sustainable products (construction materials to builders and fish to schools respectively). In such instances behaviour is not guided by informed choice but rather is ‘designed in’ to the system so there is simply no choice to be unsustainable. This raises questions about whether the public need to be informed about why a change is taking place or not.

Figure 10 captures each of these approaches and outlines the coverage by project and the EAF programme as a whole.
**Figure 10**

Q Which of the following, if any, would you say are core aspects of your project’s approach?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Increase awareness/ knowledge</th>
<th>Develop participant skills</th>
<th>Tangible benefit</th>
<th>Enabling activities</th>
<th>Exemplify</th>
<th>Community action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action for Sustainable Living Limited</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Charity Shops</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BabyGro</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BioRegional</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blooming Futures</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carplus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Ground</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall Sustainable Building Trust</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSV Environment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon &amp; Cornwall Housing Association</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Association for Universities and Colleges</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden Local Agenda 21</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envision</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federation of City Farms and Community Gardens</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSC UK</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Action Plan</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Alliance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Sustainability Exchange</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Stewardship Council</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Energy Action</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Federation of Women’s Institutes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Child International</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough Environment City Trust</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Association</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset Trust for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponge Sustainability Network Ltd</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StudentForce for Sustainability</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Conservation Foundation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Marine Federation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National Trust</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltshire Wildlife Trust</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF-UK</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Hostels Association</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Approaches to Engagement

This section focuses on approaches to engagement with communities, other stakeholders and, specifically, the use of intermediaries. It concludes with a review of progress in Year 1.

Community engagement

As we have already noted, engagement with communities and the public is a strong feature of the EAF programme and many of the groups in receipt of EAF funds are experts in this regard. Indeed, the ability to know, understand and engage the community is one of the defining features of the community and voluntary sector. There are three main approaches adopted by EAF projects:

- **Using an existing membership** – A few projects are working specifically with their memberships (e.g. the Women’s Institute, National Trust), using their influence as a trusted brand and capitalising on their access to a large, established and receptive audience. For example, the National Trust’s membership comprises 300 properties, 350 holiday cottages, 4,500 staff, 40,000 volunteers and 3.5 million members. Furthermore, these projects are capitalising on a ‘grassroots’ demand from its membership to take action on SCP issues. For example, issues around the dominance of supermarkets, environmental degradation and the erosion of community emerged from research by the Women’s Institute with its members.

- **Using existing communities** – this is the most common model of engagement among EAF projects – accounting for 16 projects in the electronic survey - and spans communities of location (e.g. streets or neighbourhoods) and communities of interest (e.g. faith groups). For example, Eden Local Agenda 21 has already made progress - one community in Grasmere has focused its attention on dealing with an invasion of Japanese Knotweed, while a street in Penrith is actively monitoring its carbon footprint and taken action on co-ordinated school runs.

- **Creating ‘new’ communities** – the electronic survey demonstrates that 10 EAF projects are working to establish a ‘new’ community group based around SCP issues. For example, GAP EcoTeam facilitators enrol individuals/households into teams to focus on specific issues around waste, transport, shopping and energy. Similarly, the Carplus project again involves bringing together groups of households in a particular location to organise collective travel alternatives to single car use.

As an overarching comment, several of the EAF projects are aiming to go beyond the ‘usual suspects’ and engage a broader base of the public on SCP issues. For example, The GAP programme which engages a range of communities suggests there is considerable value in engaging beyond ‘dark greens’. Anecdotally, the results from eco-teams with light green households were delivering better results than those with dark green consumers, given these individuals have already adopted sustainable lifestyles and so it is difficult to push them still further. This remains a key issue for further exploration in Years 2 and 3.

Furthermore, the success of several projects will be predicated not on their ability to change the behaviour of ‘already committed’ but whether this behaviour change is then transferred more widely in the community (e.g. Wiltshire Wildlife Trust, WestDen). “Viral diffusion” of sustainable behaviours from a few key individuals throughout the community is a very interesting and important approach but one that is extremely difficult to measure.
Stakeholder Engagement

Several of the projects have a focus on different “targets of change”, whether procurement officials (e.g. Environmental Association of Schools and Colleges) or restaurant owners (e.g. Sustain). Some projects in fact have a focus on multiple points in the supply chain – the Forest Stewardship Council, for example, is focusing on producers (forests), manufacturers and retailers (paper mills and timber merchants), and end consumers. Likewise, Blooming Futures is focusing on farmers (to grow rape seed crop), haulage firms to convert from diesel petrol to bio-fuels, and haulage customers.

The approach is an interesting contrast to the community engagement model and often involves more intense engagement with a smaller group of individuals. The underlying principle is that, rather than focusing on everyone, targeting a few key individuals can “unlock” blockages in the supply chain and bring about widespread change. Year 1 has already seen some success in this regard, with the Marine Stewardship Council successfully engaging with the procurement officials in charge of school meals contracts in Surrey. The impact of this has been an increase from the planned pilot with two schools to all schools in the county.

While the potential benefits are great, such an approach depends on knowledge of the key decision makers who can influence change. This can require a considerable amount of effort and background research. For example, the Sponge project has spent much of its initial work researching its audience in order to identify key individuals within the property development sector.

“Intermediaries”

We have already noted that several projects are engaging individuals – either members of the public or other stakeholders – to act as “intermediaries” who subsequently engage with a wider audience. The following types of intermediary are evident:

- **Professionals** – several projects are using professionals because of their direct access to the public and their standing as trusted and respected sources of information. This includes midwives (e.g. BabyGROE) and teachers (e.g. Peacechild). However, time can often be a major impediment, as can the professionals themselves if they do not agree with the project’s aims. Peacechild has reported that finding the ‘right’ teachers who are amenable and supportive of its aims is the most decisive factor in the organisation getting ‘its foot in the door’ of a new school. BabyGROE has in fact been forced to employ representatives instead of midwives, who were unwilling to take on the additional burden of promoting reusable nappies without additional resources.

- **Community champions recruited from the local community** - this type of technique is predicated on the assumption that community champions have a better understanding of the community, are more trusted and will embed change within the community beyond the end of the project. In some cases the champions already have a formal role within the community and are clearly seen as community leaders. For example, the Conservation Foundation is supporting the clergy to spread SCP messages, while London Sustainability Exchange is accessing Muslim residents through local faith and community leaders. In other cases the champions may be drawn from local residents in general, for example Community Service Volunteers is promoting “active citizenship” through its ‘street champions’ and ‘concrete to coriander’ projects.
• **Volunteers** – closely linked to the model of community champions, several projects are deploying volunteers to influence behaviour change among a wider audience. In some cases the volunteers are part of a corporate commitment (e.g. volunteers for the Envision programme) whereas in other cases they are volunteering as individuals on their own time (e.g. Action for Sustainable Living). The impact of volunteers can be very positive, and in particular can increase an organisation’s impact and reach (and supplement resources – see Section 4).

We note that the boundary between “community champions” on the one hand, and “volunteers” on the other is porous and the two terms are, at times, used interchangeably to mean the same thing (e.g. a volunteer could be called a community champion, and vice versa).

**Progress in Year 1**

Projects report few difficulties engaging their target audiences (Figure 11). Four projects (12%) say this was ‘very’ easy, while a further 21 (62%) found it ‘fairly easy’. In contrast, eight projects (24%) say it was ‘fairly difficult’ and one project ‘very difficult’.

**Figure 11: Reaching Target Audiences**

```
Q. How easy or difficult, in general, would you say it has been in Year 1 to reach your target audiences. Would you say it was….?

  Very Easy, 12%
  Fairly Easy, 62%
  Fairly Difficult, 24%
  Very Difficult, 3%

```

However, the discussions with project managers add some important riders to this headline finding from the electronic survey. For example, while several projects note that reaching their audience on a one-off “light touch” basis was easy, securing longer term and ‘deeper’ engagement – one of the core objectives of this EAF round - is much more difficult. Likewise, while people are comfortable participating in a group it is much more difficult to identify those willing to champion or lead the group:

"We’ve found that although people are willing to become involved in local groups, not many are willing to put themselves forward as group organisers. The challenge of finding enthusiastic and effectual people with enough time on their hands, willing to make a voluntary commitment is a huge one which the whole the NGO sector faces“
“The time and responsibility required by local communities to participate regularly is a barrier”

“We are trying to catch up with the consumer clubs because progress there has been slower than expected. Events are no problem and we have 300 people turn up, so there is no problem getting people interested”

“It has been relatively easy to target the committed, but much more difficult to engage with those who are not”

Establishing ‘new’ groups can be more difficult to form because there is no pre-existing social infrastructure to tap into, and so a key challenge is finding willing participants and building their capacity to act as a group. One project manager made the comment that “the British don’t do communities”.

Furthermore, an obstacle may be where existing communities are not as cohesive as originally thought, which has been a barrier for Eden Local Agenda 21 with some of its groups. Additionally, WWF are finding that new relationships between itself and existing community groups can take more time than anticipated to establish.

Turning to progress with intermediaries, the electronic survey paints a similar story to that with target audiences (Figure 12). The majority (71%) say it has been ‘fairly easy’ to engage their intermediaries, with a further two projects (7%) say it was ‘very easy’. In contrast, seven projects (21%) found it ‘fairly difficult’.

**Figure 12: Engaging with Intermediaries**

Q. How easy or difficult would you say it has been in year 1 to engage these intermediaries?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easy</th>
<th>Difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The discussions with projects identified some important lessons from Year 1 concerning the community champions model that are not immediately apparent from the electronic survey alone. For example, community champions can be difficult to identify and then to recruit.
“Professionals are under time pressures, have other priorities, and don’t always see the relevance to them”

“There is a barrier in terms of working ‘extra’ curricular components into schools who are overburdened anyway”

“It has been relatively easy in Year 1 as we have strong existing networks in our current areas of work. We expect this to be more difficult in new areas”

In certain instances, community champions can also have adverse impacts - for example, Eden Local Agenda 21 reports that one of its community groups has been hindered by a few individuals who are being overly bureaucratic and unapproachable. Furthermore, there are issues about the ability of intermediaries to deliver SCP messages:

“If you are using community champions as a conduit to spreading the sustainability message, be very careful to assess their ability to communicate the message. They may exemplify sustainability in their own life, but can be very poor at grasping how to engage others”

“A barrier to using intermediaries is their own limited understanding, confidence and/or enthusiasm”

Indeed, several projects noted that volunteers need to be trained and coached (which can put a strain on resources and an organisation’s capacity to provide training) otherwise there is a risk they will be ill equipped to deliver messages effectively.

3.5 Successes in Year 1

The purpose of this section is to summarise some of the key successes to date in Year 1. Taking successes at the level of individual projects first, Figure 13 sets out a summary of key successes in Year 1 (drawing on projects’ individual quarterly returns and annual reports).

---

7 This is subject to several caveats - for example, many projects are only now starting their work programmes having spent Year 1 developing their approaches and materials and so successes may be preliminary (or simply not yet apparent). Furthermore, they are successes as seen by projects themselves - in Year 1 we have not yet undertaken work with participants which will provide an important part of the ‘triangulation’ of perspectives that will enable us to establish project successes.
### Figure 13: Summary of Key Success in Year 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Key Year 1 actions and successes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action for Sustainable Living</strong></td>
<td>Engagement in four localities, mix of home visits alongside engagement outside of the home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Association of Charity Shops</strong></td>
<td>500 outlets out of 700 have enrolled in the Choose2Reuse campaign; reuse champions have been recruited and 15,000 hours of engagement work logged; media coverage and liaison with Cambridgeshire County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BabyGROE</strong></td>
<td>Sales target for reusable nappies has been exceeded, media coverage, conference and networking sessions held</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blooming Futures</strong></td>
<td>Construction of waste oil processing plant, application for Pure Plant Oil tax break, four converted vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carplus</strong></td>
<td>Links established with the Stockholm Institute and Aberdeen University re carbon, preparations for car clubs underway, networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common Ground</strong></td>
<td>Website redesigned, the “England in Particular” book is close to publishing, media coverage e.g. for Apple Day, networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Service Volunteers</strong></td>
<td>Kerbside garden waste collection expanded to 10,000 households, with 200 tonnes returned to community allotment sites; ‘growing pains’ project has been expanded to 15 new schools; a new sustainable cycling project has been launched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservation Foundation</strong></td>
<td>14 events and workshops, each with in excess of 200 attendees; contribution to a national Church of England project ‘Shrinking the Footprint’; networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cornwall Sustainable Building Trust</strong></td>
<td>Building skills training initiatives arranged in four locations, press coverage, networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Devon and Cornwall Housing Association</strong></td>
<td>Baseline undertaken of Barnstaple office, environmental policy developed and targets set; quality of life survey with residents at Oak Meadow ‘eco-estate’; environmental course for residents undertaken; 10 households undertaking EcoTeams at home challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eden LA21</strong></td>
<td>28 community halls have received comprehensive energy audits, with 15 buildings undertaking over £100,000 worth of energy efficiency measures; solar panel demonstration underway; press coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Association of Universities and Colleges</strong></td>
<td>Procurement questionnaire completed; networking with project partners, coverage at BITC conference and UN conference on Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Envision</strong></td>
<td>14 schools recruited in Birmingham and 8 involved in London; volunteers trained and networking sessions held; 294 young people registered in Birmingham; London sustainability conference for young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federation of City Farms and Gardens</strong></td>
<td>Partnership work and development; research with three pilot community groups with a view to developing a toolkit; work publicised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forest Stewardship Council</strong></td>
<td>General consumer and trade press; survey of consumers re recognition and influence of FSC label; promotions group established ahead of consumer campaign; awareness raising among public-sector procurement officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Action Plan</strong></td>
<td>Ecoteams established across 5 diverse communities; work almost complete on a database; preliminary results from 700 households suggest 25% reduction in residual waste, a 25% increase in recycling and 30% reduction in CO2 emissions; press coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Alliance</strong></td>
<td>Joint event with the Eden project to explore sustainable construction; a seminar undertaken on food waste and packaging; research completed on ‘zero waste’ case studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>London Sustainability Exchange</strong></td>
<td>Demonstration projects established; media coverage; 40 local organisations contacted and engaged; work to establish the sustainability champions network, and around 25 BAME leaders/opinion formers have been engaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marine Stewardship Council</strong></td>
<td>Foodservice partnership formed with Brakes, who have increased its offering of MSC-labelled seafood on school menus by 50%; Brakes have in turn brokered a relationship with Surrey Commercial Services (the education sector partner) who have sourced MSC-labelled fish fingers for 350 schools; ‘the Fish and Kids’ education pack and website are now ready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Energy Action</td>
<td>Engagement of residents and securing commitment to monitoring; negotiations with energy suppliers; eco-box schemes operating in three London boroughs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Federation of Women’s Institutes</td>
<td>Recruitment of WI champions; five practical pilot projects now established drawing in partners such as GPA, CAT, Carplus, Dynamic Demand and SPAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Trust</td>
<td>Progress on 21 member activities such as ‘Greening Base camps’ involving 30 adults on working holidays, the ‘Ugly Vegetable Competition’ which received significant press attention and ‘from pot to plate’ involving 450 participants; demonstration estates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacechild</td>
<td>‘Lifestyle contracts’ developed and piloted by students and teachers – 14,000 contracts established, 600 certificates awarded to students fulfilling pledges; the Ambassador project has been extended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough Environment City Trust</td>
<td>More than 115 households visited and ‘sustainable living’ welcome packs distributed; events including a workshop with the Diocese of Peterborough and an event at Hampton College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Yachting Association/British Marine Foundation</td>
<td>Demonstration projects set up; information disseminated to members; training events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Association</td>
<td>190 food retailers, and 60 Soil Association certified farms, have agreed to offer discounts to members of a ‘food club’; action pack developed for local groups; 2 pilots initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset Trust for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Conference held; 20 case study visits to demonstration projects involving 600 people; 20 action groups formed to be supported by volunteer champions; directory of sustainable living developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponge</td>
<td>Industry Steering Group has been established; desk-based research on business case and audience research; press coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studentforce for Sustainability</td>
<td>54 community checks have been completed; interest from 30 schools in a competition to win a wind turbine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain</td>
<td>Newsletters and publicity; visits to projects in London and Edinburgh; 60 meetings in London undertaken; research around ethnic food businesses has begun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westden</td>
<td>3 workshops delivered reaching an audience of 150; work undertaken with farmers and growers, restaurants, retailers and Chambers of Trade; workshops, training and presentations delivered to 270 local residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltshire Wildlife Trust</td>
<td>Community projects underway; one community has completed its waste minimisation pilot and launched their energy efficiency campaign, networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF</td>
<td>Background research; development of monitoring tools including an ecological footprint tool designed to support neighbourhood groups; three community groups recruited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Hostels Association</td>
<td>15 youth hostels have confirmed involvement in piloting hostel-based learning on SCP; achievement awards have been developed; YHA has switched its electricity provision; five 3-day training courses held; 46 Hostel Environment Plans completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In terms of more general successes at the programme level, there appears to have been considerable progress in relation to communications, where projects appear to have heeded advice on the types and tone of communications that are required. For example:

- Many projects think that language must not be laced with guilt nor based upon a belief that participants ‘ought’ to do something, e.g. Action for Sustainable Living;
- Several believe the overall message should be optimistic, inspirational and fun to counter levels of apathy, encouraging people to make small changes rather than focusing on the overall (and sometimes discouraging) bigger picture, e.g. Eden Local Agenda 21, Soil Association;
- A few projects believe a good sense of humour is necessary to engage people in SCP messages, rather than being too dry or dull, e.g. BabyGROE;
- Some projects are varying their message on the basis of who they are talking to, e.g. Cornwall Sustainable Building Trust do not emphasise the environmental message with builders and will instead concentrate on the economic benefits of sustainable products; and
- As participants’ knowledge of SCP progresses the issues they want to address may change, which will require a shift in the types of information and guidance they receive. A few projects are proactively preparing for this eventually. For example, The Environmental Association of Universities and Colleges addresses this by changing over time the type, detail and complexity of information it provides. For example, where initially it was simply advocating fair trade products, now it has introduced further discussion points, e.g. is a Nestle fair trade product really fair trade)?

It is also evident that some of the projects have taken their cue from the wider policy and political environment and, in doing so, demonstrated an ability to capitalise on political momentum. For example, the Association of Charity Shops identified waste reduction as the “next big challenge” within waste policy as local authorities look to develop their recycling services. Similarly, several food-orientated projects are alive to recent developments concerning the quality of school dinners and the “Jamie Oliver effect”.

In contrast, other projects have consciously moved away from where there is mainstream momentum to new areas - Sustain, for example, are now working with BAME food manufacturers and restaurants. This may reflect a different organisation ethos but suggests an alternative niche role for the community sector as pioneers on an issue which, if successful, can be then taken up by others.

Finally, although not a success in and of itself, we note that the EAF projects are well placed to feed into current thinking on SCP and sustainable development. For example, in spite of general low awareness about the behaviour change theory - many projects fall within the 4E’s framework from the Sustainable Development Strategy (Figure 14). They are therefore well placed to test this framework.

---

9 UK Communications Strategy on Climate Change, Futerra for Defra, 2005
**Figure 14: Synergy with the 4E’s across EAF Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>EAF example</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Targeting through existing social networks.</td>
<td>Carplus, London Sustainability Exchange</td>
<td>As already noted this is an important feature of many EAF projects, and where the community and voluntary sector can add significant value. Indeed, some groups have, with the benefit of experience in Year 1, increased the community/group aspects of their work, e.g. Action for Sustainable Living.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using ‘hooks’ to initiate interest.</td>
<td>Eden Local Agenda 21</td>
<td>Many projects are deploying different messages to encourage engagement, for example the health benefits of organic food (e.g. Soil Association) or the financial benefit of saving energy (e.g. National Energy Action). Eden Local Agenda 21 are using what they call “the fifth E” – Enrage – as a means of securing involvement (for example advertising a meeting on contentious issues such as building a local wind turbine).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media campaigns to raise awareness.</td>
<td>The Association of Charity Shops</td>
<td>The Association of Charity Shops provides a library of images and pamphlets around their ‘Choose 2 Reuse’ campaign for regional charity shops to advertise recycling and re-use issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing engagement</td>
<td>Global Action Plan</td>
<td>In the handful of cases where engagement is ‘deep’ and ongoing, this is felt to be beneficial in terms of building relationships and embedding behaviour change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celebrity endorsement</td>
<td>Peacechild are searching for a celebrity</td>
<td>Peacechild consider this approach important given the target audience and responsiveness of children and teenagers to celebrity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pledges.</td>
<td>AfSL, YHA, Peacechild.</td>
<td>Several projects are considering the use of competitions to encourage behaviour change or simply to increase response rates to surveys. In some instances there are prizes planned, e.g. Studentforce are considering a wind turbine as a prize for the winning school. In other instances the social value of competition is being used rather than the attraction of a prize per say, e.g. Wiltshire Wildlife Trust have a Bronze, Silver and Gold Award scheme predicated on how much action a community undertakes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives.</td>
<td>Studentforce, Wiltshire Wildlife Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing services &amp; infrastructure.</td>
<td>CSV operate ‘Run A Muck’ (a compost collection scheme), MSC school meals programme</td>
<td>Some EAF projects Behaviour change may not necessarily require a change in attitude first. For instance, changes in municipal waste services may encourage an increase in recycling without the public deciding that recycling is ‘a good thing’. Similarly, the MSC project in schools – by using ‘choice editing’ – brings about significant SCP benefits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing information.</td>
<td>Forest Stewardship Council</td>
<td>All EAF projects provide information as an integral part of their work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading by example so that public may follow.</td>
<td>Youth Hostels Association, National Trust</td>
<td>As already noted, many projects are attempting to adopt sustainable behaviours themselves, although fewer are undertaking more widespread activities. Exceptions include the Youth Hostels Association which is aiming to exemplify sustainability in practice through its buildings, and National Trust who are demonstrating via their estates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We also note that, even in the absence of design, many of the EAF projects fall under the four priority areas identified recently by the Sustainable Consumption Roundtable.
3.6 Barriers in Year 1

This section briefly outlines some of the barriers which have emerged during the course of Year 1. The review has identified four that are particularly noteworthy:

- As already noted in Section 3.4, the recruitment, training and management of volunteers and community champions can take more time than is anticipated. For example, community champions can be difficult to identify, existing champions are typically already active and busy on other projects, and they may not always ‘stay on message’.

  “There is a limited pool of people to recruit from, and they are likely to be doing other things already”

- Many projects have had considerable success in Year 1 in terms of awareness raising and “light tough” engagement. However, there has been markedly less success in undertaking “deep engagement” where contact with individuals is repeated and frequent.

  “It hasn’t been hard to reach the community. It has though been more difficult to persuade them to become more sustainable”

  “The home visits have generated a lot of interest but the challenge is how you take that on further”

- There is a disconnect between the behaviour change literature and ‘work on the ground’. This need not necessarily be an issue, particularly since Figure 13 demonstrates a degree on synergy between the projects and the 4 E’s of the SD Strategy. Nonetheless, we see room for improvement on two counts: firstly, to make this more systematic across all projects (to the benefit of the each individual project and the EAF programme overall); and secondly, by making further use of the theory, projects would be able to take advantage of the opportunities, namely:

  ❖ Several projects are well placed to take better advantage of “change points” in people’s lives e.g. when they move home. For example, Peterborough Environment City Trust is targeting newly built housing estates, providing households with “sustainable living advice” within the first six months. However, the project might have greater impact if, in accordance with the theory, they approached households immediately after their move to fully exploit the opportunity.

  ❖ There are potential crossovers between different spheres of people’s lives, e.g. is a behaviour fostered in the workplace transferred to the home? Peacechild have anecdotal evidence that their work with schoolchildren is filtering into their home lives, where ‘pester power’ can encourage parents to behave in a more sustainable manner.

  ❖ The crossover between different SCP issues and behaviours is very important to the current programme, although not all projects appear to be considering all of the linkages. National Energy Action for instance, believe that once households start to consider energy conservation measures there is a natural progression to thinking about the fuel consumption of their car. Somerset Trust for Sustainable Development envisages a “conveyor belt” where people move from basic, single issues through to systematic behaviours.
The apparent lack of connection to the theory and evidence does appear to be, in our judgement, a missed opportunity to refine and develop the operation of the projects. There is indeed, a genuine interest among many in the theory – not only as an abstract piece of work – but also to "have the theory broken down into 10 things to consider". There may be some form of translation role required here; and we are in a position to pick this up at the annual October workshop with project managers.
4 Organisational Issues & Project Delivery

We have already noted in Section 2 that EAF projects are very diverse in size, structure reach and capabilities. In this section we look at organisational issues that have arisen in Year 1 and how this has influenced project management and delivery. Areas examined are:

- Staffing and external resources (4.1)
- Organisational capacity and skills (4.2)
- Funding and financial sustainability (4.3);
- Partnerships & relationships (4.4);
- Project management and delivery (4.5); and
- Reporting (4.6).

4.1 Staffing and External Resources

Staffing

EAF projects vary enormously in size and are therefore likely to have very different resources and capacities to deliver behaviour change. Projects were asked in the electronic survey both about the size of their organisation overall (which was reported in Section 2) and the numbers of permanent staff working specifically on the EAF project.

Based on survey responses, the EAF programme as a whole is currently providing paid work for over 210 staff, of which 128 are employed for more than 8 hours per week (Figure 15). When converted to a Full Time Equivalent (FTE) this amounts to an average of 2.5 staff per project.

Figure 15: Project Staff in Year 1
We note the following issues concerning staffing:

- Regardless of the size of the host organisation, most EAF projects (22) have five or fewer permanent staff devoted to them so far (Figure 14);

- This is typically a core team of full time and/or part time staff working 15-30 hours per week, although 11 of the projects have (as yet) no full time staff working on them;

- Many projects (20) also deploy staff working 1 day a week or less to supplement their core team; and

- In a few projects, these more ‘occasional’ staff are a significant supplementary component (Devon & Cornwall Housing Association, Federation of City Farms & Gardens, the National Trust and the Youth Hostel Association). In the case of the Youth Hostel Association and National Trust this reflects the way in which they are harnessing existing staff in sites across the country to help deliver the project.

On securing EAF funds, many projects have recruited new or additional staff; others have seconded staff from elsewhere in their organisation. Some projects said they had experienced delay or difficulty in recruiting administration staff; others commented on lack of skills within the sector. This last point is more generic to the community sector and has been documented elsewhere. The nature of time-limited funding undermining job security is also a more generic issue.

On a day to day basis, many of the staff working on EAF projects have their time split across a number of projects within their organisation (as shown in the high number of part time staff) and this has been issue for some projects in terms of co-ordination and project management.

**External Resources**

Many groups are supplementing their workforce (and therefore skills) with other resources (Figure 16):

- A majority are using volunteers (71%);

- Many groups are also using external consultants/advisors (including academic), in both a paid and unpaid capacity (51% for both); and

- Just over a third of groups also say they have used Defra expertise (37%) for help with marketing or press releases.

---

10 The Conservation Foundation did not provide staff numbers in the survey; the YHA made rough estimates of occasional staff, which are not included in the graph or FTE calculations.
Projects’ are aiming to use volunteers both to increase organisational/administrative capacity and also to help extend their reach into communities, for example, as community champions or intermediaries. As discussed in Section 3, the picture on the latter at the end of Year 1, however, is not entirely clear; some projects have successfully recruited champions but some have found it more difficult than anticipated.

In Year 1, consultants have principally been undertaking formative research for the projects to help them identify target audiences, or have been retained to undertake future evaluation. A number of the projects will be working with universities to provide expert input on evaluation (see Section 5).

Interestingly, whilst community sector organisations elsewhere (e.g. especially in the waste sector) often use intermediate labour market (ILM) workers, these have not featured very much in the EAF projects in Year 1. Paid community workers have similarly not featured in many projects.

If this is really the case, and if it continues into years 2 and 3, then it may represent a lost opportunity to promote social sustainability alongside sustainable consumption. One of the issues we might look at further next year is the extent to which the use of (unpaid) volunteers is helping to develop community social capital in those projects which are operating in deprived areas or with excluded groups.

### 4.2 Organisational Capacity & Skills

Almost all of the projects feel confident about their skills on finance and accounting but there is more variation for other skills, including communications, marketing, evaluation and measurement (Figure 17).
• Though most appear confident about handling marketing and communications a large minority of projects (15 and 12) say they only have “some” or no expertise in these areas;
• Similarly, while most claim some expertise in evaluation or measurement, only seven of the 35 say they have significant expertise in this area. (Evaluation is covered further in Section 5); and
• While knowledge of sustainable development is, not surprisingly, widespread, projects are generally less well versed in behaviour change theory or ideas (which were discussed in more detail in Section 3).

Figure 17: Expertise within Organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q. Thinking about the capacity and skills within your organisation, what level of expertise would you say the organisation has in each of the following areas?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of behaviour change best practice from other organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of behaviour change theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable development agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement/ performance indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial/ accountancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Other, more general, issues about organisational capacity and skills emerged from our in-depth discussions with projects:

• Many project managers initially lacked the required skills and experience and it has taken time to build skills within some projects: For example, Blooming Futures, by its own admission, has been on a self-taught crash course in everything from health and safety to tax and regulation. This aspect has, no doubt, increased the length of set up time and delayed some projects.

• Smaller groups have less access to resources which places them at a skills disadvantage: attending training can often be cost-prohibitive when all expenses are taken into account and smaller groups have less exposure to large research establishments. Many of the larger organisations have recruited universities as research partners, e.g. WWF and the University of Surrey; Devon & Cornwall Housing Association and Exeter.

• Volunteers increase capacity but need managing: most projects have not found it an additional burden to train volunteers but a few raised issues about the time required to manage volunteers, and some identified obstacles to working with intermediaries (such as the building of relationships and trust - discussed in 4.4).
• **Expertise may occur more by chance than design, based upon skills offered by third parties:** for example, Westden receives all accountancy advice from a local volunteer; Peacechild has a superior website and IT infrastructure because these are the skill sets of recent interns (but is lacking PR capabilities); and Action for Sustainable Living allows its volunteers to determine the work they want to do, which relates to their own skills base, e.g. students tend to give sustainability advice, run projects or conduct evaluation based upon their degree courses.

• **Projects have already sought/would like to seek support services from Defra to plug some skills/knowledge gaps:** This is most evident in relation to monitoring and evaluation (see Section 5) but is also true regarding support on press releases (e.g. Association of Charity Shops), communications/marketing and behaviour change practice and theory. Defra has also advised Blooming Futures on the implications of a change in tax rebates on bio fuels (which could still drastically alter its outcomes).

• **Best practice findings are not being shared between EAF projects:** many groups appear to be ‘reinventing the wheel’, creating topic guides or sustainability packs in their own location, unaware that another EAF group is doing exactly the same thing elsewhere. Contact between the projects has so far been limited (Figure 18) though some have exchanged ideas, learning or advice. There is undoubtedly more scope for projects to learn from each other going forward.

• **Groups are receptive to the idea of working with other EAF projects:** many cited time and resources constraints as the main obstacle to making contact; for others, their location makes regular networking prohibitive in terms of time and money. Many expressed a desire to be placed in learning groups with similar EAF projects but needed someone else to ‘make the links’ for them.

"A number of regional seminars / regional EAF network group meetings would have been useful facilitated by a Defra EAF manager. There have been no obvious events to meet others at since the very first meeting in 2005“.

**Figure 18: Contact between EAF Projects**
4.3 Funding & Financial Sustainability

The funding situation of EAF projects varies dramatically, ranging from the completely grant reliant (e.g. Common Ground) to organisations with well diversified income streams (e.g. WWF). Many EAF projects discussed and raised financial issues which were perceived to be obstacles to day-to-day project management. Many of these issues are generic across the community sector, while a few are specific to the EAF.

- The EAF compares favourably to other funding sources – a majority of the projects (23) think that EAF compares favourably while only four think it compares unfavourably (BabyGROE, Common Ground, Environmental Association of Universities and Colleges, Westden). Some projects praised the EAF specifically for allowing them to experiment with innovative methods and approaches.

- Funding is typically used for revenue expenditure – such as the creation of teaching modules, brochures and pamphlets. Eden Local Agenda 21 is one of the few projects investing EAF funds into capital investment such as lorries and recycling infrastructure.

- Organisations constantly struggle to secure funding – this diverts the focus from delivery and other important issues, such as evaluation. However, the EAF programme is generally considered generous in length compared to other funding streams, which tends to allow a longer period of security for smaller groups before new funding must be sourced.

- Many projects struggled to find match funding – match funding has come from a wide variety of sources. Projects with volunteers appear to have been successful in attracting match funding, as this adds to the number of staff hours offered by the project. Calls were made by some projects for:
  - A larger chunk of Defra funds in year 1 with a more heavy reliance on external funders by year 3. This would allow for setbacks when getting started or provide the necessary start up capital required for new business ventures;
o Greater clarity about what qualifies as match funding - (e.g. the definition of public/private funds in relation to university funding for the Environmental Association of Universities and Colleges); and

o More generally, a wish for support from Defra on securing match funding or helping to think about continuation post-EAF – for example, by signposting possible sources.

“As all EAF grants require 100% match funding and the project will be halted if this match funding is not found, I am surprised that there is not a lot more support and advice to help groups find sources of funding”.

• Financial sustainability is not a major priority for many groups – a few are self-sustaining (e.g. BabyGROE) and a handful of others see this as a major objective by year 3 (e.g. BioRegional). Most, however, will continue to source charitable funding, either because they cannot see a lucrative avenue for their work or because they do not think it is their role to charge for services (e.g. Common Ground).

• Only a small minority of groups are attempting to diversify their financial income – but this can be through a variety of methods:

  o Training e.g. Global Action Plan coach local authorities in the Eco-Team concept and the Cornwall Sustainable Building Trust teaches building skills;

  o Membership fees e.g. the Environmental Association of Universities and Colleges charges three different prices for access to knowledge and networks;

  o Referral fees from green suppliers, where projects receive commission when participants purchase products. These appear to be more of a token gesture rather than providing major revenue (Action for Sustainable Living has been unable to implement referral fees due to a lack of interest/demand by suppliers)\(^\text{11}\);

  o Development companies, e.g. Cornwall Sustainable Building Trust, although it is about to wrap up trading because it has not been entirely successful;

  o Consultancy services, e.g. Westden are working with local authorities on their sustainability strategy and Wiltshire Wildlife Trust who (prior to EAF) were commissioned to lead on the local authority’s LA21 strategy.

  o Private sector sponsorship, e.g. the Forest Stewardship Council is hoping to link up officially with HSBC while Peacechild is searching for a corporate sponsor.

4.4 Partnerships & Relationships

EAF groups are working with a variety of formal and informal partners (Figure 19) – most notably with local authorities (81%), but also with local community/resident groups (66%), businesses (60%), voluntary and community sector groups (60%), and other public sector organisations such as schools and hospitals (60%). Some of these

\(^{11}\) The Sustainable Consumption Roundtable Report (2006) Communities of Interest – And Action? notes that many projects feel uneasy about demanding fees or subscriptions from participants who are potential community champions or volunteers. Additionally, many feel that taking referral fees places them in an uncomfortable position regarding impartiality of products.
are new relationships developed as part of the project in Year 1; others are long-standing relationships which pre-date the EAF project.

Almost all of the projects are actively networking, either promoting their EAF project through existing channels, drawing in advice or expertise from existing contacts, or developing new networks to help support delivery of the project. The two notable gaps appear to be other EAF projects (noted above) and Regional Development Agencies/Assemblies (only seven of the projects claim some sort of relationship with RDAs). The latter may not be of concern given that RDAs, with their more strategic focus, are unlikely to be in a position to provide much support to the EAF projects.

Figure 19: Partners/Interested Parties in EAF Projects

The nature of partnerships varies widely - some have formal partners involved in delivery (e.g. National Energy Action, Eden Local Agenda 21); others attract voluntary support, for example, via product donations; and others are looking forward to creating opportunities for mainstreaming. Relationships with partners are widely reported as being good, except perhaps where projects feel their ‘brand’ or model is threatened or in danger of being copied.
Relationships with local authorities are clearly a very important aspect for many projects with the potential to ‘make or break’ delivery in a few cases:

- **Some groups are influenced by local authorities:** for example, Carplus’s activities are currently delayed while York council determines which car club will win the council tender for running a car club and participate in the EAF project.

- **Local authorities can enable project progress:** WWF, for example, has had significant support from the local councils involved in their community projects which has helped to push the process along. The Association of Charity Shops reached 70,000 households via a feature in one local authority’s regular magazine for residents; it could not have achieved this reach with its own resources.

- **Engagement with local authorities can be difficult:** Action for Sustainable Living, for example, state that whilst they have good relationships with key individuals, they are too small an organisation to exert much influence across the authority as a whole. GAP and LSX also point out the difficulty of having to deal separately with different departments when their own projects are taking an all-encompassing approach to sustainability. Projects have found it easiest to engage local authorities on specific service related issues – e.g. waste, transport – but more difficulty on SCP and consumption issues, and climate change. London Sustainability Exchange further point out that the distribution of responsibilities differs between authorities so that bespoke approaches have to be developed for every one.

- **Sustainability officers can be a help or hindrance:** The presence of a sustainable development potentially offers an obvious point of contact with the local authority. However, not all relationships are necessarily smooth. For example, Eden Local Agenda 21 reported to us a frustration that a newly appointed local sustainability officer has begun to repeat work already conducted by themselves (with local schools) which can alienate the participants, cause confusion about mixed messages, decrease participation rates and is ultimately a waste of resources.

This raises a more general point that some EAF projects (and community projects more generally) are often at risk of being squeezed out if local authorities decide to introduce similar services. For example, Penrith council is about to begin offering a recycling service to local rural businesses, tested as part of the Eden Local Agenda 21 EAF project; Community Service Volunteers spends the bulk of its resources on the ‘Run a Muck’ programme (a community composting scheme) but Birmingham council is about to begin a large scale composting service to all local households - placing Community Service Volunteers in a highly exposed position.

Many of the EAF projects are unlikely to have the resources, partnerships or economies of scale available to compete successfully with local authorities unless they radically change their modus operandi. Looking towards the end of the EAF programme, this begins to raise questions about how continuation, mainstreaming or roll-out could be managed where projects have been successful.

Further observations about partnerships and other relationships which emerged from our discussions are:

- **Large organisations already have well-developed external relationships** – organisations operating at national or regional scale, such as the Royal Yachting Association, FSC or Green Alliance, for example, already have working relationships with government agencies, regulators and other large NGOs, so do not have to spend time building these relationships from scratch. A few of the smaller projects commented that their size undermines their ability to be taken seriously by potential partners (e.g. Action for Sustainable Living), though most of the small projects have successfully built external relationships.
• **Project partnerships have been formed in different ways** – some have been ad-hoc, depending on who has heard of or expressed an interest in the project; others are functional, where partners are providing services or products (e.g. National Energy Action, Peterborough Environment City Trust).

• **There seems to be little idea of ‘companion planting’ so far** – i.e. that a specific combination of partners can be used to mutual benefit (e.g. the Youth Hostel Association regularly use neighbours’ car parks for their own guests but not on a routine basis at present).

• **Relationships with partners are time consuming to establish** – creating relationships can be hard work and take a long time to develop: Peacechild and Envision both reported difficulty in convincing teachers to participate in their programmes (often requiring many visits and telephone calls before access to the children is allowed); and the London Sustainability Exchange find it difficult to build strong associations with faith leaders due to the amount of time involved.

  “With large organisations, trying to change behaviour is very difficult until you have buy-in from all the different decision-makers. This is far more time consuming than we had envisaged and so can be very frustrating”.

• **Relationships differ according to different groups’ ethos, agenda and strategy** - some groups are keen to apply a strict code of sustainable ethics to project partners (Environmental Association of Universities and Colleges). Ethical considerations are not as important or deemed unfeasible for others, e.g. National Energy Action’s need for an energy provider (which has been difficult to secure) far outweighs any possible ethical considerations about the energy company concerned.

• **EAF can increase a group’s standing within their peer group, enabling new relationships to be formed** - for some of the smaller groups, participation in EAF has improved their ‘place in the world’ through the credibility provided by Defra funding (e.g. Blooming Futures).

**4.5 Project Management and Delivery**

Most projects have taken more time to set up than originally planned; this has been across the board and regardless of size. The following factors have contributed to longer than anticipated set-up time:

• **The length of the EAF programme** – some projects were possibly not as well prepared before embarking on EAF as they might otherwise have been with shorter funding pots (of one year for example);

• **Many project managers are part time** - generally spending the other half within their larger organisation. This can slow things down; the Youth Hostel Association and the Association of Charity Shops, for example, both reported this as a major obstacle in regard to setting up meetings etc.;

• **Many projects are operating at a national level** – which can stretch resources to the maximum and cause difficulty for managing intermediaries (e.g. BabyGROE – an organisation of 7 people - reported a difficulty in organising and managing its nationwide representatives);

• **A number of projects reported disruption caused by turnover of project managers** - this has caused process issues, i.e. projects can stall with the departure and arrival
of new managers. It is still too early to say if these management changes for some projects will impact upon their ability to effect successful behaviour change.

- Recruiting participants and intermediaries, or project partners, has been less straightforward than anticipated in some cases: this feature was covered in detail in Section 3.

In addition, many projects (20) have found it necessary to change tack to some extent during Year 1. Blooming Futures for example, are working to raise awareness of bio-fuel (primarily pure plant oil) as a sustainable transport alternative. Its original aim was to convert fifty public transport vehicles (taxis and buses) to run on bio-fuel in partnership with the local transport operator. With the benefit of its own research, it has since adapted the project to work with two different target audiences: a) working with farmers, it intends to begin operating a rape seed press to provide bio-fuel from locally grown sources; and b) working with haulage companies, it aims to convert heavy fuel consumption vehicles to use this rape fuel. In doing so, it has successfully modified the project to potentially achieve greater CO₂ savings and provide more ‘joined up’ thinking about the supply and demand of bio-fuel markets.

For the most part these changes have been in response to learning or obstacles as the projects have progressed. Principal reasons for change were:

- Adapting project plans in light of early, formative knowledge (e.g. WWT, Westden, BioRegional, Blooming Futures);
- To rethink approaches to recruiting intermediaries or working with partners (e.g. BabyGROE, National Energy Action);
- To respond to external input – e.g. from Steering Groups (Sponge) or interests of match funders (Green Alliance); and
- To allow for the fact that some elements of the project progressed faster than expected (e.g. MSC, London Sustainability Exchange) or attracted greater than expected interest (e.g. Environmental Association of Universities and Colleges).

Given the innovative nature of projects in this EAF round, substantive change to original project plans was perhaps always inevitable, and should by no means be seen as a weakness of the projects selected. A number of projects, in fact, praised the flexible manner in which Defra has supported change to their project plans.

“Our ideas are evolving; we value the grant for giving us the opportunity to explore possibilities; by definition, as an organisation that deals in ‘ideas into practice’, things will change”.

“I think though that any project, to be successful, has to be very, very flexible to survive if it is to function on the edges of what is known in society and still survive as an organisation”.

Change has generally been managed adequately or well though it has caused delay in some projects - to the extent that around a third of the EAF projects (11) said they were behind schedule in June 2006. Our project discussions and review of annual reports suggests this may be an underestimate (Figure 20). We do not believe this is of special concern at this stage, though Defra should pay attention to on-going delivery issues, from Year 2 first quarter reports and as the projects move into the next quarter. Particular aspects to watch are projects that appear to be rolling over the same outputs and not clearly demonstrating onward movement in the project.
Figure 20: Project Progress

Q. Thinking about your overall progress to date, taken against your Year 1 plan and targets, would you say you are currently…..?

- 6% Slightly ahead of schedule
- 0% Well ahead of schedule
- 57% On schedule
- 31% Slightly behind schedule
- 6% Well behind schedule
- 0% Not applicable


4.6 Reporting

Most projects have (so far) had a positive experience of EAF. In particular, there is widespread praise for the Defra team as being approachable and helpful, and many projects value the fairly ‘light touch’ approach that Defra has taken with them.

Principal complaints about the EAF process are reserved for reporting and for lack of networking opportunities. We commented already in Section 2.3 that creating more opportunities for sharing experience would be desirable.
The demands of reporting were a frequent item for discussion in our visits to projects. Phrases such as “too complicated”, “onerous” or “excessive” were used, and some questioned the merit of having detailed quarterly reporting as well as annual reports. Some also questioned the relevance of the material they were being asked to provide. Most, though, thought that EAF reporting was no worse than for other funders and were resigned to the demands it placed on them.

“The advantage of Defra funding has been in enabling us to deliver some innovative methods of engaging our community…. The main disadvantage has been a continually changing and time-consuming reporting process that has detracted from the delivery of the practical objectives of the project”.

From an evaluation point of view, we found the material provided in the reports to be too inconsistent to use as the basis for a fully rounded view of the outputs and outcomes of Year 1. Some projects provided very clear, and quantified, information on specific outputs, and reported against initial targets; others, however, provided information that was so vague as to reveal little about the progress of their project. In both good and bad cases, reporting on outcomes was limited, and often muddled with outputs; to be fair to projects, it is in any case probably too early for them to be reporting on outcomes. Projects which provided weak information have been flagged separately to Defra in our draft “Outcomes and Outputs” report.

At the risk of introducing a further change to reporting, we suggest it would be in Defra’s interests to once again clarify to projects the requirements for reporting, to reiterate the distinction between outputs and outcomes, and to make it clear what is required for the purpose of monitoring delivery as distinct from evaluation of project impact (on which the projects are now receiving independent advice). It may also be worth flagging to projects that some of the simplest reports were also some of the most effective in terms of transmitting the required information.
5 Evaluation and Learning

A key objective of this round of the EAF - and of our accompanying three-year review - is to enhance the evidence base on how community level projects can deliver behaviour change for sustainable development.

In addition to the normal requirement to monitor project progress and account for spending (covered in section 4), it is hoped by Defra and the wider SD policy world that the current EAF projects will provide useful data for evaluating the behavioural impact of these kinds of activities. This section focuses on the progress that EAF projects have made in Year 1 on evaluating behaviour change and generating learning, under the following headings:

- General issues relating to evaluating behaviour change (5.1);
- Progress in evaluation in Year 1 (5.2);
- Evaluation issues for the EAF projects (5.3); and
- Approaches to measuring behaviour change (5.4).

5.1 General Issues Relating to Evaluating Behaviour Change

The relative novelty of ‘behaviour change’ as a policy delivery tool within the field of sustainable development means that attempts to design in methods for monitoring and evaluation are in their infancy. Where there has been a longer history of behaviour change approaches – for example, in health or regeneration – criticisms have also been made that evaluations tend to be too heavily focused on project processes, rather than on impacts or outcomes (a point that was also made by CAG in their review of the last round of EAF).

For behaviour change projects generally, “measuring behaviour change is one of the hardest parts of the project, though many also volunteered that it was essential to their success”. Reasons for this difficulty include:

- ‘Behaviour change’ is hard to define, and difficult to measure: Global Action Plan, for example, notes that a major lesson it has learnt in Year 1 is ‘the complexity of capturing hard data on the impact of behaviour change projects’. There are two dimensions to consider here:
  - What is meant by ‘impact’ or ‘hard data’? In our work on community waste projects for Defra we have divided impact into two: ‘hard’ impacts, such as demonstrable change in levels of recycling, energy use etc; ‘soft’ impacts in terms of changes in underlying attitudes and motivations. The best evaluations include both kinds of impact; without knowing why people changed their behaviour (e.g. was it the recycling box, having children, or a community worker paying them some attention?; was it the green credentials of a car club or having no money to buy a car?) it is difficult to know whether participants’ behaviour change is likely to be enduring, or whether it could be replicated with other audiences who have entirely different sets of motivations or practical barriers.

---

12 For example, see the report of ChangeLab’s expert workshop. [www.changelabproject.org](http://www.changelabproject.org)
Even if it is clear what needs to be measured, it is not always straightforward to measure it. Generating accurate data on recycling participation, for example, usually requires observation of households over several weeks, or reliance on self-weighing by participants (which, in itself is a barrier to engagement); in its absence, projects may have to fall back on claimed participation, which is typically over-reported in surveys. Indeed, there are many pitfalls inherent in attitudinal surveys, which EAF projects may have had little exposure to.

- **It is difficult to attribute behaviour change to a specific project:** behaviour is complex and change is rarely directly attributable to one cause or one project, e.g. is an improvement because of an EAF project, local authority initiatives or a national campaign? This is compounded by the fact that a number of the EAF projects are concentrating on ‘awareness raising’ rather than in-depth, sustained contact with the same participants over time (where direct impact can more easily be attributed).

- **The duration of projects may not be long enough to fully capture behaviour change impact:** the full impact of projects may be felt after the projects have ended, yet funding is not normally available to revisit participants to investigate long-term impact. This may be an issue particularly for those using a community development model, where the impetus for change may continue to grow beyond the project (as the evaluation of EcoTeams in the Netherlands appears to show).

- **Projects may generate unforeseen positive spin-offs, for example on community social capital or community cohesion:** it is sometimes hard to anticipate what these impacts might be and therefore build them into the evaluation at the beginning; even where they can be anticipated, there are few established methodologies for capturing these impacts (hence the significance of NEF’s work on quality of life measurement for the GAP EAF team).

- **Cost is also a clear barrier to best practice evaluation in community projects:** Best practice evaluation, deploying a range of ‘triangulated’ techniques to measure both hard and soft indicators, tends to be expensive while many community based projects have relatively small budgets.

We also need to consider the more general issues common to evaluation: whether the project has provided **additionality** (i.e. the behaviour change would not have occurred without the project happening) and whether or not it has **diverted** activity from elsewhere (e.g. if participants are already buying a sustainable product and merely switch to an alternative sustainable brand).

It is important to bear in mind this wider context when considering the progress that EAF projects have made on evaluating behaviour change outcomes in Year 1. The situation within the EAF is certainly no different from practice elsewhere in evaluating community behaviour change projects, and there are huge opportunities for the EAF projects to set the standard, if the issues outlined below can be addressed successfully.

## 5.2 Progress on Behaviour Change Evaluation in Year 1

Immediately following our site visits in Spring 2006, we alerted Defra to the very significant risk that many of the projects would not be able to demonstrate behaviour change impacts, because evaluation was not being built in adequately enough, or early enough, to produce robust evidence. This issue is now being addressed by Defra, through the provision of free consultancy advice to each project to help them develop evaluation plans. Here we report on the situation we found before this advice was provided, and the responses to the electronic survey in June, flagging evaluation issues that will still need to be monitored as the programme progresses.
Progress on monitoring and evaluation has been hugely variable in Year 1, ranging from the well defined (e.g. Carplus) to the non-existent. Evaluation has not been a major element of many work programmes; in many cases resources have been devoted to recruiting participants and getting delivery up and running, with an assumption that impact evaluation can be retro-fitted later.

Indeed, from the interviews with project managers, it is clear that few had considered the need for a baseline measurement before commencing work. However, our discussions with projects about the importance of collecting baseline data for future evaluation was well received and may be responsible for the higher than anticipated response rate in the subsequent electronic survey as to whether projects had taken, or intended to take, a baseline of participants’ attitudes/behaviour (Figure 21).

**Figure 21: Baseline Measurements taken by EAF Projects**

![Baseline Measurements taken by EAF Projects](image)

Nonetheless, around one-third of the projects (11) have not undertaken, or have no plans for, a baseline. Of these, at least three are currently considering how they will capture behaviour change impacts, either by taking baselines with new groups as they are set up, or by retrospective questioning of participants. Principal reasons why the others have not undertaken baselines are either that they feel too resource constrained, or they feel they know enough about their audience already to make a baseline irrelevant. A few of these latter projects are cause for concern as it will be difficult for them to demonstrate evidence of change (e.g. Common Ground, Cornwall Sustainable Building Trust).

"We deal with such a diversity of people and groups it would have taken all of our time to do it”.

"It was known that we would be targeting primarily a new target audience so it was assumed the benchmark behaviour and attitude to sustainable building would be zero or very low".
"We had already carried out reviews of our activities with partners and participants, and felt confident of the likely impact the work would have".
"We did not realise the importance of establishing a baseline".

Where projects are working with new groups of participants throughout the project, there are still opportunities to undertake baseline measurement, and this should be helped by the evaluation support provided by Defra. However, there are a handful of projects where this is not the case and the opportunity to take any form of measurement before contact begins with the participants may soon be lost.

Of those projects that did or will undertake baselines, not all of them will provide benchmark data for referencing change in participant behaviour:

- Some projects have used research in a formative way, to identify key characteristics of their target markets or audiences (e.g. MSC, Sustain, London Sustainability Exchange, National Federation of Women’s Institute);

- Others have used it in the strict sense of providing data on a particular audience who will be monitored or re-surveyed to assess change by the end of the project (e.g. GAP, Devon & Cornwall Housing Association, Somerset Trust for Sustainable Development); and

- For some types of project – for example, those seeking to influence policy or the wider market (e.g. Sponge, Green Alliance) – it will perhaps be difficult to demonstrate impact, given that it is difficult to define their target audiences precisely.

While a majority of projects are now claiming that they will have baseline data, we still have some concerns about the range and quality of data being collected specifically on outcomes, if the end intention is to generate programme wide learning on behaviour change. While some variation in practice is inevitable given the diversity of projects, we would urge Defra to ask for clear evidence of evaluation plans in the projects’ next quarterly reports. There is also undoubted scope for facilitating an exchange of practice amongst the projects, especially where these are targeted at the public and include questionnaire surveys.

Indeed, some projects have well developed evaluation plans from which others could learn. Carplus is one such exemplar through its research of the benefits of a car club scheme about to be established by the local authority in York. It intends to record and capture two main factors in relation to new car clubs:

- firstly, in partnership with the Stockholm Institute, it will measure the carbon benefits in a neighbourhood before and after a car share scheme comes into effect;

- and secondly, it will measure and evaluate attitudes to travel behaviour in partnership with Aberdeen University.

Three additional factors illustrate good project design and evaluation by Carplus: a) the area has been surveyed for likely demand and mapped in regard to public transport options and possible car share parking spaces (‘donated’ by the local authority); b) a baseline of attitudes and car use has already been taken and will be repeated two months after the car club is operational and at the end of the EAF project (in 2008); and c) targeting both individual households and businesses in the area, questions will be used from the bi-annual National Travel Survey providing a benchmark from the wider population.
For the most part, learning opportunities for other projects exist where: the project is heavily focused on research (e.g. Carplus), or where projects can call on large in-house research departments (e.g. National Energy Action); or where projects have joined forces with partners at universities (e.g. Devon and Cornwall Housing Association); or where they can recruit students/interns to conduct the research. A few have recruited participants to conduct their own research (e.g. Eden Local Agenda 21, Envision, Action for Sustainable Living). We return to opportunities for shared learning in section 5.3 (iii).

5.3 Evaluation Issues

Most projects recognise the importance of evaluation, but frequently cited two main obstacles:

- Lack of resource for evaluation appears to be a significant impediment, as does evaluation knowledge and research culture (according to the survey, only one fifth of groups claim to know ‘a significant amount’ about evaluation and monitoring); and

- Many projects see themselves as innovators not evaluators arguing that ‘swamping’ a project with evaluation demands can take away their creativity and ability to deliver, which they see as one of their primary roles as ‘niche’ community sector projects.

There are, perhaps, as yet unresolved questions about what it is reasonable to expect the projects to produce in terms of transferable learning on behaviour change, as opposed to simply demonstrating that their project has had successful – if idiosyncratic - outcomes. This is an issue we would like to discuss further with the EAF research manager in Year 2 as the projects’ evaluation plans become clearer and we begin our own participant research.

What is clear is that many projects need more help on evaluation, which Defra is now providing through the one-to-one advice sessions being delivered by external consultants. The level of support required varies from simply approving/guiding the proposed approach, to recommending survey software packages, to quite elementary and fundamental aspects, such as the notion of a baseline survey and the importance of thinking ahead about evaluation rather than leaving it to Year 3. Specific evaluation issues that emerged from our Year 1 review relate to three main areas: evaluation processes; measurement; and learning.

(i) Process Issues

- Few groups have set research based targets. As identified earlier, many projects establish targets in their work programmes (with Defra) that mostly appear to be output rather than outcome-based. While, just over half of EAF groups (57%) claim to have set these targets based upon research undertaken at the start of the project, our discussions suggest that target setting has so far been much more ad hoc. This is particularly so as regards the expression of, and intention to measure, behaviour change outcomes. As far as we can tell, few projects have identified explicit indicators that they will use to demonstrate behaviour change. Those which have done so typically use either/both ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ indicators, such as utilities bills, pledges made/kept, eco-footprinting, self-monitoring (usually weighing waste), or participant attitudes and claimed behaviour.

- Some projects are rolling out previous approaches which have not yet been fully evaluated – a number of projects are using this round of EAF to expand existing work, some without formal evaluation and no measured evidence of its success.
In many cases, evaluation (as planned so far) has an over-reliance on anecdotal evidence to prove effectiveness – this applies both to monitoring of project outputs as well as behaviour change outcomes. Anecdotal evidence, especially from the community workers, is clearly part of the ‘soft’ evidence base but in some cases it seems as if reliance on anecdotal evidence has provided too much reassurance to some EAF groups and masked the need for further quantifiable evaluation.

Many projects are still not making the distinction between awareness raising and behaviour change – in many cases this is because projects are equating outputs (e.g. workshops, leaflets) or awareness raising to ‘behaviour change’; in some cases, it is impossible for projects to go beyond evidence of awareness raising because they have little follow-up with participants.

Few groups distinguish ‘outputs’ from ‘outcomes’ - some do not appear to know the difference whilst others are unsure of how to measure the difference. A vast majority of projects are monitoring their projects in output terms (e.g. number of workshops held) rather than evaluating the outcomes, i.e. who went on to change their behaviour as a result of attending a workshop. There is also some confusion between delivery outcomes (e.g. recording figures of workshop attendees) and behaviour change outcomes, which hardly feature in reporting at all, at least so far. The latter may not be an issue at this stage in the programme, when there are actually few outcomes to report, as long as projects are aware that they need to be captured eventually – in some cases, we suspect they are not sure.

Groups do not think about their own cost-effectiveness or ‘value for money’. Only one group mentioned it at all (Blooming Futures) and most do not consider if competitors could do their work better. Consequently, apparently none of the EAF projects are evaluating the ‘bangs per buck’ aspect of their project. In view of local authority competition for many of the services they provide, this may be a valuable and wasted opportunity to evaluate the community against the public sector.

(ii) Measurement Issues

Some projects lack the technical ability to evaluate behaviour change effectively – access to research and evaluation skills varies markedly across the projects. Larger organisations can draw on previous experience, their own staff or associate consultants; others have brought in academic researchers to undertake their evaluation. In some groups though - and especially the smaller ones - they are staffed by community development workers who have no experience of research or evaluation and are, quite rightly, focusing on delivering the project. There may be a case for more focused and on-going evaluation support for these particular projects. Skills particularly lacking (as we have already flagged to Defra) are survey specification, questionnaire design and data analysis.

The scale of surveys required to generate robust evidence is beyond the resources of most of the EAF projects - it is inevitable that many of the projects will have to use anecdotal or partial evidence since the scale of surveys and participant monitoring required to generate robust evidence is prohibitively large for most EAF projects, and particularly those using a community engagement model. To maximise what the projects are able to do, we suggest that Defra should help projects to exchange what they have learnt so far about the most cost effective ways of monitoring/surveying participants, and perhaps supporting the development of a question bank. 

---

There are an existing model here in the WRAP evaluation best practice toolkit, designed for evaluating local recycling campaigns and programmes, which holds detailed question bank on waste behaviour. [www.wrap.org.uk](http://www.wrap.org.uk)
Some projects expressed concern about ‘survey fatigue’ amongst participants – this was cited by some as a reason for not undertaking a baseline. Some felt that undertaking a survey would make recruitment more difficult and may be off-putting to some participants (e.g. Action for Sustainable Living, Eden Local Agenda 21, WWF).

Target audience cannot be defined in some projects so evaluation of impact is impossible - some projects are not focusing on clearly defined target audiences (e.g. those undertaking wider influencing work) and some are one step removed from the audience, making evaluation of impact difficult. As a result, it will be difficult in some cases to identify who has actually changed their behaviour as a result of the project, and how and why particular approaches have helped particular audiences.

When evaluating impact, projects need to be aware of their audience’s starting points – if programme level conclusions are to be drawn about the impact of different approaches on behaviour change, then it will be important to know what kinds of audiences have been engaged. We are not confident that all of the projects are really aware of who they are attracting, whether these are the most environmentally engaged or civically minded people, and therefore what potential there may for replication/diffusion to the wider community or elsewhere. Some projects are consciously targeting specific audiences (e.g. Global Action Plan, London Sustainability Exchange, Sustain) and others have the potential to differentiate evaluation of impacts (e.g. Cornwall Sustainable Building Trust who attract both voluntary attendees and those made to attend by their employer).

Capturing the ‘diffusion effect’ from community champions and similar approaches will be difficult – some projects (e.g. WWT) raised the issue of how they might demonstrate the diffusion of behaviours from their core participants to the wider community, but none have so far found solutions (and this is a wider problem in evaluating community based projects in any case). This is a further argument for helping similar projects to exchange practice as they develop their methodologies.

The unintended consequences of EAF projects are not recorded - as noted by the Sustainable Consumption Roundtable, many projects have beneficial outcomes that are entirely unrelated to EAF goals but important to capture nonetheless. For example, Peterborough Environment City Trust note the positive impact the project has for its disadvantaged volunteers.

Few groups are returning to evaluate sustained behaviour change – whereas some (e.g. Global Action Plan, National Energy Action, Carplus) are undertaking more or less continuous monitoring, most projects have not considered the possibility of re-canvasing past participants to determine longer term project impacts (e.g. if people are using hippos six months later or if a workshop has caused participants to change recycling habits). In some cases, follow-up is impractical because it would be hard to trace participants (e.g. Common Ground – who have one-off contact at events; BabyGROE – who chose not to store names or e-mail addresses of web site visitors to avoid poor PR), but in many cases is overlooked because projects have not appreciated its importance. We suspect too that some projects which are aiming to re-survey their initial participants may run into difficulties in carrying follow-ups. All too often, attendance at a workshop is seen as the desirable end result rather than the possible resultant behaviour change. Projects should be encouraged to think about how repeat contact could be achieved at minimal time and resource cost to the project.
Few groups are using best practice guidance on evaluation or measurement - only five projects claimed in the electronic survey to be using best practice toolkits, though 12 said they were developing their own impact measurement tools. We suggest that it would be worthwhile publicising which tools are being used/developed amongst the EAF projects, to encourage more sharing and learning – perhaps the next edition of Activate could focus on evaluation and measurement aspects of projects, supported by signposting to best practice advice?

(iii) Learning Issues

Early (and continued) evaluation is not currently evident - some projects are rolling out their approaches before success has been proved. For instance, the Association of Charity Shops does not know if its brand campaign is working with the public (except from feedback from shop staff). Crucially therefore, projects are building on perceived successes based in the most part on anecdotal evidence or intuition about ‘what works’. Where evaluation will be done in year 3, if a project is unsuccessful in certain aspects, there is no time left to tweak it.

Evaluation best practice is not currently shared - project managers appear to be learning a great deal about everything by themselves and (with a few exceptions) they are not sharing best practice. Given that a number of projects are trialling similar experimental approaches, there are clear opportunities to share emerging learning, for example, how to:

- Evaluate pledges (Youth Hostel Association and Peacechild);
- Ensure community groups take a baseline without being discouraged (Eden Local Agenda 21 and WWF);
- Undertake ‘before and after’ participant surveys (e.g. Peterborough Environment City Trust, Envision);
- Measure the impact of community champions/ambassadors (e.g. Action for Sustainable Living, WWT, London Sustainability Exchange);
- Define and use ‘hard’ impact measures, such as utility bills or product sales (e.g. National Energy Action, Conservation Foundation; BabyGROE, BioRegional);
- Sustain self-measurement by participants (e.g. Global Action Plan, WWT, National Federation of Women’s Institute); and
- Develop databases or web tools for recording participation and analysis (e.g. Global Action Plan, BioRegional, Youth Hostel Association).

We are hoping to initiate this process of sharing at our October workshop. However, we suggest that Defra will also need to help sustain momentum throughout the rest of Year 2 to maximise the opportunities to generate innovative evaluation methods through this round of EAF.

5.4 Approaches to Measuring Behaviour Change

One of the difficulties in developing programme-wide indicators of behaviour change is the sheer diversity of projects. As the EAF moves into Year 2, and as projects’ evaluation plans become firmer, we will look in more detail at the kinds of indicators being used to demonstrate behaviour change, and the scope for making comparisons between projects.
In this first research report, we have drawn on the electronic survey to illustrate projects’ initial thinking on (i) what they will measure and (ii) how they will measure it. We will use these findings as a baseline for further exploration in later discussions.

(i) What Projects Intend to Measure

The survey asked projects about a range of ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ indicators that we would expect to see in a behaviour change evaluation, drawing on the key aspects of change identified in the literature. In particular, we were interested to find out how far projects are likely to have moved on from simply measuring change in awareness of participants.

Based on the survey, the picture appears fairly encouraging, with most projects aiming to measure a wide range of indicators. A majority (24) are intending to measure more than four indicators, and some as many as ten (the Soil Association and Somerset Trust for Sustainable Development). However, our discussions indicated a less advanced picture and we have some reservations about the quality and extent of the data that is going to be collected; we will continue to review this in Year 2.

According to the survey, change in awareness is, indeed, the second most commonly cited indicator (26 projects), following closely behind increase in participation (29) (Figure 22). It is not clear at this stage how projects intend to measure participation but our discussions lead us to suspect that much of this data will come from participant surveys rather than direct observation (which introduces the problems of over-claiming with which some projects may not be familiar).

A sizeable number of projects are also intending to capture data on take-up or purchase of sustainable products, including both those specifically promoting a product (e.g. BabyGROE, BioRegional, FSC, MSC) as well as many of the community based lifestyle projects (e.g. Eden Local Agenda 21, Peterborough Environment City Trust, Westden, Conservation Foundation). Some already have good systems in place to monitor sales/take-up and resulting SCP impact (e.g. BabyGROE, BioRegional, MSC).

Figure 22: Intended Indicators for Measuring Behaviour Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase in participation</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in participant awareness</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take-up/purchase of sustainable products</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in knowledge of actions to take</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media reach</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced quantities of waste</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced consumption of resources</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of community social capital</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal financial benefits for participants</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social economy benefits</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other ‘hard’ indicators – waste reduction and decreased resource consumption – are also well represented (in around half of projects), but more social aspects – community capital and social economy benefits – are being measured by only a few projects. Only one project specifically mentioned development of volunteers as an indicator of success. The poor showing for social economy benefits reflects our earlier comments that there may be more scope to develop this outcome aspect of the EAF, given that so many projects are using community volunteers, some of whom may be developing workplace skills and employability.

(ii) How Projects Intend to Measure Behaviour Change

Two questions were asked in the survey as to how projects were intending to evaluate the outcomes in Year 1, then for behaviour change generally. It is clear that – at least with current plans - most of the data that is going to be generated is likely to come from participant surveys and workshop feedback (Figures 23 and 24), as well as from website usage and more anecdotal evidence from project team discussions and Defra project returns.

While this may reflect what is most practicable for the projects to achieve, it has two potential drawbacks:

- The amount of ‘hard’ data based on quantified indicators is going to be relatively limited. We need to assess further the likely sources of this data and whether there are lessons for the other projects about how to capture hard data, or to develop combined impact measures (e.g. the projects intending to use footprinting); and

- The programme level data generated will be highly dependent on the quality, and comparability, of individual project surveys. In our view, this reinforces the argument for (a) further support on questionnaire approaches, including, possibly, access to a shared question-bank and good practice guidance on questionnaire design\(^{16}\) and (b) greater sharing between projects of their survey designs and methods. For example, it is likely that some of the projects using academic evaluators will generate very robust surveys which take into account behaviour change theory (e.g. Exeter and Northampton are both experienced in this area).

\(^{16}\) Or, at very least, signposting to the WRAP evaluation toolkit
In addition, it is very clear that projects are not - with few exceptions - in a position to compare behaviour change against a comparable control group, nor benchmarking evidence against other research. As the programme progresses, therefore, it would be desirable to encourage projects to share emerging evidence of impact, so that they can compare their own performance against their EAF peers.
At the time of our visits, few projects had completed their initial surveys so we are not yet in a position to comment on their coverage or content. Some approaches, however, are fairly well developed (including website hits, documentary evidence, or proxy calculations) and these are reviewed in the table below (Figure 25), including critical observations about issues arising so far.

**Figure 25: Evaluation Methods used by EAF Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Critical evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveys of workshops or events attended</td>
<td>Many groups conduct surveys when participants attend events, e.g. the Royal Yachting Association surveys attendees at the annual boat show and the Conservation Foundation asks workshop participants to fill in a questionnaire.</td>
<td>For the most part, questions simply cover views about the organisation or how the workshop was run, as opposed to sourcing behaviour change information. Furthermore, many groups survey participants only once, so are unable to substantially quantify changes in attitudes or behaviour before and after. It may be possible to extend such questionnaires to include 'before and after' assessments (with follow ups much later to determine long term impacts). Many groups, however, (such as Eden Local Agenda 21) were afraid that pre-workshop surveys would have a damaging effect on the day's proceedings: putting people off the upcoming events; bore them; or dampen energy levels vital for a good start to the event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpline or website usage (“hits”)</td>
<td>The Forest Stewardship Council runs a public helpline for advice on sustainable wood products and counts these calls as part of its evaluation. Common Ground counts hits on its website as the number of people reached.</td>
<td>Some projects appear to have made the simplifying assumption that use of a helpline or website hits is equal to a behaviour change outcome - but clearly one does not necessarily lead to another. The website can be a useful tool for re-engaging with participants but caution should be offered on three grounds. Firstly, many groups are struggling to get websites established because of technical difficulties (e.g. the Youth Hostel Association). Secondly, caution should be taken in relying on the internet as an evaluation tool with disadvantaged groups (who may not access to a computer at home). Finally, the internet is able to provide a wealth of data from users that is only useful if a group has the capacity to process it e.g. Peacechild has collected so much data from schoolchildren through its website, but is unsure how to use this data going forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collation of documentary evidence (or calculations) from participants, e.g. utility bills, till receipts</strong></td>
<td>Proxy calculations, e.g. once it has provided a new household with a hippo, Peterborough Environment City Trust attributes a water saving as an output. Other groups are using the same technique with energy saving light bulbs and loft insulation (energy saved) and composting (landfill diversion).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>This type of evaluation implies two things about the general public/household: that they will continue to use these hippos/light bulbs once they have been installed; and that attitudes have changed significantly for participants to replace these products with similar saving devices when necessary. Further investigation is generally required to ascertain if this is the case, e.g. returning to the same participants six months or one year later.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automatic monitoring – National Energy Action are installing smart meters in participant households, which will automatically monitor the energy savings.</td>
<td>This obviously implies a greater commitment by participants, which may be harder to achieve (although in the case of National Energy Action, most participants will sign up for cost reasons rather than environmental ones).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual statements – the Conservation Foundation is intending to collect energy bills from parishes to ascertain energy savings after workshop events.</td>
<td>This is considerably harder to collect than ‘home-made’ proxy calculations, partly because people may be reluctant to make financial statements public.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Interim Conclusions and Recommendations

This final section draws together the analysis in order to arrive both at conclusions about the EAF programme in Year 1, and then any key actions required on the part of Defra or projects moving into Year 2.

We present our conclusions under the following headings:

- Progress in Year 1 – is EAF on track? (6.1);
- Emerging lessons: project processes (6.2);
- Emerging lessons: behaviour change (6.3); and
- Opportunities, risks and recommendations (6.4);

6.1 Progress in Year 1 – is EAF on track?

This section presents our overarching conclusion about the ‘state of play’ of the EAF programme at the close of Year 1 and whether it remains on track to achieve its core objectives.

Our conclusion at this stage is that EAF is indeed an innovative test bed of ideas and approaches that will make a significant and timely contribution to the SCP evidence base (as well to sustainable development practice in general). Nonetheless, we do note there is considerable variation in both progress and performance across the projects, with some notable successes alongside potential weaknesses.

For example, in some cases projects have already undertaken a significant amount of work on the ground, are well advanced in their work programme and have recorded considerable success. Examples of projects that fall into this category include:

- the Marine Stewardship Council, who have far exceeded their own expectations in terms of the schools stream of their work programme with every school in Surrey now participating rather than selected pilots;
- Eden LA21, by virtue of significant progress against each of their work streams (community buildings, commercial recycling and community groups) and the fact that the council are taking ownership of the commercial recycling work given its success;
- Global Action Plan, who have delivered a range of eco-teams across diverse communities with impressive initial results, particularly in relation to non-traditional members of an Eco Team;
- Envision, who have adapted their well honed approach to the SCP agenda, have utilised their own model for behaviour change and have been successful in deeper and more extended engagement with participants.

In contrast, other projects have spent much of the first year undertaking the preparation and groundwork for their work. In some cases such planning is a fundamental and necessary part of the approach given the nature of the project, while for others it represents a positive response to challenges as they have arisen.

---

17 By their very nature some of these may be interim, subject to further research and subject to change in future years.
However, in our judgement there are cases where this cannot be explained by either of the above and will, unless addressed, significantly reduce the amount of time projects will spend influencing behaviours and, with it, their ability to contribute meaningfully to the EAF programme. Indeed, it has been difficult for us to ascertain what some projects have achieved in Year 1, since very little has yet been done and is reported only vaguely in feedback to Defra. This has limited our own ability to review progress on behavioural change.

We now turn the focus on specific issues and lessons from the point of view of project processes and behaviour change.

### 6.2 Emerging Lessons – Project Processes

The review is concerned with project processes insofar as they influence the capability of projects to deliver behaviour change. The Year 1 review has identified a number of successes in this regard. For example:

- The range of formal and informal partnership arrangements which have emerged/been built upon. In some cases this involves formal joint delivery, whereas in others it concerns the provision of support materials, access to learning networks or creating opportunities for mainstreaming. There has, however, been markedly less exchange across the EAF network itself.

- The steep learning curve experienced by projects recruiting and deploying volunteers and community champions has provided valuable experience for the projects themselves as well as wider learning lessons that are applicable beyond EAF. This includes the time and resources required to both identify and equip these individuals with the requisite skills.

Other aspects of the project process in Year 1 have been less successful. The most notably include:

- Staff turnover which adversely impacts the project;

- Gaps in the capacity of some projects to deliver behaviour change, especially in relation to a range of skills covering marketing, communications, evaluation and monitoring and behaviour change.

The gaps in capacity concerning the behaviour change literature – both the theory and the existing good practice – will likely represent a missed opportunity for projects to hone and refine their approaches and learn from the experiences of others. It is not likely to represent a threat to the programme, particularly as several projects are in fact trialling behaviour change techniques even if they are not necessarily aware of this.

However, in our view the same is not true of the weaknesses in capacity around both monitoring and evaluation. The lack of clarity on outputs and outcomes, in addition to the absence of formative evaluations across many of the projects, is a serious risk. Further monitoring and intervention is required.

### 6.3 Emerging Lessons – Behaviour Change

In Section 6.1 we concluded that some projects – a relative minority at the current time - are relatively advanced in their work programmes and have recorded notable successes in changing behaviour.
Furthermore, many more projects – using Wiltshire Wildlife Trust, the Soil Association and Somerset Trust for Sustainable Development as examples – appear well placed to deliver behaviour change, although at this point there is insufficient information to make a judgement. Our view is that the ability of such projects to deliver behaviour change will depend on the progress made in the next 6 months.

The Year 1 review points to three factors that help explain the variation in performance so far in achieving behaviour change:

- We make a distinction between those organisations who were already well versed in behaviour change approaches and had developed their own approach prior to EAF funding – such as Envision, Global Action Plan and the Marine Stewardship Council – and those which have less experience in this respect. Our interim judgement is that the former have been able to hit the ground running and been more successful in Year 1 at delivering behaviour change. In contrast, the latter have had to go up a steep learning curve and have spent much of Year 1 building internal capacity on behaviour change and preparing for Years 2 and 3.

- Many projects, as already noted, have made insufficient use of the behaviour change theory and, perhaps more surprisingly, the behaviour change practice. As discussed, while it may not represent a threat to the EAF programme, we are of the view that without reference to this material projects may not reach their full potential.

- A key issue relevant across the EAF programme concerns the distinction between raising awareness on the one hand, and changing behaviour on the other. While projects may legitimately point at this stage to awareness raising as a prerequisite to securing deeper engagement and behaviour change, we are concerned that only few of the projects are making headway on the ‘deeper’ engagement elements of their work, and much of the purported success in Year 1 concerns “light” engagement and awareness raising. It will be critical in Years 2 and 3 to test the impact of deep engagement on behaviour change.

We make one final comment here in relation to the distinction between behaviour change on a single issue as opposed to changes in lifestyles in the round. The ability to bring about systematic change in behaviours remains a key objective for the EAF programme and indeed a number of the projects. While a focus on “quick wins” on single issues is a legitimate engagement approach in Year 1, the focus on sustainable lifestyles – and with it ‘difficult’ lifestyle choices – must be retained if the programme is to address these issues.

### 6.4 Opportunities, Risks and Recommendations

The previous sections have outlined in some detail our interim findings concerning project processes, behaviour change and whether the EAF programme is on track.

The purpose of this final section is in two parts: firstly, to summarise the key opportunities and risks to the EAF programme; before secondly making our interim recommendations to Defra.

With regards to the opportunities, the progress of some projects on behaviour change – as well as the potential of others to make progress – has already provided lessons about behaviour change success factors and raised a series of interesting questions that remain outstanding. The programme continues to have the potential to make a significant contribution to UK understanding on behaviour change practice.

Nonetheless, in our judgement there are two major risks to the programme:
The ability of projects to go beyond awareness raising and “light touch” engagement to trial “deep engagement” techniques (which are considered to be more effective means of delivering behaviour change); and

Even if projects do deliver behaviour change, there remain serious questions about the ability of the individual projects and ourselves to capture the evidence and make the case to others.

In view of these opportunities and risk we make the following recommendations:

**Recommendation 1:** A better system for capturing information from the projects is required. We recommend a simplified quarterly report which has minimum requirements, separates outputs and outcomes, includes quantitative data and, providing this captures both the quarterly information as well as a cumulative total for the year, we see no reason for the annual report.

**Recommendation 2:** Defra should retain its “light touch” system of monitoring but, drawing on the new data capture system (proposed under Recommendation 1) alongside their own dialogue with projects, should adopt a stronger reign with projects where progress is either unclear or known to be weak (which may include, for example, calling in projects to demonstrate their progress).

**Recommendation 3:** Defra should consider further opportunities for networking among the projects. Such opportunities may be virtual as well as physical, and we recommend Defra consider an internet forum for projects to access remotely.

**Recommendation 4:** The Defra SCP team should develop and/or disseminate existing material that bridges the gap between the behaviour change literature and the project, in the form of short guides that flag issues in the vein of “key considerations from the behaviour change theory”, “key behaviour change case studies” and so on.

**Recommendation 5:** We support the work Defra has commissioned to support projects in undertaking monitoring and evaluating and this needs to be monitored on an ongoing basis to ensure the projects have the capacity to contribute to the evidence base. In particular we recommend that Defra highlight to the projects the importance of monitoring participants over time, where appropriate, to measure longevity of impact. A specific weakness in the evidence base – and therefore an area where EAF 2005-8 can make a crucial contribution – is deciphering whether an intervention leads to sustained change as opposed to short lived and temporal behavioural responses.

**Recommendation 6:** Defra need to re-emphasise to projects the need to move beyond awareness raising activities alone and test a wider array of behaviour change tools including, in particular, forms of deeper and more sustained engagement.
Appendices
Appendix 1: EAF Topic Guide (Qualitative)

FOR MODERATOR

- The main emphasis of our research is on behaviour change, so do not get bogged down in the “nitty gritty” details of project process;

- This topic guide is intended as an exhaustive list for projects, so not all questions will be relevant for all project visits. In this sense, please cover as and when appropriate; and

- Additionally, some of these issues raised below are for us to ascertain from our visit and should not all be asked directly. Please use common sense.

INTRODUCTION

The main points to clarify to each project are:

- We are not here to evaluate each project individually, but rather to examine the projects at a macro level to establish best practice for other community projects;

- While we will need to understand how the organisation/project functions, we are not interested in project processes (e.g. admin, HR, finance) per se, but only in regard to how these have enabled them to instigate behaviour change;

- We are not here as part of future EAF funding discussions; and

- We can promise project anonymity if preferred.

DOCUMENTATION REQUIRED

- Outcomes/outputs (provided to Defra and internal);
- Participants – who these people are and contact details moving forward (database);
- Evaluations; and
- Accounts (for summary annual reports).
OVERALL SCHEMATIC

- **main focus**: behaviour change
- **secondary focus**: project evaluation and progress
- **tertiary focus**: project processes (impact upon behaviour change)
A PROJECT PROCESS

ORGANISATION HISTORY

Aims
- What are the overarching aims of the organisation?
- What are its aspirations/what does it hope to achieve? Where is its target audience?
- How have these changed over time? How do they link into the local community?

Philosophy/Ethos
- What is the philosophy of the organisation?
- What is the organisation’s guiding principles/the culture of the organisation?

Founding
- Who founded the organisation? Are they still involved? How long ago was it founded?

Geography
- At what spatial scale does it operate? Where are its offices based?

Status
- What is the organisation’s legal status?
- Is it part of a parent organisation?
- Does the organisation have any national affiliates?

PROJECT HISTORY

Origins
- Why was project started? What are its roots?
- Why was it started in this particular way?
- How was it started? Was it a new idea or a spin-off from a previous project?
- Where did the project get its ideas from? (e.g. is it community driven or other)
- How long ago was it founded? Who founded the organisation? Are they still involved?
- Who else was involved in setup? (e.g. partners, community etc)

Aims
- What is overarching aim of project/mission statement? (and if relevant, how do these differ from main organisational aims?)
- Do you have organisational “buy in” for your specific project?
- What is main driving force?
- How does behaviour change fit in with these aims?
- How would you typify different projects of organisation?
- Have you set targets? How have these been set (e.g. community driven, outcome based)? What do you hope to achieve/what are the outputs and outcomes?

Project drivers
- Is the organisation value driven or outcome driven?
- How far has the community developed the organisation as opposed to the organisation driving the community?
- What is the main driving force behind project roll-out and development?

Geography
- At what spatial scale do you operate? Where are your offices based?

Philosophy
- What are the guiding principles of the project?
- What is the overarching philosophy/ethos of the project?
- What do you perceive the culture of the organisation to be?
OPERATIONS

Size
• How many staff?
• What is geographical coverage?
• How big is physical site of offices?

Human Resources/ Training
• What are their backgrounds?
• How long been working for organisation? Are they from local community?
• What are their different responsibilities/ what are they working on? Is there a firm hierarchy or is this much more flexible?
• Type of employment: part-time/ full-time; paid/ voluntary; temporary/ permanent?
• Demographics of staff: gender; disability; age; disadvantaged; BMEs? Has this changed (particularly if project has transferred from one community to another?)
• What has turnover been; have you tried to lower it?
• Do they receive any training (formal/ informal)?
• Where recruit from; any problems in recruiting and how overcome?
• Are there people dedicated specifically to the project?

Governance
• Is governance flat or hierarchical? Who is in charge of decision-making?
• Who are the main people dedicated to the project?

Finances
• EAF funding & Match funding
• Turnover/ profit. Financial planning/ acumen. Self-sufficiency

Marketing
• What is your marketing strategy? How has this changed over time/across communities/as a result of outcomes and outputs or research evaluations?

Administration
• Do you have an administrator? Do you think you could do with more support?
• Are you happy with the way the project is administered? What are your opinions on external administration?

Technology/ IT
• What is level of technology of project? E.g. access to computers
• Do you have website? Do you use email etc to keep in contact with staff and participants? Does this enable information transfer/networking?

PARTNERS

Partnerships
• Who are the main partners? Are they from community/target audience?
• What form do partnerships take – formal/ informal?
• To what extent is project driven by partners?
• What have partnerships contributed? How were partnerships formed?
• What is the relationship like with different partners?

Place/role in community
• How do you perceive your community presence?
• Is there scope for ‘companion planting’ in the community?
• Does a tighter, well-defined community bring about more effective behaviour change?
Board/ trustees
- How big is the board/Who sits on it/How was this decided?
- What is role of board/How often meet/What is influence?
- Who are the trustees? Are they from community/target audience?
- How big an impact do they have?

Funding
- Are there any funding partners? How dependent is project on them?
- What do they contribute?
- How do you see future funding relationships developing?

Intermediaries
- Who are the intermediaries?
- What is their role?
- How big is their involvement; how integral are they/ how much depend on them?
- How regular is contact?
- How involved are they in decision-making; do they sit on the board; to what extent do they drive project/ just deliver project?
- Established links or networks or forged for the purpose of this project?

B  BEHAVIOUR CHANGE, PROGRESS & EVALUATION

BEHAVIOUR CHANGE

Behaviour change aims
- Have you explicitly stated which behaviour/behaviours you wish to change?
- Do you have your own understanding of sustainable behaviour change, or are you allowing participants to decide this themselves?
- How are you seeking to change behaviour?

Type of behaviour change
- How many behaviours are you trying to change? Do they centre around one core issue or multiple issues? Is this based on evaluation results etc?
- Is the behaviour change one of facilitation (e.g. giving out light bulbs) or is it conscious deliberative change?
- Does the organisation have its own ‘agenda’ in instigating behaviour change – i.e. is the project just one aspect of its aims or is it an end in itself? Are you aiming for “soft” or “hard” behaviour change?
- Do you think there is a cross-over/spill-over between different parts of participants lives – e.g. behaviour at work AND at home?

Behaviour Change Promotion
- How has behaviour change been promoted; what techniques have been employed?
- Why was this approach used as opposed to others?
- What methods have been used to achieve social changes – e.g. guilt/pressure?
- Have you tried to promote further methods of behaviour change – such as ‘if you liked this, you might also like this’?
- Are you participants aware of your behaviour change aims; are they aware of the outcome/outputs you want to achieve; do you think it matters?
- How have you considered issues of trust and how to overcome barriers?

Target audience
- Who are your target audiences? How do you define different audiences?
- Do you see your audience as a tightly defined community? How do you find/contact the participants?
- Do you have a marketing strategy?
• How has the audience changed? (in response to project evaluations etc)
• Do you have plans to change/ expand audience?
• Do you have audience contacts who are involved in the organisation?
• Are the main participants in the programme those intended?

Project ethos
• How environmentally ‘extreme’ does the project see itself as?
• What does it feel like to work at the organisation?
• What is the organisation’s cultural identity?
• Where does the project sit within the community?
• How does ethos impact on behaviour change?

PROGRESS

Year One progress to date
• What have different projects/ sub-project achieved?
• Have you achieved what you set out to in year one? Have you met your aims and targets?
• How have you moved away from what you originally set out to do? How?
• Have you done anything innovative – have you provided any new or fresh thinking in the design or implementation of the project?
• Did you have regular meetings to plan direction of project and timings of roll out?

Successes/ challenges
• What were the main challenges/ success factors in setup, development and roll-out?
  What do you consider to have been most successful factors/ the biggest challenges?
  How have these changed over time?
• Would you say you have achieved value for money?
• Have you achieved any wider benefits for the local area?
• Do you see any best practice examples that you would want to pass onto other organisations? Would you say that some elements are transferable to other projects/regions?

Looking forward to yr 2 and 3
• Do you have an exit strategy in place?
• Have you started to think about how the project will be sustainable or is the project a standalone entity that is not intended to continue past EAF funding?
• Have you started to think about how you can share what you have learnt with other projects?

EVALUATION

Impact Evaluation
• How will you be (have you been) measuring the impact of your projects (e.g. number of light bulbs given out)?
• What are you already measuring?
• Are you evaluating project against targets that were set?

Behaviour Change Evaluation
• How do you intend to measure behaviour change? What do you intend to measure?
• Will you be measuring interim steps that act as precursors to behaviour change, even if change is not yet evident?
• Have you started the self-evaluation processes – are you monitoring successes and challenges. If yes, how?
• Have you thought about transferring your evaluation findings to similar projects?
Other Evaluations
- Is the project involved with any other research and development?
- Is the project involved in any other marketing?
- Are you doing research in any possible new markets?

C NEXT STEPS

Discuss next steps with the project in regards to future visits but predominantly how to move forward to measure participant’s behaviour change.

Thank you for your time
Appendix 2: EAF Survey Top Line (Quantitative)

This document presents top line data from the EAF Evaluation. The research was undertaken by Brook Lyndhurst on behalf of Defra through an electronic survey sent to all project managers in the EAF programme. All 35 projects responded throughout the month of June 2006.

Where percentages do not sum to 100, this may be due to computer rounding, the exclusion of ‘don’t know’ or ‘not stated’ categories, or multiple answers. An asterisk denotes any value less than half a percent but greater than zero.

Section 1: Organisational Background and Project Details

Q1. Organisation Name
Q2. EAF Project Title
Q3. Respondent(s) name(s)

Q4. Would you describe your project as mainly operating ….? (Tick one)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationally</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regionally</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally – district/borough level</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally – town/village level</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5. Approximately how many staff does your organisation employ on a permanent basis? (Tick one)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-49</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q6. How many permanent staff (directly employed by your organisation) worked on this EAF project in Year 1? (Write in number)

Q7. In Year 1, has the EAF project employed/used any of the following? (Tick all that apply)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government trainees (e.g. Intermediate Labour Market workers)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other work placements</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid community workers</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid external consultants/ advisors (including academic)</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid external consultants/ advisors (including academic)</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise within Defra (e.g. marketing/ press support)</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q8. Thinking about the capacity and skills within your organisation, what level of expertise would you say the organisation has in each of the following areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>A significant amount</th>
<th>A fair amount</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Not very much</th>
<th>None at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and monitoring</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement/ performance indicators</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and media</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable development agenda</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of behaviour change theory</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of behaviour change best practice from other organisations</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial/ accountancy</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2: Behaviour Change

Q9. Which of the following areas of Sustainable Development (SD) and Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP) are the main foci of your project? (Tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumer goods (e.g. food, household goods)</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource use (e.g. energy, water)</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste and recycling</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction/ building/ design</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyles – general</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood/ street issues (e.g. litter, vandalism, parks)</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity and conservation</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Please</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q10. Which of the following, if any, would you say are core aspects of your project’s approach? (Tick all that apply)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase awareness/knowledge of Sustainable Consumption and Production issues</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase awareness/knowledge of the personal actions participants can take</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertake a measurement/ audit of participants’ impact</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide ‘hard’ skills (e.g. DIY skills for sustainable construction)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide ‘soft’ skills (e.g. leadership, facilitation, negotiation)</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide sustainable services and “gadgets” (e.g. low energy light bulbs)</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate a self-learning process among participants</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signpost participants to other organisations and grants</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate/exemplify sustainability in practice</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting the personal benefits/“business case” for sustainability</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring communities together to tackle SCP issues collectively</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Please specify</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q11. Would you say your project is, in the main, establishing new community groups/networks or capitalising on existing community groups/networks? (Tick all that apply)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishing new community groups/networks</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalising on existing community groups/networks</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Please specify</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q12. How well informed do you feel about the lessons from the behaviour change literature (produced by Defra and others)? Would you say you are .... (Tick one)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Informedness</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well informed</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly well informed</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little informed</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very well informed</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all well informed</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q13. How interested would you be to find out more about such work? (tick one)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Interest</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very interested</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Interested</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very interested</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all interested</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q14. Thinking about the model of behaviour change your project is using, which one of the following best characterises your approach? (Tick one)

- Building on approaches and methods used by your own organisation in previous projects 49%
- Applying/replicating approaches which have been tested by others. 11%
- Testing approaches and methods developed from theoretical research on behaviour change 6%
- Seeking to test specifically elements of the “Enable, Encourage, Engage, Exemplify” framework from the UK Sustainable Development Strategy 11%
- Developing and testing completely new/novel approaches and methods to deliver behaviour change 23%

Q15. Briefly, are there any lessons your have learned in Year 1 about how to engage participants or change behaviour which you think would be useful for other projects to know about? (write in)

Section 3: Target Audience

Q16. We know that many projects are targeting several different audiences. Which of the following groups would you say your project is specifically targeting? (Tick all that apply)

- Individuals/consumers 74%
- Households 51%
- Staff within your own organisation 17%
- Local community groups/workers 60%
- Other voluntary organisations/ NGOs 54%
- Public Sector Professionals (e.g. teachers/midwives) 26%
- Local Authorities 49%
- Individuals businesses 40%
- Business decision-makers/influencers 17%
- Faith leaders 14%
- Trade federations 9%
- Policy makers 29%
- Other, please specify 34%

Q17. Thinking about the socio-demographics of your target audience, which of the following groups would you say your project is specifically targeting? (Tick all that apply)

- Children and young people 43%
- Older people 37%
- Black and Asian Minority Ethnic Groups 27%
- Faith groups 23%
- Disadvantaged groups 40%
- Affluent groups 30%
- Other, please specify 47%
Q18. And, thinking about the level of environmental awareness of your target audience, which of the following groups would you say your project is targeting? (Tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Already very environmentally aware/active</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already reasonably environmentally aware/active</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very environmentally aware/active</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all environmentally aware/active</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q19. And how often has (will have) the project been in contact with these individuals? (Tick one only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-off contact and no follow-up contact planned</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial contact and single follow up</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial contact and repeated contact</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not yet made contact with participants/target audience</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are different levels of contact across participants</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not applicable</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q20. How easy or difficult, in general, would you say it has been in Year 1 to reach your target audiences? Would you say it was…..? (Tick one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very easy</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly easy</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly difficult</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very difficult</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q21. What if any, have been the barriers to reaching your target audiences (noting where applicable, any differences between different target audiences)? (Write in box)

Section 4: Using Intermediaries

Some of the projects are using “intermediaries” – either individuals or groups – to reach the target audience on their behalf. For example, finding community champions/volunteers to engage residents or professional groups to deliver messages (e.g. midwives offering advice to new parents)

Q22. Which of the following types of “intermediary”, if any, are involved in the delivery of your project? (Tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediary Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionals (e.g. midwives, school teachers)</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community champions recruited from the local community</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers (corporate, via work)</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers (personal, via own time)</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business supply chains</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/not use intermediaries</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q23. How easy or difficult would you say it has been in year 1 to engage these intermediaries? (Tick one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Easy</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly Easy</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly Difficult</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very difficult</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q24. Briefly, what have been the barriers to reaching or recruiting intermediaries? (Please mention specifically if there have been any differences in the ease of recruiting different intermediaries – for example if you are recruiting both volunteers and community champions).

Section 5: Progress

Q25. Thinking about your overall progress to date, taken against your Year 1 plan and targets, would you say you are currently...? (Tick one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well ahead of schedule</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly ahead of schedule</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On schedule</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly behind schedule</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well behind schedule</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q26. To what extent, if at all, has the year 1 work changed from what you had intended to do in the original plan? (Tick one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changed considerably</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed somewhat</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not changed very much</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not changed at all</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q27. Why would you say the project had changed?

Section 6: Partnership work and networking

Q28. To what extent are you currently networking with other organisations? (Tick one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A great extent</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fair extent</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very much</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q29. How much contact does the project have specifically with other EAF projects? (Tick one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant contact</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A fair amount of contact</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some contact</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very much contact</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No contact at all</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q30. And who would you say are partners/interested parties in your EAF project? (Tick all that apply)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Authorities</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community/resident groups</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Development Agencies or Assemblies</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary and community sector groups</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other EAF projects</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public sector organisations (e.g. schools, hospitals)</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 7: Monitoring and Measuring

Q31. Did you/will you carry out an assessment of participants’ attitudes and behaviour before project activities started?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q32. Briefly, what did you include in this assessment prior to the project starting? (Write in box)

Q33. Was this assessment used to set targets for behaviour change outcomes? (Tick one)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q34. Why was an assessment not conducted prior to project activities starting? (Write in box)

Q35. Which, if any, of the following indicators is/will the project be using to measure “success”. (Tick all that apply)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase in participant awareness of SCP issues</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in participant knowledge of specific actions they can take to promote SCP</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media reach (e.g. websites, advertising)</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in participation in sustainable activity (e.g. recycling, composting)</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced consumption of resources (water, energy)</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced quantities of waste</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take-up/purchase of sustainable services or products</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social economy benefits (e.g. jobs for ILM workers, support for low income families)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of community social capital (e.g. networks, social groups)</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal financial benefits for participants</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Please specify</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q36. Which of the following sources of evidence will you use to assess the outcomes of the project at the end of Year 1? (Tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Evidence</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project team discussions</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defra project returns</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A formal interim project evaluation</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantified key performance indicators</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant behaviour/attitude research</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing “behaviour change” impact toolkits or recommended methods (e.g. Eco-footprint, WRAP communications evaluation toolkit)</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bespoke “behaviour change” impact measurement tools developed for this project</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking against other organisations/research findings</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q37. What methods do you intend to use to measure the extent to which participant behaviour has changed, or been influenced by, your project? (Tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop/event feedback form</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-off questionnaire survey</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat questionnaire surveys</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpline or website usage/“hits”</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collation of documentary evidence from participants (e.g. utility bills, till receipts)</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparisons with control groups who have not been engaged by the project</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparisons with other benchmark data (e.g. existing published surveys, industry data, best practice case studies)</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative interviews/focus groups with participants.</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Please specify</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q38. Based on your own experience of the EAF process in this round (2005-08), how good or poor have you found the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Fairly good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Fairly poor</th>
<th>Very poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The application process</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice and information at the beginning of the project</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice and information during the project</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility for you to innovate/ experiment</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands-on support and guidance on key issues</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of what you are being asked to report on</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reporting process</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for networking</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q39. How would you say EAF compares to other funding streams/grants you have secured? Would you say it...? (Tick one only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compares very favourably</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compares quite favourably</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is about the same</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compares quite unfavourably</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compares very unfavourably</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q40. Finally, is there anything else on any other subject that you would like to feed back? (Write in box)