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Executive summary

The Environmental Action Fund (EAF) was a Defra funding programme which supported third sector groups to further the Government’s sustainable development objectives within England. There have been several rounds of funding covering discrete three-year periods. In this round (2005-2008), Defra wished to support projects that would:

- Contribute to the sustainable consumption agenda identified in the Government’s Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP) Framework;
- Build the capability and commitment of communities to change consumption patterns;
- Move from awareness of consumption challenges into action;
- Have England-wide coverage or demonstrate models with potential for wider application;
- Go beyond single-issues covered by other more specific programmes to address consumption and lifestyles ‘in the round’;
- Attempt some leap of innovation in social or market activity;
- Be led by community sector organisations (but developing partnerships was encouraged).

Just under £7 million was awarded to 35 organisations over three years. These organisations were asked to apply for funding each year and were required to match what they were allocated from the EAF with equal funding from external sources.

The organisations receiving funding were extremely diverse. They ranged from small local groups to large organisations with national reach; from those who had been working on sustainable development for years to those who were entirely new to the subject. What they used the grant for also varied greatly – developing or testing something they were already doing, establishing totally new projects within existing organisations and testing new ideas or concepts. The models and tools that they used to do this are explored in more detail below (section 1.2).

1.1 Evaluating the EAF fund

Brook Lyndhurst was appointed as fund evaluator half way through Year 1 of the fund. The scale and scope of the EAF evaluation was extensive. In addition to monitoring outputs and outcomes, Defra wanted to learn lessons about the behaviour change process – both in general and specifically when delivered by third sector organisations. Because of this, a great deal of emphasis was put on analysis of what aspects of the approaches used did and did not work.

The evaluation consisted of two key elements: (1) a formative evaluation of the whole programme by Brook Lyndhurst; (2) an evaluation by each project of its own work. (The quality of the latter being enhanced by independent evaluation advice offered by Defra to the projects).

Brook Lyndhurst’s evaluation

The key components of Brook Lyndhurst’s evaluation are outlined in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Comprised</th>
<th>Contribution to evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visits to the projects</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>2-3 hours each project</td>
<td>Built a sense of what the projects were doing and the barriers they were facing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-survey of projects</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>30-40 questions</td>
<td>Gave comparable data across projects. Helped gauge extent of views/activities and substantiate hypotheses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress check with Defra staff</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Half day discussion</td>
<td>Gave the opportunity to cross-check findings and feedback insight to Defra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant interviews</td>
<td>Year 2-3</td>
<td>174 interviews of 20-30 mins</td>
<td>Insight on changes in behaviour and participant interaction with the projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National survey of</td>
<td>Year 2-3</td>
<td>7 waves of c. 1000</td>
<td>Nationally representative benchmark of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 | The components of Brook Lyndhurst’s evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UK public</th>
<th>UK adults</th>
<th>attitudes and behaviours undertaken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output and evaluation reports</td>
<td>Year 1-3</td>
<td>2-4 reports per project/ year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops with projects &amp; Defra</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Full day sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rich information on project activities, outputs and outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informing projects of emerging findings, gauging reactions, discussing key issues, networking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limitations of the evidence
The limitations of the evaluation data were 1) a lack of project outcomes data overall (particularly in relation to certain types of activity – e.g. events and publications); 2) a reliance on self-selecting samples to gauge projects’ success; 3) participant self-reporting of outcome data where these were provided; 4) a general lack of clarity about what projects’ own data referred to and 5) a lack of data which might allow cross-project comparisons.

These weaknesses were addressed by the evaluators being able to triangulate from different sources of information, by projects being given evaluation guidance and support and by standard reporting frameworks and survey questions being used.

Strengths in the evaluation data
Together, the material gathered from the different strands of the evaluation formed a rich source of triangulated evidence and enabled both the evaluation team and Defra to follow project progress at close hand and take lessons on board as the fund progressed. This resulted in a formative evaluation in the true sense of the word: working closely with the projects throughout the three year process allowed practical lessons about behaviour change to be learnt by all parties – something which is not possible in more summative evaluations.

1.2 Engagement models
As already touched on, projects used many different approaches to deliver their objectives and a broad classification was developed which distinguished between the following project types:

1. **community action**: working to change the behaviour of individuals at a community level
2. **changing organisations**: working to change the behaviour of their own organisations or the behaviour of their members
3. **market development**: working to increase demand for/ availability of sustainable products
4. **policy landscape**: seeking to influence policy (either as a core purpose or as an adjunct)

EAF projects had the scope to tackle the so-called ‘value-action gap’ between awareness raising and the uptake of pro-environmental behaviours. Defra’s 4Es model for behaviour change is predicated on the idea that behaviour change models need to use a package of self-reinforcing measures in order to translate awareness into action and ‘unlock’ people’s bad habits. This is indeed what many of the projects attempted to do: in each case, they used a variety of means to engage their audiences and a range of tools to deliver their work (see table below).

Although the academic work on behaviour change is complex, the projects were (knowingly or unknowingly) looking to achieve many of the motivational drivers identified in the theoretical literature - getting participants to believe issues are important; building an understanding of personal impacts on those issues; getting participants to want to change those impacts; persuading them that doing so is the kind of thing people like them do; giving them the know-how and tools to make the changes, etc.... Their work also tied into thinking around the role of personal drivers and personal identity, external social and institutional factors, human agency and some of the newer social marketing approaches. This is explored further in the body of the full report.

---

2 Engage, enable, encourage, exemplify
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall classification</th>
<th>Models used under this classification</th>
<th>Approaches to engagement and tools used to deliver work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community action</td>
<td>Community action groups</td>
<td>Targeting people through social networks; community engagement and outreach; providing facilitation and support/ advice; training/ supporting ambassadors; outreach work; events; pledges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EcoTeams</td>
<td>Cascading through membership organisations; provision of materials and facilitation (direct facilitation or facilitation training); measuring impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working in schools/ with schoolchildren</td>
<td>Use of intermediaries (e.g. teachers); group working; workshops; footprinting/ energy audits; pledges; providing freebies; learning through experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working with and through faith communities (directly or through ambassadors)</td>
<td>Use of membership groups, intermediaries, ambassadors and champions; holding talks/ sermons; activities and events; staff training/development; energy audits; tailored messages (‘hooks’); publications; pledges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working with low income communities</td>
<td>Resident engagement; awareness raising; education programmes; use of ‘hooks’ (e.g. health/ finances); audits; learning through experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doorstep support</td>
<td>Surveys of households’ behaviours; provision of products and services (incl. freebies); signposting to sources of support; installation of devices (e.g. smart meters); audits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public education/ large-scale public events</td>
<td>Use of intermediaries (e.g. midwives; charity shops; estate agents); events; newsletters; websites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Changing organisations | Engaging with members and visitors | Cascading information through membership; tailoring information; demonstrations; educational activities; consultations; leadership by example; using places that many people visit as examples |
|                       | Changing ways organisations operate internally | Designing/ re-designing internal policies and/ or systems; staff training; changing facilities; using seminars/ meetings and steering groups to influence colleagues; leading by example |
|                       | Supporting external programme development | Building knowledge and capacity; workshops; seminars; training programmes; one-on-one support |

| Market development     | Removing barriers for final consumers | Use of intermediaries; direct communications to final customers (e.g. via formal media and publicity channels incl. web); celebrity endorsement; training courses; directories of services; guides; provision of products and services (e.g. recycling collections) |
|                       | Improving information flows between demand and supply sides | Use of information networks (e.g. websites); stakeholder events; signposting buyers/ suppliers; setting up buyers’ & suppliers’ clubs; commissioning research to build a business case |
|                       | Brokering supply-chain relationships to increase availability of sustainable products | Working with ‘gatekeepers’ of supply and demand (e.g. buyers; service providers; retailers; food service companies); increasing consumer awareness; developing skills and training |
|                       | Removing supply-side limitations       | Working with suppliers (e.g. farmers) to increase production or improve quality of materials (e.g. through giving talks); campaigns |

| Policy landscape       | (Engage, Enable)                       | Networking events; seminars |

Table 2 | Means of engaging audiences and tools used to deliver work in each project type.
1.3 Outputs

Although some achievements may be attributed to more than one source, the amount and diversity of activity that took place under the EAF was considerable. For example:

- the involvement of at least 78,000 participants;
- the involvement of between 5,500 and 6,000 volunteers;
- the support of around 190 community action groups (many of them new);
- the organisation of hundreds of events, attracting hundreds of thousands of visitors;
- the development of service infrastructure;
- the involvement of at least 3,000 people in EcoTeams;
- the running of hundreds of workshops and training courses;
- the receipt of pledges from at least 10,000 people;
- the design of websites that have received hundreds of thousands of visitors;
- the formation of hundreds of partnerships with businesses, local authorities and other groups;
- the generation of local and national media coverage;
- the distribution of magazines and other printed material to hundreds of thousands of individuals and households;
- the creation of a multitude of toolkits and other resources;
- research and development activity;
- the auditing of hundreds of buildings and installation of energy saving measures.

Despite the scale of outputs however, it is impossible to estimate the total reach (the number of people engaged) of activities undertaken with any degree of precision. Neither is it possible to estimate the total reach for individual projects or projects types. There are a number of reasons for this: for instance, not all projects provided numeric data on the total numbers of activities they conducted and some did not measure or robustly estimate how many people took part in activities or received publications.

The figure of 78,000 quoted above is a best estimate of the minimum number that were ‘actively’ engaged in the projects (i.e. that undertook a specific activity as a result of the project rather than simply being reached by a magazine, publication or open public event). If publications and events are included, the potential reach of EAF amounts to millions of people.

1.4 Outcomes

Behaviours

By the end of the three years of EAF funding, participants were doing more than they were before, and were doing so in greater proportions that the general public. Nevertheless, it is obvious from the outcome data that certain behaviours proved a lot easier to change than others. Easiest were waste/recycling and energy, intermediate were general consumption and water, and hardest was transport (see section 1.5).

Overall, the EAF appears to have had most success in encouraging small to moderate increases in existing behaviours (e.g. recycling) and in the adoption of many small, low impact behaviours in other areas (e.g. energy saving and water). There were also documented successes in encouraging the purchase of sustainable food although this was seen as being a relatively confusing area given conflicts between food that is organic, local, seasonal, etc...

There were few successes in areas which would have required major lifestyle changes by participants, such as micro-generation, flying and car use - but this also reflects the fact that few projects focused on them.

Some of the best evidenced and biggest changes occurred where an organisation was changing its own practices as part of its wider engagement with sustainability, and also in some of the market development projects where projects had helped to re-engineer supply chains in favour of sustainable products.

---

2 Third sector projects typically survive on a patchwork of grant funding from many sources; it needs to be borne in mind that the achievements reported in the EAF may be attributable to more than one source of funding.

3 The evidence on outcomes comes from projects’ evaluation reports, the annual project e-survey, information provided during project visits and interviews with participants themselves.

4 Reducing energy use, waste and CO₂ emissions and increasing sustainable food purchases were the areas that projects most often concentrated on.

5 Insulation was, in some ways, a surprise as despite it not requiring major lifestyle change there was relatively little evidence of uptake in participant households other than where the project led the installation activity.
Nevertheless, these successes did highlight the limits to voluntary behaviour change - they tended to be localised and relatively small scale.

**Personal capacity**

The evidence suggests that projects had an important impact on building the personal capacity of participants, even though much of this evidence is anecdotal (e.g. through projects witnessing first-hand the changes in those they were working with). Examples include inspiring participants, fostering their commitment, building their confidence, increasing their general understanding of sustainability and their knowledge of high-impact behaviours, making them aware of particular products, and so forth.

Most projects felt they had achieved significant impact in raising awareness and nearly half on building specific knowledge to enable action (either now or in the future) - e.g. through subject specific training, providing guidance and tips on specific actions, etc... A similar proportion reported changing the willingness of participants to take action. Both in the case of building knowledge to enable action and changing willingness to do so, however, the strength of achievement seems less than the aspiration the projects had at the start of the EAF. This discrepancy suggests that awareness raising has been more easily achieved than other capacity building goals.

**Community action and capacity building for delivering in the long term**

There is evidence of success in building community capacity e.g. in increased social interaction and social cohesion at a community level, in the development of community action groups and community activists, in building stronger community networks, in influencing organisations and supply chains, in building resources that can be used to bring about action on sustainable consumption/lifestyles and in the knowledge of staff and volunteers working on projects.

Projects were less successful in building community action or developing community social capital/ wider social benefits - this in part reflects smaller numbers prioritising these areas.

**Value for money**

Value for money cannot be assessed on a consistent basis because of the diversity of projects, the variation in depth and breadth of community engagement, the blurred boundaries around how much of each project the EAF funded, and an absence of unit cost data for individual project activities or components. That said, there seems to be little correlation between project funding and either reported outputs or project outcomes.

- Overall, there was no clear pattern in which projects achieved high levels of activity;
- Some of the projects receiving the most funding have been unable to demonstrate significant project outcomes (though they may have delivered a wide range of project outputs);
- Some of the projects receiving the smallest grants (c. £90,000 - £150,000) have produced strong evidence of output delivery, of influencing their communities and, in some cases, actual changes in behaviour;
- Low levels of outputs came from a mixture of project types.

Nevertheless, although the big picture is mixed, there are examples which represent ‘good value’. In particular, successful market development projects delivered strong project outcomes, and projects which engaged people through a) a combination of door-knocking, advice giving and providing goods and services (including ‘freebies’) and b) EcoTeams® appear to be an effective way of reaching large numbers for short duration engagement.

Conversely, because there is little data on the impact of publications and events, spending on these cannot be found in and of themselves to represent good value for money.

**Additionality**

The evidence points to additionality in a number of different areas:

- changes to participant behaviour overall – EAF participants are doing more than they were before they took part in the projects and the proportional increase is far greater than that of the general public over

---

6 The reference to EcoTeams refers to the delivery model and is not an endorsement of any delivery organisation.
the same time frame. We can therefore deduce they are doing more than they would have done otherwise and that the projects built on wider shifts in pro-environmental attitudes;

- the speed and confidence with which participants made changes – participants felt that by being given the tools to make changes they knew they needed to make, they had been able to progress further and with more confidence than they would otherwise have done;
- market expansion – markets targeted by the projects have expanded in ways that have not been matched in other comparable markets.

The evidence also points to the programme doing more than simply displacing other activity. Projects:

- set up new services, new community action groups and provided support that was not available elsewhere;
- entered new areas of market activity, accelerated changes within current markets and rendered them more effective;
- were able to conduct R&D activity, take risks and run activities on a larger scale than would otherwise have been possible;
- project managers acted as catalysts for change within organisations.

Overall, they seem to have successfully built on wider shifts in public attitudes towards the environment and achieved impacts above and beyond those seen in the behaviour of 'average' citizens.

**Spill-over effects**

There is anecdotal evidence of spill-over effects in certain areas, though few projects set out to log or measure them. Of the examples found, most relate to secondary impacts on other people rather than spill-overs from one behaviour to another.

**Longevity**

Few tried to assess whether any observed behaviour change was sustained. Increased capacity amongst participants was often seen as a better indicator of longer term impact. Nevertheless, a small number of participants did produce evidence of longevity.

Where projects worked on organisational practice or supply chain relationships, there is a good chance that changes will be locked in for the medium to long term. A few projects were also able to 'lock-in' behaviours through choice editing.

**Catalytic individuals**

A small number of individuals often played a key part in how projects developed and projects’ success was often as much due to the individuals leading them as the engagement models used. ‘Catalytic’ individuals operated at all levels. Their enthusiasm, commitment, knowledge and personality persuaded people to take part and they often displayed considerable entrepreneurial capacity. This is certainly an important factor in considering the replicability of what was achieved.

### 1.5 What worked?

**Engaging audiences**

The kinds of audiences that were engaged - Although some projects did engage a broad range of people, projects were especially successful in engaging participants who were ‘greener’ and more active in their communities than the UK population overall. This does not signify wasted effort though – people who were already ‘switched on’ to community or environmental concerns were often helped to become more effective activists or to focus activities on the environment.

Projects were also successful in engaging a range of internal audiences, both within their own organisations and organisations with which they were working. These proved particularly important in giving them momentum and enabling lessons learned to be spread more widely. Where projects were dependent on close

---

7 i.e. effects on people or behaviours that were not directly targeted by the project
8 although they did not necessarily have a smaller environmental footprint
co-operation with external bodies to carry out their work (e.g. schools and faith groups), internal engagement was key to giving them a platform from which to work as well as giving them the credibility to do so.

**How audiences were reached** - In many cases, projects had relatively privileged access to audiences that would otherwise have been difficult to engage with en masse, be it through the credibility they had with the public, the 'captive' audiences of large membership organisations, their deep knowledge of the sector, or the reach and focus provided by partner organisations (e.g. schools and faith institutions). They made use of this position by employing many of the engagement tools described in section 1.2 – holding events, workshops, and courses, using mainstream publicity channels, developing publications, visiting people at home and so forth – the most successful of which are described below. In terms of engaging internal audiences, one of the big success stories was inviting senior staff to join project steering groups as this acted as a catalyst for spreading the principles of the project more widely within organisations.

**How they were motivated** - Projects were particularly successful in five areas:
- Building a stronger sense of personal responsibility
- Giving people facts about how their daily life impacts on the environment
- Making people believe that personal action does make a difference
- Making people feel more confident that they can achieve the changes needed
- Giving practical advice on what to do

The tools which worked most effectively in engaging audiences and building this motivation were:
- face-to-face contact (applicable to all audiences, from businesses and suppliers to the general public);
- hand-holding (e.g. through facilitation and providing people with the personal tools to overcome barriers);
- repeated contact (e.g. through follow-up contact to remind participants and show interest in what they are doing); and
- providing tangible/ visible representation of any changes made (e.g. through auditing or measuring change).

Other factors of importance included:
- knowing the audience well (which in turn enabled appropriate projects to be developed, helped projects start from where their audience was 'at', etc...);
- pitching information specifically to the audience (i.e. tailoring messages given, being able to offer appropriate advice or services);
- finding audience hooks (e.g. using financial arguments as drivers in communities particularly sensitive to cost; linking to positive desires/ aspirations such as health and quality of life; targeting moments of change in peoples’ lives);
- normalising green behaviours (e.g. showing people who are taking action that they are not isolated);
- making action more convenient to participants (to counter the perception that making changes is difficult and/or time consuming);
- getting participants to take small steps and provide early, tangible results (reinforcing the theory that there is a need to start where people are comfortable and reinforcing a sense of capability by achieving early successes);
- using specific 'tools' such as pledges, freebies, gadgets and rewards (pledges can communicate what people should be doing and when scrutinised or followed-up can be found to produce behaviour change amongst those who made the pledge. This is most likely to be effective for 'easy actions' though; freebies and gadgets can create enthusiasm and help projects gain access to participants, but they are not always used; rewards can be an effective way of reinforcing a sense of achievement);  
- auditing or measuring participants’ use of resources (which can act as a motivational tool by making impacts visible and creating a feeling of agency but also risk being ineffective when before and after samples are non-comparable);
- demonstrating or exemplifying new behaviours (particularly using celebration or positive experiences e.g. learning by doing);
- re-freezing good behaviours (e.g. through adopting processes so that a behaviour is made routine; training or teaching people to manage themselves; and choice editing).

**Key barriers to audience uptake of new behaviours** - As we have already seen, certain behaviours were particularly challenging for projects and these often had specific barriers to engagement. Projects working on transport for example suffered from a scarcity of public transport in rural areas, the number of stakeholders involved in service provision, participants’ safety concerns, and many other barriers. Food was sometimes felt
to be a complex subject which was full of contradictions, while taking large-scale action around energy and insulation was reported to be so complicated and difficult that people often lost interest. Issues around buying more sustainable products included their availability in particular areas; their affordability and the limited choice on offer.

There were more generic barriers to uptake as well though. On a personal level for project participants, these include the loss of personal control (especially where new actions or behaviours are quite different from the old ones); a fear of the unknown; people feeling overwhelmed by what they were being asked to do; or simply lacking the time or skill to take action. Project participants were also affected by external factors such as infrastructural limitations which made it difficult to convert good intentions into action, institutional and structural barriers which presented particular obstacles to those working with organisations, negative news stories which make people doubt the worth of what they are doing, and the public image of sustainable consumption resulting in participants feeling stigmatised.

**Behaviour change models**

**Community action groups** - These were successful in building a sense of ownership over environmental issues and a sense of empowerment, capability and personal motivation as a result. They provided a structure to focus individuals’ desire to act\(^9\) and gave participants access to new skills and viewpoints, mutual support and encouragement which may translate into increased community capacity to support environmental action in the longer term. They did however take a long time to establish momentum and, because continued successes were central to the motivation of group members, were limited to what could be tackled in small, achievable steps (e.g. events and small, everyday behaviours). Because initiatives taken were the decision of group members, their behavioural outcomes were also relatively unpredictable. Groups needed cohesiveness in order to be successful, and this common ‘glue’ needed to be relatively strong (more than simply living on the same street). Lastly, their success also relied on skilled facilitators with knowledge of the sustainability agenda and considerable people and community development skills, and it is therefore a relatively resource intensive model.

**EcoTeams** - These bring many of the same advantages as community action groups, but are more prescriptive over the targeted outcomes and had notable successes on key headline behaviour goals such as better energy management (especially in relation to heating). The semi-facilitated model shows good potential for being scaled up, but spill-over effects are unknown\(^10\), as is the extent to which behaviours continue in the longer term.

**Working in schools** - This provided access to large audiences and offered the opportunity of mainstreaming environmental action. The impact on pupils was often an educational one, although projects were also successful in provoking small changes in everyday behaviours that were within pupils’ control. The impact on schools themselves could often be more significant (e.g. in changing energy use patterns or procurement). Key to the success of working with schools is the buy-in from school staff, followed-up contact, and projects themselves providing all the resources needed to deliver programmes and maintain momentum.

**Working with faith communities** – This is an effective means of reaching large numbers with messages tailored to their personal values. The institutional frameworks linked to faith can also lock-in changes in the longer term. Successful projects relied on long-term relationships with leaders or individuals within congregations, good understanding of how the community functions, credibility, and the ability to provide hands-on advice and support. This said, there was little evidence of these types of projects creating sustained changes in attitudes or behaviour.

**Working with low income communities** – Projects working with this group helped empower low income households, contribute to social inclusion and community cohesion and improve quality of life. Where choice editing was used (e.g. in re-negotiating service contracts) they also made significant environmental gains but voluntary action mainly focused on small, everyday habits. Projects’ success came from adapting ‘hooks’ (e.g. promoting cost saving and getting involved in local environmental activities); providing hands-on support (e.g. through associations or influential individuals) and using networking as a way of initiating and sustaining contact.

---

\(^9\) i.e. attracting people who might be more active and motivated than average anyway

\(^10\) e.g. the impact on behaviours outside the home
Working with champions, ambassadors and volunteers - The impact of working with intermediaries was largely positive, enabling projects to extend their reach and impact, and providing a cost-effective means of, for example, facilitating local groups. Contributions were most effective where projects paid close attention to recruitment and offered training and on-going support.

Doorstep support – Door-stepping provided access to large audiences (including people who might not be reached by other means) and is a model that could be widely replicated. Successful projects were able to offer practical help and advice to the householder and often used freebies to ‘get through the door’. They also conducted follow-up contacts as a reminder and to measure outcomes. Householders were shown to make small changes to everyday behaviours, though using gadgets sometimes resulted in more substantial impacts. Having said this, there was little evidence of significant behavioural change being achieved.

Public education campaigns and large scale events – These were the only models capable of reaching very large numbers. Although they were usually one-off contacts, projects were able to tailor messages and language to specialist audiences and were able to give clear and simple calls to action. This said, the impacts of these initiatives are largely unknown and it is highly unlikely that they are able to deliver behaviour change without being part of a wider package of action.

Changing organisations projects – These achieved success in tackling a range of behaviours within projects’ own organisations (which they were able to lock-in through changing working practices), and were able to achieve large-scale reach (through their memberships and through clients/visitors with varying results). Success factors included securing buy-in from senior staff, having dedicated project personnel, knowledge of how organisations themselves function, what makes clients/members tick, having credibility with internal and external audiences and being able to influence working practices. Working with organisations’ members was often found to have a catalytic effect on organisations themselves.

“The project has normalised environmental and green behaviour [and led to a] massive shift in awareness and understanding internally.”
NT project manager

Market development projects – These projects have the potential to expand market share for sustainable products and achieved significant successes in altering patterns of consumption in specific areas. (They showed less success in fuelling more radical changes in consumption patterns). Key factors in their success included a good understanding of the markets in which they were operating and a strong business case. Some also identified supply chain ‘gatekeepers’ for their particular products and increased purchasing by building strong relationships with these individuals (who then influenced the choices available to consumers) rather than working to influence consumers themselves. Independent accreditation of products proved an advantage.

Projects working to influence the policy landscape – These projects relied very heavily on personal contacts and networking to build relationships but were not able to demonstrate any direct impact on behaviours (although could point to important outputs in some cases).

Other successes

Partnerships - A clear achievement of the EAF was the development of new partnerships (formal and informal) which enhanced the ability of projects to deliver their work. Examples included partnerships with local authorities who acted as gatekeepers (to new markets and to the provision project support), with other EAF organisations which enabled sharing of knowledge and resources, and commercial partnerships which provided access to new markets and advertising opportunities.

New technology – A number of projects invested part of their funding in new technology e.g. website design. Where the brief was a complicated one, they often had trouble obtaining what they had specified and several projects incurred higher costs that they had anticipated and project overruns. This said, technological investment has led to significant benefits such as enabling scheme participants to see the impact of their efforts and engaging new members of the public.

Leveraging extra support – EAF funded organisations were able to secure a lot more support than they directly paid for. In many cases the bulk of work on the ground was done by volunteers – be this through formal volunteering programmes or, for example, through partnerships with schools and colleges. This significantly expanded projects’ reach.
**Innovation** - The EAF has brought a great deal of small-scale innovation and re-innovation to tackling behaviour change by developing new products, engagement tools, partnerships and bespoke packages for particular settings. In particular, projects were very successful in transferring standard engagement approaches and tools into their own organisations and projects, and many developed creative packages of measures which were 'fit for purpose' to address the opportunities they identified. This 'innovation' has enabled projects to develop entirely new activities, work more effectively, extend their reach and better serve their audiences but it cannot be concluded that EAF brought about a 'leap' in innovation. Nevertheless, working within and through membership organisations and some of the projects’ supply chain brokering should be seen as distinctively innovative and as successful outcomes.

### 1.6 Operation of the fund

Overall, the projects were very complimentary about the level of support offered to them by the Defra team, especially in the earlier stages of funding, and they felt them to be both approachable and helpful. The evaluation support offered also proved extremely useful. It has helped build evaluation capacity within the organisations and has almost certainly increased the quality of the data available.

The length, size and nature of the fund had advantages in terms of projects being offered stability, freedom and flexibility, giving them ambition and encouraging risk taking in terms of trying out new models. In particular, the fund’s flexibility was the most common source of praise about the EAF as a funding vehicle. This enabled many of the projects to adjust their work plans in the face of changing circumstances and, consequently, enabled them to achieve more than they would otherwise have done. The facilitated networking opportunities presented by the annual workshops were also seen as useful.

The disadvantages mentioned were that in trying to build the capacity and confidence of community-level groups even three years was not felt to be a long time. Many projects also struggled with match funding (through the diversion of staff resources, the project being unattractive to potential funders and the narrower remits of other funders).

In terms of fund set-up, the main complaint was that reporting requirements were not explicit from the outset. Projects tended not to have prior experience of evaluating their projects or reporting evaluation findings and they certainly experienced some difficulties doing both of these (notably due to the time-consuming nature of evaluation - which some felt got in the way of them getting things done - and the difficulty in obtaining accurate baseline data). Having said this, many also felt that, overall, they had benefitted from having to evaluate their work.

### 1.7 Legacy of EAF

The overall legacy of EAF is a strong one, but one which lies in large part in the increased knowledge and capacity of people and organisations involved with the programme, rather than in behavioural changes that have already taken place as a direct result of project activity.

**For the funded organisations**, EAF has resulted in increased financial stability and organisational capacity; the training and additional experience of staff and volunteers (which may continue being of benefit to the wider agenda, even if staff or volunteers themselves move on); the formation of new partnerships and closer working with others in the sector; the mainstreaming of pro-environmental behaviour change within organisations; the proven worth of behaviour change engagement models; a better understanding of project audiences (which will enhance future engagement) and new systems, products and toolkits.

**For those that the organisations have worked with**, there is strong evidence of the projects having built up personal capacity around environmental issues, and having contributed to increased community capacity as well as direct behaviour change (through increased social interaction and community cohesion, the development of community action groups and community activists, the building of stronger networks in communities, the influence projects have had on supply chains and 3rd party organisations and the new resources which can be used by those working at a community level to bring about action on sustainable consumption).

In addition, funded organisations have contributed to policy debate, expanded markets for sustainable products and 'eco-brands' and produced a large amount of published material.
Many of the projects will keep going, either as stand alone entities or through becoming mainstreamed within their organisations. However, the legacy of the individual projects is only a small part of the overall legacy of EAF and question marks remain over what will happen to the rest – to the personal and community capacity that has been built, to the resources that have been produced, to what has been learned about different engagement models, and so forth.

For some of these things there are ‘quick fixes’. Defra itself can ensure that project reports are published and that the lessons emerging from a) how to run a fund of this nature and b) what kinds of models and tools work for particular types of projects, are used to inform how other funds are run, what types of projects to support and what information to make available to community practitioners. Other things are not so simple though. In particular, without a direct successor to EAF, there is no obvious means of continuing to provide facilitation for community groups. There is no means of gauging what might happen to existing groups once this has gone.

In deciding which models are worthy of further support, Defra (and other funders) need to be clear about the overarching objectives of funding – in particular whether what is desired is to bring about rapid and large-scale measurable behaviour change among the UK public, to build the long-term capacity of communities, or both. If the objective is simply to deliver rapid behaviour change on a scalable basis then the following options seem worthy of consideration:

- choice editing or supply chain brokerage;
- door-knocking advice or audit, supported by help to source products and devices;
- supporting influential individuals/teams of people to perform a challenge and hand-holding function for public institutions, large membership organisations or similar to catalyse significant institutional behaviour change.

1.8 Recommendations

This evaluation has highlighted a number of areas in which the experience of EAF could provide lessons for future funding models.

Supporting the third sector

Visible government action/leadership on climate change

The work of funds like the EAF needs to be supported by top-down communication and visible government action on climate change. These communications should aim to straighten out some of the inherent contradictions in less mainstream behaviours such as food.

Tackling ‘difficult’ behaviours through multi-stakeholder partnerships

Multi-stakeholder projects are essential to overcoming barriers around ‘difficult’ behaviours where the landscape is more complex.

Improved co-ordination between government departments

Better co-ordination between departments with different remits would help support grass roots action on sustainability. Additionally, funders could offer coordinated access to advice from several government departments for projects aiming to change whole lifestyles ‘in the round’.

Sustained support throughout the funding programme

Any support offered to projects should be sustained throughout the duration of the funding programme not just at start-up, allowing the opportunity for reassurance and feedback on both sides (and a level of flexibility). Access could also be provided to partners who may be able to help projects overcome any possible infrastructural and institutional barriers.

Long-term funding

Longer-term funding (similar to that of the EAF) should be considered for future behaviour change programmes (particularly where there may be delays between project activity and behaviour change).

The applications process

A two-step application process

A two-step application process could provide an opportunity for funders to feed experience into project development, signpost applicants to useful materials and project partners, and allow funders and applicants to jointly develop an appropriate evaluation plan. It could also ensure that projects and funders do not utilise more resources than necessary.
Demonstrating knowledge
Projects should be able to demonstrate their ability to change behaviour rather than simply raise awareness. Funders should consider (a) how well the applicant understands their target audience and (b) how projects are proposing to address the success factors for engaging audiences.

Using existing audiences
Third sector projects can be successful where an audience already exists and are accessible en masse. Membership organisations, for instance, do not have to spend time recruiting or attracting their audience.

Recognising the importance of personality
Where successful models appear reliant on certain catalytic leaders, it may be beneficial to fund the person for the duration rather than the project.

Considering local authority partnerships
Third sector partnerships with local authorities can achieve the best of both worlds – access to service gatekeepers and a level of officiality but with local ‘buy in’.

Utilising workshops
It may be beneficial to hold workshops before funding programmes begin to build capacity within projects.

Old ideas vs. ‘new’ innovation
Significant scaling-up of successful projects can be achieved by funding proven models to extend their reach and impact. Old ideas/existing projects may be just as favourable as ‘new’ innovation.

Evaluation

Providing long-term evaluation support
Evaluation should be embedded at the outset through an outcomes-driven approach rather than rigid task specification (outputs). Projects could be encouraged to focus on the measurable aspects of their work. Reporting requirements should be as explicit as possible at the outset.

Key components of a successful evaluation methodology
The evaluation should consider: integrating data collection into work plans; conducting baseline measurement; carrying out types of work where impacts are easier to evaluate; working with audiences where behaviour change is easier to gauge; working for realistic goals in the timeframe given; and having regular access to project audiences.

Fund evaluators
Fund evaluators should be involved for the entire fund duration, need to have direct access to the projects’ audiences and must be able to triangulate from different sources of information.

Funders must be closely involved in the evaluation process
Funders should be involved in the development of the overall evaluation approach and have regular contact with the evaluators so that interim findings can shape internal thinking and policy. Where possible, an experienced research manager inside the funding team can be extremely useful to provide ongoing guidance and challenge to the evaluators.

Dissemination of EAF knowledge

Networking events
Defra is in a good position to hold networking event(s) to bring together the lessons and the people from its Climate Challenge Fund, Every Action Counts and Environmental Action Funds.

Mentoring
Fund managers should consider enabling and/or supporting the mentoring of newly funded projects by project managers from the EAF. This could reduce the risk of repeating the same mistakes.

Use of evaluation reports
There is scope to maximise access and signposting to evaluation reports and ‘best practice’ guides, possibly on the Defra EAF website or by establishing a new repository.

Use of toolkits
It is worth considering how toolkits and other engagement tools developed during the EAF could be used beyond the project that developed them, either freely or through avenues such as licensing.

Compile a ‘stakeholder network’
Finding a method to compile a ‘stakeholder network’ of key EAF project managers/catalytic individuals could ensure that expertise on behaviour change/community action work is retained by Defra.

For recommendations on future research, please see the concluding chapter of the main report.
Chapter 2: 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 impacts and key factors for success. This is the final technical report of the evaluation, which brings together all the evidence gathered throughout the review. The introductory chapter outlines:

1. The scope of the EAF – its objectives and policy context
2. The scope of the evaluation – its aims and approach
3. Coverage of the report

2.1 Scope of the EAF

Objectives of the EAF 2005-8

The Environmental Action Fund (EAF) is a Defra funding programme which has supported third sector groups to further the Government’s sustainable development objectives within England. There have been several rounds of funding covering discrete three-year periods, each with a distinctive focus. The current round (2005-8) allocated just under £7 million to 35 projects. In this round, Defra wished to support projects that would:

- Contribute to the sustainable consumption agenda identified in the Government's Sustainable Consumption and Production (SCP) Framework;
- Build the capability and commitment of communities to change consumption patterns;
- Move from awareness of consumption challenges into action;
- Have England-wide coverage or demonstrate models with potential for wider application;
- Go beyond single-issues covered by other more specific programmes (e.g. energy efficiency, waste) to address consumption and lifestyles ‘in the round’;
- Attempt to make some leap of innovation in social or market activity (as distinct from innovation in technology);
- Be led by community sector organisations - but the development of innovative partnerships was encouraged.

“Communities” were defined as either physical communities in a particular place, or communities with a common affiliation, such as faith, social interest or demographic group. Within these parameters, Defra was not prescriptive as to how the projects should operate or what specific outcomes they should deliver, but there was a general emphasis on changing behaviour and discovering effective ways of doing this.

Policy context

Defra’s thinking and evidence base on pro-environmental behaviour change evolved rapidly during the period in which the EAF 2005-8 operated. This has affected both the landscape in which projects operated as well as the expectations against which their achievements will inevitably be judged. Three key developments need to be flagged in this respect:

1. The UK Sustainable Development Strategy & Defra’s 4Es framework

In the 2005-8 round, the scope of the EAF was moulded by evidence and thinking that had fed into the UK Sustainable Development Strategy. Research at that time was suggesting that a “much more active approach to change habits” is required if the public is going to adopt more environmentally sustainable lifestyles\textsuperscript{11}. The Strategy set out a framework for engaging the public in behaviour change which was organised around four axes – engage, enable, encourage, and exemplify\textsuperscript{12}. With their long history of delivering community engagement, and of developing novel engagement models, community organisations seemed particularly well placed to test how Defra’s 4Es could be put into practice.

\textsuperscript{11} Securing the Future, UK Government Sustainable Development Strategy Helping People Make Better Choices. See also the review of behaviour change theory in Professor Tim Jackson’s Motivating Sustainable Consumption, Andrew Darnton’s Taking it On literature review for Defra, and Brook Lyndhurst’s consumer research on Bad Habits; Hard Choices.

\textsuperscript{12} The framework is considered in more detail in chapter 4 in relation to the evaluation methodology.
2. I will if you will from the Sustainable Consumption Roundtable
In the first year of the EAF, work underway on the Sustainable Consumption Round Table’s I will if you will from the idea that community-based action is a vital tool (among others) for bringing about sustainable consumption. The SCR also advanced propositions that behaviour change programmes needed to focus on key consumption goals – namely food, personal travel, homes (particularly home energy), and holiday travel. This work partly informed the development of Defra’s evidence and research strategy for sustainable consumption.

3. Defra’s framework for pro-environmental behaviours
Defra then developed its framework for pro-environmental behaviours through a series of activities including stakeholder deliberation. The framework sets out Defra’s approach to researching, testing, implementing and monitoring activities designed to promote pro-environmental behaviour.

Within the framework is a set of 12 headline behaviour goals, comprising “a range of low/high impact and easy/hard behaviours”. The headline behaviours concentrate primarily on those with significant carbon saving potential though Defra recognises that there are others which it may wish to promote that are not so narrowly focused on carbon reduction.

The EAF evaluation has both contributed to Defra’s evolving thinking on pro-environmental behaviour and been shaped by it in turn, as was anticipated in the original objectives for the evaluation.

2.2 Scope of the evaluation
Aims of the programme evaluation
The evaluation was designed to look beyond the traditional evaluation themes of processes, outputs and outcomes, to provide Defra with lessons on effective approaches to behaviour change in the domain of sustainable consumption. Defra wished to know:

- What measurable impact have EAF projects had on changing the behaviour of individuals, households or business?
- Which kinds of projects and engagement models are more successful at delivering behaviour change on sustainable consumption?
- What are the lessons from the EAF about critical success factors and barriers involved in delivering effective behaviour change projects in community based projects?
- Can successful initiatives in one location, or with a particular target group (e.g. those already receptive to sustainable behaviours), be replicated on a wider scale?
- What are the implications for future funding streams and policy developments?

Approach to the evaluation
To answer Defra’s questions, a research-led, formative approach was adopted. Brook Lyndhurst was appointed half way through Year 1 of the Fund, to deliver bursts of research activity throughout the next three years and provide regular feedback on emerging lessons. This feedback shaped Defra’s on-going management of the Fund, the support it provided to projects (covered in chapter 9), as well as its strategic thinking on pro-environmental behaviour.

In designing the evaluation, we acknowledged that some behaviour change outcomes would be difficult to evidence, and that community based projects do not always have the capacity or skills to undertake rigorous evaluation. To provide as much information as possible, and to ensure that different perspectives were taken into account (i.e. the projects, the participants, and Defra), the evaluation therefore joined up evidence of several different kinds, from many sources.

The detailed content of the evaluation and any limitations are set out in detail in chapter 4. The following table provides a summary of the main research components and how often they were carried out during the three-year exercise.

---

Table 1 | Scope of the EAF evaluation

The findings and analysis in this final evaluation report draw on interim reports produced in Years 1 and 2\textsuperscript{15}, as well as the research conducted by Brook Lyndhurst in the final year of the EAF. The Year 3 work included a detailed review of the 34 projects’ own final evaluation reports as well as primary research with the projects and participants.

2.3 This report

The evaluation evidence is presented in three main parts: what projects did and how they were evaluated (chapters 3-5), what they achieved (chapters 6 and 7), what worked and the key lessons for other projects and funders (chapters 8-10). The detail of these chapters is as follows:

- **Chapter 3 – Projects receiving EAF support**
  This chapter introduces the projects that were funded by the EAF, how much they were awarded, and the diversity of activity covered by the EAF.

- **Chapter 4 - Evaluation method**
  This chapter describes the many sources of data which the evaluation drew upon, how sources were used in the analysis and any data limitations.

- **Chapter 5 - Delivery and engagement models**
  This section is concerned with the different approaches used by projects to build action on sustainable consumption in their communities. It outlines a typology of project types and behaviour change tools as a framework for analysing achievements and lessons learned.

- **Chapter 6 – Outputs**
  This chapter is a descriptive account of the principal outputs achieved by EAF projects, focusing on the activities that were delivered.

- **Chapter 7 – Outcomes and impacts**
  This chapter considers the outcomes that resulted from projects’ activities, in terms of headline environmental behaviours, and the capacity of individuals and communities to take action on sustainable consumption. It also considers questions of additionality, longevity and spill-over effects.

\textsuperscript{15} Separate reports on project outputs, and on research findings in both years. See www.defra.gov.uk/ENVIRONMENT/eaf/index.htm
• **Chapter 8 – What worked?**
  This chapter provides an interpretative discussion of what worked, firstly in terms of motivating behaviour changes, then in terms of engaging audiences and using different types of delivery model.

• **Chapter 9 - Operation of the Fund**
  This section looks at projects’ experiences of the EAF process, how it supported them to deliver their projects, and the barriers that they encountered. It draws out lessons for similar funds.

• **Chapter 10 – Legacy of the EAF**
  This chapter considers what the legacy of the EAF will be for the projects themselves and the wider world, what they will do next, and the scope for replicability and scaleability of models developed during the EAF.

• **Chapter 11 – Conclusions and recommendations**
  This chapter brings together the main findings of the evaluation, discusses their implications for Defra and presents a set of recommendations.


3 Projects Receiving EAF Support

This Chapter provides the context for the evaluation analysis which then follows. It introduces the EAF projects and highlights the diverse nature of the activity that was supported by the Fund. This diversity is an essential feature of the EAF 2005-8 but it has made the job of evaluating behaviour change outcomes challenging. Readers need to bear this diversity in mind because it affects the nature of the evaluation evidence collated and the extent to which generalisations can be made about behaviour change outcomes.

3.1 Allocation of funds

Just under £7 million was awarded to the 35 organisations over three years (2005 to 2008). These organisations were asked to apply for funding each year and were required to match what they were allocated from EAF with equal funding from external sources. One project (WestDen) did not receive funding in Year 3 and is not included in the evaluation; the other 34 projects received funding for three years.

Most of the organisations had not received EAF grants previously and the 10 that were funded in both rounds (2002-5 and 2005-8) either started entirely new projects or proposed significant developments of their previously funded models.

The total awarded to each project over the three years of EAF varied from around £90,000 to around £400,000, with half of the projects receiving over £200,000 each. Table 2 shows the breakdown, as well as a brief pen portrait of each project (more detailed descriptions are provided in Appendix A). Projects’ full titles are used in the table but thereafter acronyms are used to aid readability. A list of project acronyms is given in the glossary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipient organisation</th>
<th>Total awarded (05-08)</th>
<th>Total claimed (05-08)</th>
<th>Brief project description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action for Sustainable Living (AfSL)</td>
<td>£150,150</td>
<td>£147,588</td>
<td>Promoting sustainable living through pledges &amp; local action groups; local partnership/network building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Charity Shops (ACS)</td>
<td>£111,500</td>
<td>£111,500</td>
<td>“Choose2Reuse” campaign for clothing &amp; textiles in East Anglia, delivered through charity shops &amp; local media, plus stakeholder engagement on developing the re-use collection/processing infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Green Recycled Organic Ethical (BABYGROE)</td>
<td>£245,444</td>
<td>£245,444</td>
<td>National magazine for new mothers to promote sustainable living &amp; baby products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BioRegional Development Group</td>
<td>£266,304</td>
<td>£266,304</td>
<td>Piloting buyers’ &amp; suppliers’ club to secure use of “One Planet Products” in housing development (pilot mainly with Housing Associations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blooming Futures (BF)</td>
<td>£148,300</td>
<td>£148,300</td>
<td>Promoting use of Pure Plant Oil through work with farmers and vehicle owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carplus</td>
<td>£113,583</td>
<td>£105,993</td>
<td>Action research to identify the impact of a car club in York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Ground†</td>
<td>£338,314</td>
<td>£338,314</td>
<td>Promoting local distinctiveness of food through events, media, books &amp; support to local action groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service Volunteers (CSV)</td>
<td>£214,053</td>
<td>£214,053</td>
<td>Food growing, recycling, &amp; cycling projects with local residents in Birmingham and Bristol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td>£112,942</td>
<td>£96,230</td>
<td>“Parish Pump Programme” to support take-up of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 Or groups of organisations where these bid together to run one project.

17 Applicants could be in receipt of support from other government departments, agencies or local authorities but could not use such support as matching funding. Total government support for the project could not exceed 50% of relevant expenditure and public funding had to be in cash rather than contributions in kind. See http://www.Defra.gov.uk/corporate/regulat/forms/envprot/eaf14.pdf
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Accounted for</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation (CF)†</td>
<td>£224,847</td>
<td>£224,847</td>
<td>Environmental action in the Church of England, including newsletter, workshops, training &amp; publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall Sustainable Building Trust (CSBT)</td>
<td>£224,847</td>
<td>£224,847</td>
<td>Sustainable construction - training &amp; workforce development support for individuals &amp; businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon and Cornwall Housing Association (DCHA)</td>
<td>£93,500</td>
<td>£90,520</td>
<td>Sustainability officer to enhance environmental management in the HA &amp; engage low income residents in environmental action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden Local Agenda 21 (EDEN)</td>
<td>£219,408</td>
<td>£216,965</td>
<td>Engaging local residents &amp; businesses in environmental action, through community action groups and energy/waste projects in community buildings &amp; businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Assoc of Universities and Colleges (EAUC)</td>
<td>£117,800</td>
<td>£117,800</td>
<td>Providing hands-on support to FHE institutions to adopt sustainable procurement policies &amp; practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envision</td>
<td>£176,817</td>
<td>£176,817</td>
<td>Year-long engagement with groups of KS4 students in secondary schools on environmental projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Stewardship Council UK (FSC)</td>
<td>£170,590</td>
<td>£160,278</td>
<td>Working with retailers to increase supply of FSC products; campaigns &amp; outreach to promote consumer awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Action Plan (GAP)†</td>
<td>£231,967</td>
<td>£231,967</td>
<td>Promoting sustainable living through EcoTeams – individuals working in groups to reduce their own household’s environmental impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Alliance†</td>
<td>£115,959</td>
<td>£115,958</td>
<td>Promoting debate on key policy areas through events, stakeholder engagement, research &amp; publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Sustainability Exchange (LSx)</td>
<td>£212,654</td>
<td>£211,544</td>
<td>Engaging minority ethnic communities in environmental action, through events, faith groups &amp; community ambassadors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Stewardship Council (MSC)</td>
<td>£292,406</td>
<td>£289,959</td>
<td>Brokering new supply &amp; demand relationships in food service supply chains to enhance take-up of MSC fish in schools &amp; restaurants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Energy Action (NEA)</td>
<td>£365,100</td>
<td>£365,100</td>
<td>Increasing consumer understanding &amp; encouraging sustainable living - through home energy audits, sustainable living packs &amp; installation of smart meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Federation of Women’s Institutes (NFWI)</td>
<td>£114,865</td>
<td>£114,865</td>
<td>Membership consultation followed by four environmental action projects: EcoTeams with local WI groups; local purchasing demonstration project, car sharing workshop; home composting training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Trust</td>
<td>£263,000</td>
<td>£257,817</td>
<td>Promoting ‘greener’ working internally; demonstration activities to expose visitors to sustainable living (e.g. food, eco-“gadgets”); schools outreach &amp; energy saving week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Child International†</td>
<td>£214,100</td>
<td>£214,100</td>
<td>School visits &amp; follow-ups to secure ‘lifestyle contracts’ (mainly with KS2 pupils); recruiting &amp; training secondary students as ambassadors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough Environment City Trust (PECT)</td>
<td>£162,372</td>
<td>£156,914</td>
<td>Home advice visits &amp; ‘goody bags’ of eco-products to new residents to promote more sustainable living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Yachting Ass. (RYA) / British Marine Federation (BMF)</td>
<td>£402,062</td>
<td>£402,061</td>
<td>Promoting more sustainable boating practice amongst members on pollution, recycling &amp; wildlife protection, through multiple activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Association</td>
<td>£278,606</td>
<td>£278,606</td>
<td>Enhancing demand for organic food through support for local action groups, an annual organic food festival &amp; “why organic” website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Funding Allocation</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset Trust for Sustainable Development</td>
<td>£254,500</td>
<td>Supporting local community action groups &amp; providing ad hoc advice to local ‘activists’ as they need it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAN partners[^1]</td>
<td>£315,000</td>
<td>New network of community sector organisations to support grass-roots food growing &amp; other sustainable development projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponge Sustainability Network Ltd</td>
<td>£99,500</td>
<td>Working to promote the business case for sustainable homes &amp; support home-buyers with an information leaflet on the questions they need to ask sellers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studentforce for Sustainability</td>
<td>£101,683</td>
<td>A toolkit to conduct environmental performance checks of community buildings. Initial &amp; follow-up visits undertaken by student volunteers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain - Alliance for better food and farming</td>
<td>£140,260</td>
<td>Through its &quot;London Food Link&quot; bringing together local food stakeholders from demand &amp; supply sides, providing advice &amp; information, running events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westden</td>
<td>£79,632</td>
<td>This project was not funded after Year 2 and is not included in the evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiltshire Wildlife Trust (WWT) †</td>
<td>£90,000</td>
<td>Supporting the development of “Climate Friendly Communities” through local action groups, events and visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF UK</td>
<td>£177,535</td>
<td>Testing an “action learning” model of environmental engagement by providing facilitation support to three local community groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Hostel Association (YHA)</td>
<td>£355,243</td>
<td>Delivering educational activities to visiting school groups, developing Environmental Activity Leaders, &amp; training staff on environmental management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^1]: Organisations receiving funding from previous rounds of EAF

### Table 2 | Project funding allocation

#### 3.2 Types of organisations funded

The organisations receiving funding were very diverse. They range from small local groups to large organisations with national reach; and from those who had been working on sustainable development for years to those who were entirely new to the subject. Some of the important dimensions on which they differ - which affect what they did, how they did it, and what they were able to achieve - are:

**Organisational status**

EAF recipients included organisations that could be considered ‘national institutions’ (membership charities such as NT, YHA and NFWI), national or regional environmental charities and action groups, certification organisations (FSC, MSC), a regional housing association (DCHA), right down to very small groups set up by individuals with a pro-environmental zeal (e.g. BF, AFSL, EDEN, BabyGROE).

**Organisational size**

Some of the larger organisations (e.g. NFWI, NT, YHA, WWF) could provide access to extra internal resources and wide audience reach, whereas this was not the case for some of the smaller groups, who often relied entirely on one or two key people, which constrained how much they could do (e.g. EDEN, CF, BF).

**Geographical scale**

Half of the projects were working on a national scale[^19] (e.g. RYA/BMF, NT, FSC, GAP) while the rest were divided between projects with regional scope (e.g. DCHA, WWT, Sustain) and those working mainly in a focused local area (e.g. EDEN in Cumbria, WWF in Surrey, PECT in Peterborough, Carplus in York). The local projects were funded to test out models which may have potential for national scaleability or could be widely replicated.

[^1]: The SPAN partners were: Community Composting Network, Federation of City Farms & Community Gardens, Garden Organic, Permaculture Association UK, Women’s Environmental Network,

[^19]: Source: Year 1 projects e-survey
Knowledge of sustainability
Some organisations already had sustainability at the core of their work (e.g. Common Ground, WWF, GAP) while others had to build the SCP agenda into their existing work streams. In these cases there was work to be done to get buy-in from the organisation as a whole (e.g. DCHA, NFWI and YHA). Those already focusing on sustainability varied from tiny, activist-led, organisations (e.g. Eden, BF) to well-known environmental NGOs, such as WWF or the Soil Association.

Single vs. multi-issue focus
Some organisations focused on narrow product or lifestyle areas (e.g. BF on Pure Plant Oil; FSC on sustainable timber; SA on organic food) so that they had potential to make significant advances in one behavioural area. Others – especially the projects promoting lifestyle change ‘in the round’ - had more diffuse behavioural targets and therefore a weaker starting point for achieving significant gains in any one, individual, SCP related sector (e.g. AFSL, CSV and WWT).

Experience of working with different audiences
Some EAF organisations already knew their target audiences well (e.g. BabyGROE and new mothers, EAUC and higher education, Envision and Peace Child and schoolchildren; the RYA/BMF and boaters). Others were engaging new types of audience for the first time and had to develop an understanding of their needs, which necessarily demanded investment in terms of time and energy (e.g. BioRegional, MSC, LSx).

Financial standing
For some groups, (e.g. EDEN, AFSL, BF, CG) the EAF grant was either most or a very substantial part of the group’s income. At the other end of the spectrum were well resourced national membership organisations and charities (e.g. NT, YHA, NFWI, WWF). In between were the third sector environmental organisations that are used to surviving on a patchwork of funding from different grant funds (e.g. GAP, Envision).

3.3 How organisations used the EAF funding
Organisations used the EAF grant in different ways to fund:

Further development or testing of something they were already doing
In these cases there was already a certain level of in-house expertise on how to run the project, enabling organisations to ‘hit the ground running’ (e.g. CF, BabyGROE, BF, CG, GAP, Envision and Sustain). “Development” in these projects took various forms, including expanding audience reach, tweaking engagement techniques or refining models that had been part trialled previously.

Totally new projects within existing organisations
These were of two main types:
- Where community-based sustainability groups took the opportunity to trial activities or approaches that they had not done before.
- Where organisations concerned less directly with environmental behaviour change developed a stand-alone pilot which might not have been funded otherwise as part of mainstream activities (e.g. in some of the large membership organisations and certification organisations).

Testing a new idea or concept
The “outcomes” in these projects were the learning generated about the engagement methods as much as actual behaviour change achieved (e.g. Carplus testing the impact of a car club, WWF learning about how to facilitate community action and learning).

Partner organisations working together to form a bespoke project
One project (SPAN) was set up by five partner organisations to investigate ways of improving support and information to community groups involved in food production and consumption.

In evaluating what contribution the Fund made, it has been extremely difficult to draw boundaries between what was and was not funded by the EAF (and the associated match funding), and therefore how much of the projects’ outcomes should be attributed to EAF. In a number of cases, projects were apparently able to do more than could have been supported by the EAF grant alone, because:
other aspects of their project were funded from another source (e.g. where the EAF paid mainly for project management staff, or where different components of the project received support from other funders); they could piggy-back on other resources or existing infrastructure in the parent organisation (e.g. communication channels); or they had already built some momentum for their project by previous work.

Sometimes, there were also blurred boundaries between core activities of the organisation and the EAF project as a separate entity.

To some extent, these blurred boundaries reflect normal conditions in the third sector, where projects typically survive on a patchwork of grant funding from many sources; but in looking at outputs and outcomes in chapters 6 and 7 it needs to be borne in mind that the achievements reported may be attributable to more than one source of funding.

3.4 Projects’ approaches

As well as the recipient organisations being diverse, so too were the projects they ran and the approaches they used. A broad typology of approaches was developed by the evaluation team in order to make it easier to distil key lessons from the EAF in the later analysis. The typology is introduced briefly here (figure 1), then described in more detail in chapter 5. It is important to note that the categories overlap and that individual projects may span more than one category. The typology distinguishes between:

1. ‘community action projects’ - projects working to change the behaviour of individuals at the community level
   This is the largest category, covering projects with very different breadth and, depth of engagement with their participants - from ‘one-off’ contacts on a large scale to frequent contact with the same small group over sustained periods. Many of the projects were concerned with tackling lifestyles ‘in the round’ – encouraging people to think about sustainable consumption as a package of behaviours.

2. ‘changing organisations’ projects - projects working to change behaviour within their own organisations, or of their members
   This category includes several large, national, membership organisations (and others) which undertook projects to both engage members and visitors, and change internal working practices (e.g. NT, NFWI, YHA). A few focused externally to support change in other organisations (e.g. the EAUC in higher educations and the CF working with the Church of England).

3. ‘market development projects’ - projects working to increase demand for, and availability of, sustainable products.
   Projects under this heading vary from those working on developing the market for one product (e.g. MSC and sustainable fish, FSCouncil and sustainable wood products) to those working towards the wider development of a sector (e.g. BioRegional and sustainable construction, BabyGROE and sustainable baby items). Most were concerned with bridging a perceived gap between demand and supply sides, ranging from information sharing to hands-on brokering of new supply chain relationships.

4. ‘policy landscape’ projects - projects which sought to influence policy either as a core purpose or as an adjunct to their project work
   Only Green Alliance focused exclusively on influencing policy makers. Others, such as Sponge (in building a demand-led case for sustainable homes) and BF (in promoting the use of Pure Plant Oil as a vehicle fuel) have tried to influence debate in the particular areas within which they have been operating.

---

20 e.g. NFWI being funded for conducting their members’ consultation and organising initiatives but the initiatives themselves being conducted with other sources of funding The NFWI case is further complicated because one stream of their work – the NFWI EcoTeams – was part funded by GAP and GAP has also reported on their outputs and outcomes.

21 e.g. the CF’s Parish Pump programme.
3.5 SCP areas projects have been working on

Reflecting the funding criteria of the EAF, and the desire to address sustainable consumption across the board, EAF projects were involved in tackling a wide range of behaviours, covering most of Defra’s headline behaviours (table 2). Projects were asked at the end of Year 3 to reflect on what they had done and to say which areas of activity had been priorities for them over the three years. Looking at their responses, four behavioural areas stand out (figure 2):

- reducing energy use (16 of the 32 projects responding said this was a high priority)
- reducing waste (14/32)
- reducing CO₂ emissions (14/32)
- increasing sustainable food purchases (14/32)

Tackling water use followed some way behind, while transport behaviours and switching to green energy supply were a high priority for relatively few projects. Reflecting the fact that market development projects were fewer in number than those using the community action model, just nine out of thirty two rated “increasing the market size for sustainable products” as a high priority. A few had very specific priorities not covered by options in the survey, such as marine pollution, or access to land.

Even more projects indicated that increasing the capacity of participants to act on sustainability was a high priority, notably:

- increasing the willingness of people to take action (27/32)
- or giving them the capacity, knowledge and skills that would enable them to act (29/32)

---

22 The table lists projects by goal regardless of whether their work in a given area was a priority or just a small part of the project, so the weight of responses is different from that shown in the figure based on priorities.

23 Covering recycling and waste prevention
Large numbers (25/32) also mentioned awareness raising as a high priority. One important question is whether the projects regarded awareness raising as an aim in and of itself since the fund explicitly urged projects to go beyond awareness raising. By the fact that 29 out of 32 projects claimed that increasing the capacity, knowledge and skills of their participants to take action was a priority, it would seem that they were indeed looking to go beyond awareness raising.

Despite the fact that building the capacity and commitment of communities to changing existing patterns of consumption was a main objective of the fund, fewer projects explicitly set out to build social capital or develop activism at the community level (figure 3). Both aspects were at least a moderate priority for most projects, however. In qualitative responses, a few projects also mentioned aspects such as social inclusion, health and empowerment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defra Behavioural Goals (no of projects in brackets)</th>
<th>Projects identified (by BL or projects themselves) as working in each area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficient vehicles (2)</td>
<td>BF, WWT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car use (11)</td>
<td>AFSL, Carplus, CSBT, DCHA, Envision, GAP, NFWI, Peace Child, PECT, WWT, YHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-essential flying (2)</td>
<td>WWT, YHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water (15)</td>
<td>AFSL, BioRegional, CSBT, DCHA, GAP, LSx, NT, NEA, NFWI, Peace Child, PECT, RYA, Studentforce, WWT, YHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulation (5)</td>
<td>AFSL, DCHA, EDEN, Studentforce, WWT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy usage (17)</td>
<td>AFSL, BioRegional, CF, CSBT, DCHA, EDEN, Envision, GAP, NT, NFWI, NEA, Peace Child, PECT, STSD, Studentforce, WWT, YHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling (15)</td>
<td>ASFL, CSV, DCHA, EDEN, Envision, GAP, NFWI, NT, Peace Child, PECT, STSD, Studentforce, WWT, WWF, YHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste (19)</td>
<td>ACS, AFSL, BabyGROE, BioRegional, CSBT, DCHA, Envision, GAP, Green Alliance, LSx, NEA, NT, NFWI, Peace Child, PECT, RYA, STSD, WWT, RYA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient/eco friendly products (14)</td>
<td>AFSL, BabyGROE, BioRegional, Envision, EDEN, FSC, GAP, NT, Peace Child, PECT, RYA, Sponge, Studentforce, WWT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-generation (5)</td>
<td>AFSL, CSBT, Envision, WWT, YHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food locally in season or lower impact (16)</td>
<td>AFSL, BabyGROE, CG, CSV, Envision, GAP, LSx, MSC, NFWI, NT, PECT, SPAN, SA, Sustain, WWT, YHA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 | EAF projects working on Defra’s headline behaviour goals.

24 Two of the behaviour goals - adopt diet with lower GHG/environmental impacts and eat food locally in season – have been combined in our analysis because projects often failed to differentiate between the two. Waste has been taken in the broadest sense rather than specifically in relation to food.
Figure 2 | Thinking about your project, over its 3 years, to what extent, if at all, have the following been a priority? Based on projects' responses to the Year 3 e-survey
N = 32 answering this question

Figure 3 | Thinking about your project, over its 3 years, to what extent, if at all, have the following been a priority? Based on projects' responses to the Year 3 e-survey
N = 32 answering this question
3.6 Who the projects worked with

An analysis of the characteristics of the audiences that projects actually engaged is given in chapter 8. The following is a brief summary of the types of audience projects were targeting, to give a sense of the breadth of audience types covered by the EAF projects. This last fact is important because it is another factor which makes it difficult to compare across projects when analysing which models were successful.

In general terms, projects had four main types of audiences (see also chapter 5 on engagement models):

**Individuals** – who were contacted or engaged in a wide variety of settings, including at home, at events, on day visits and holidays, through websites and publications, at school or church, at training courses, at group meetings, or simply as friends or family of those more directly involved.

**Community groups** – the majority of projects claimed to have regular or ad-hoc contact with community groups, either community action groups they were supporting directly, or others they collaborated with for specific activities.

**Businesses and employees**
Many of the “changing organisations” projects worked with employees within their own organisations. 23 projects also claim to have had regular contact with businesses, for example, food producers and caterers (e.g. Sustain, MSC, Soil Association), developers, housing associations and contractors (e.g. BioRegional, DCHA, Sponge) and energy companies and regulators (e.g. NEA, DCHA).

**Public institutions**
With the exception of those working on policy, most projects have not sought to directly target public institutions, though (22) reported they had had regular contact. Some projects worked through local-level public institutions in order to access their intended audiences, and others formed links and partnerships to help deliver their projects.
4 Evaluation method and evidence

The overall approach to the evaluation was described in the Introduction. It outlined how the analysis in this report has drawn on many different sources of information to form a rounded judgement on the outcomes of the EAF. This chapter provides a detailed account of the principal data sources, how they were collected, and any limitations. Each source is covered in turn as follows:

1. Projects’ progress reports submitted to Defra as a requirement of the funding.
2. Projects’ own end of fund evaluation reports.
3. The Brook Lyndhurst research and formative evaluation.

This is followed by an explanation of how the research design and analysis were informed by the literature and theory on behaviour change, and concludes with an assessment of the lessons learned from the evaluation in terms of data and content. Projects’ own experiences of the evaluation are covered in section 9 where lessons regarding the evaluation process are identified.

4.1 Project progress reports to Defra

Evolution of the reporting process

The initial application form specified that applicants should describe how they would know whether or not they had achieved their objectives. Defra asked funded projects to report both on outputs (i.e. what they had done) and outcomes (i.e. what they had achieved as a result of their activity). This approach took on board criticisms made by CAG in their evaluation of the EAF 2003-5 that projects had produced little evidence of outcomes or impact.

Projects were initially asked to report on a quarterly basis as well as to produce an annual report summarising their activities for the year. Following initial feedback that the quarterly reporting process was too time-consuming, Defra moved to six-monthly reporting in Year 2. More detail on how and why the reporting process evolved is provided in chapter 9.

Data quality and limitations

During Year 1 there were substantial variations in the style and content of the reports produced. Additional guidance was therefore given to projects about the form that reporting should take and about the expected content. The variability continued in years 2 and 3, however, so that the progress reports on their own did not provide enough robust information for evaluating the outputs and outcomes of the EAF as a whole. The main weaknesses of these reports as evidence sources were:

- inconsistent reporting (e.g. on the time-periods covered and what activities were included in which time period);
- incomplete reporting (e.g. lists of activities without any indication of how many people had participated in them);
- confusion between outputs and outcomes;
- a tendency to report on activities rather than on the impact that these activities were having.

Use of this source in the analysis

The progress reports were, though, a rich source of information on individual project activities and outputs, which could be cross-checked against information from other sources (e.g. to verify the wealth of information provided during the Brook Lyndhurst project visits) and to fill gaps (e.g. in information given in the projects’ own evaluations).

---

They were also used as background material in preparation for Brook Lyndhurst’s annual project visits (especially in Year 1) and were the main source of information used to compile the annual summary reports of project outputs for Defra\(^{28}\).

As regards data used in this report, project progress reports to Defra were used alongside other information sources (see below) to piece together the account of EAF outputs provided in chapter 5.

### 4.2 Projects’ own evaluation reports

#### Evolution of evaluation during the EAF

The absence of useful outcome data was flagged as a key concern in the Year 1 evaluation report, as was the fact that only a few projects had plans in place for a rigorous evaluation of outcomes. The report warned Defra of the risk that only limited ‘hard’ data on sustainable consumption impacts would be produced by the end of Year 3.

As is explained in more detail in chapter 9, Defra responded by reducing the requirement on projects to compile progress reports, but at the same time asked them for an evaluation plan which would generate information for their final project report. Defra offered free access to an independent evaluation expert (Kathryn Rathouse) to projects who wanted it.

#### Evaluation approaches used by the projects

It is important to recognise that most of the EAF projects had limited resources (money and time) to undertake extensive research into the behaviour change outcomes of their projects. Moreover, behaviour change is itself often difficult to measure and often requires expensive research techniques to measure it at all (e.g. direct monitoring of participant behaviour, large-scale baseline and follow-up surveys).

Through the evaluation support, projects were encouraged to focus on manageable techniques, and on aspects of their projects that would be measurable using these techniques. The rationale was that it was better to produce robust data for some aspects of projects’ activities rather than weak and un-useable data for everything. They were further provided with an evaluation handbook written specially for the EAF by the independent evaluation advisor to help them with the analysis and presentation of their findings\(^{29}\).

Appendix B provides short case studies of good evaluation practice in the EAF, together with examples showing how some projects measured actual behaviour changes or environmental impacts resulting from their activities.

#### Data collection methods

Projects used various methods to collect data, tailored to their engagement model and target audience. It was much more common that projects measured their outcomes through surveys (i.e. self-reported data) than they did by monitoring actual changes in consumption behaviour (e.g. purchases, meter readings). Some of the constraints projects faced in capturing behaviour change outcomes are described further below.

In their final Year 3 evaluation reports:

- 22 projects reported data from both baseline and follow-up surveys;
- from post-project surveys (with no baseline);
- 1 from baseline surveys only (with no follow-up)\(^{30}\).

Additionaly:

- 10 reported having conducted focus groups;
- 19 having conducted depth interviews;
- having conducted footprinting and/or having used carbon calculators;
- 8 having conducted building audits.

Examples of data collection methods are provided in the table below.

---

\(^{28}\) Both of these reports are available at: [http://www.Defra.gov.uk/environment/eaf/](http://www.Defra.gov.uk/environment/eaf/)


\(^{30}\) This project was not used to gauge outcomes
Constraints on being able to measure behaviour change directly

There were valid reasons why many projects used surveys, self-reported or qualitative data, including:

**Many projects did not have contact with their participants in an environment where behaviour change could have been measured.** Contact often:

- **happened at events** (e.g. Common Ground at Apple Day; Eden during its ‘green build fortnights’);
- **happened in a place other than the one where desired actions would take place** (e.g. CSBT during their training courses; Envision and Peace Child at school);
- **happened indirectly** (e.g. ACS through shop staff and volunteers; BabyGROE through its magazine; Soil Association through its website);
- **could not result in an easily measurable outcome** (e.g. Green Alliance’s influence on decision makers).

**Measurement in itself is often problematic:**

- **some behaviours are extremely difficult to measure objectively** (e.g. many people do not have water meters; there is no way of gauging whether people actually take flights);
- **it is hard to quantify the combined value of many small lifestyle changes.** Impact may depend on how it is observed e.g. a focus entirely on individual behaviours may underestimate the cumulative impacts of those sustainable living projects that succeeded in getting many people to change lots of small everyday actions.
- **some projects or participants had no access to means of measurement** (e.g. school children not having access to household bills);
some projects lacked skills to measure what they were doing as demonstrated by the demand for evaluation support;
some projects’ were aiming to build capacity more so than change behaviour so it was hard for them to establish the latter;
some data were deemed commercially sensitive and were not made available, for example, sales data.

Data coverage

Reflecting the fact that much of the evaluation work was administered through surveys, there is much better coverage of self-reported changes in behaviour than actual monitored changes. In their final evaluations:

- 22 projects reported claimed changes in participant behaviour;
- 13 reported attitudinal changes amongst participants;
- 13 reported changes in participants’ willingness to act;
- 9 reported actual (monitored) changes in participant behaviour.

The fact that almost all the projects were able to produce an evaluation of their impact was significant achievement of the EAF. In particular, it is impressive that 22 projects had baseline and follow-up data with which to gauge the impact of their work. While the changes may be self-reported in most cases, being able to compare follow-up to baseline behaviour adds weight to the robustness of the data. One project (NEA) also compared both baseline and follow-up results to a control sample, giving further confidence that the changes resulted from project activity.

Throughout the report we have made a distinction between:

- **Self-reported behaviour change**
  These are referred to as ‘soft outcome data’ and are derived from survey data, pledges, qualitative research etc.

- **Measured behaviour change**
  These are referred to as ‘hard outcome data’ and are derived from direct observation or monitoring, through meter readings or weighing waste for example

- **Environmental impacts of changes in behaviour**
  These are included in the definition of ‘hard outcome data’ and include conversions of impacts to CO₂ equivalent units or global footprints, for example.

The table below identifies where there are the most data, showing which projects produced information under Defra’s headline behaviour goals. A detailed table containing the actual outcome data by behaviour goal is included in Appendix C.
The table highlights the fact that only a small number of projects were able to produce ‘hard’ outcome data although there is a wealth of evidence from ‘soft’ outcome data, which is available for all Defra’s behaviour goals. Some key points to note are:

All projects have provided some outcome data although there is a great deal of variation in the amount and quality of outcome data provided.

Projects working on internal change in their organisations (e.g. DCHA, NT, YHA) were more likely to provide ‘hard’ outcome data. This may in part be because they are likely to have access to the means of proving any changes – e.g. energy bills and mileage figures – and so it was easier for them to do so.

Transport projects were particularly able to estimate the impact of their projects in terms of CO₂ reductions e.g. BF and Carplus. In the case of BF, savings have been quite sizeable, reflecting the fact that the organisation has concentrated on commercial vehicles which do long distances.

With a few exceptions, community action projects found the provision of ‘hard data’ problematic. This in part reflects the nature of their projects and the relationship they have with participants (they are not “gatekeepers” of products and services in the same way as some of the market development projects are; and have little access to meters, bills etc, in the same way as those who are effecting changes within their own organisations).
But, community action projects which were directly involved in service provision were able to provide hard evidence. CSV, thanks to its role as provider of the “run-a-muck” organic waste collection, Eden through provision of recycling bins in community buildings, and DCHA, thanks to its coordination of improvements to its housing stock (e.g. the fitting of insulation and new boilers) have each been able to provide reliable figures for service take-up.

Where monitoring was factored in as part of the work plan, some community action projects were also able to provide outcome data. This was the case for the GAP and NFWI EcoTeams as well as for the WWT Urchfont group sustainable living trials, and Peace Child which has been able to quite clearly demonstrate which types of pledges its audience has been able to keep to.

Projects that followed up all or some of their participants could show behaviour change. e.g. PECT and AfSL have both been able to provide an indication of whether participants stuck to particular behaviours between initial and follow-up contact.

Some projects with long-standing programmes in place can indicate longevity of impact where they have contact details for past participants and have done followed up surveys (e.g. GAP and Envision’s follow-up studies with previous programme participants pointed to their work having positive long-term impacts).

Many of the projects receiving lower levels of funding had relatively poor data (hard or soft) so may look as though they have had very behavioural impact when the scale of the outputs they delivered may suggest otherwise.

Projects which used mainly published materials to target audiences seem to have found it particularly difficult to provide any outcome data. (e.g. Common Ground, Sponge). Because of this they may appear to have had little behavioural impact but their impact is simply unknown and could be great or small. Their activities generally had a potential for large audience reach but nothing can be said about whether this was actually achieved, or what scale of behaviour change it led to.

Data limitations

The data from the projects’ evaluations come with certain caveats. (These caveats have been taken into account in the reporting of outcomes in chapter 6).

There was heavy reliance on self-reported data. While such data is valuable (and the evaluation support enhanced the quality of the questionnaires being used in our judgement) it is, by its very nature, subjective. The main drawbacks are over-claiming, misestimating and, simply, differing views of what should come under particular categories such as “a lot” or “a little”.

Survey or observation samples were often small – this was often dictated by the small size of the audience (e.g. WWT’s Urchfont energy and waste trial; LSx’s water diaries) or resulted from low response rates (in a few cases). Samples ranged from nationally representative quantitative surveys to surveys of just 8 participants - too small to provide any useable data from which inferences could be drawn.

Drop out from baseline to follow-up surveys was significant in some cases so that the samples are too small and/or too different to be compared reliably. Some projects made interpretations about changes between baseline and follow-up that cannot be supported. A notable exception was NEA which, though its samples were small, had undertaken statistical significance testing.

It was sometimes difficult to gauge where data came from - both who were the audiences being referred to (including sample sizes) or where and how the data had been collected. Where necessary, and where it was possible, we have inferred sample sizes from other information provided but where we cannot be sure of sample sizes the data are treated with caution.

Samples were generally self-selecting – and there is a risk that those responding may have been the more active or environmentally engaged participants in projects. NEA were able to demonstrate this by comparison with their control sample; others noted it as a possibility (e.g. Carplus).

Samples may not be representative of all project participants – since we typically do not know whether respondents are representative of the target audience in general, or the whole population which was engaged, the results cannot necessarily be generalised. An important example is the GAP and NFWI findings. While their data on actual behaviour change is some of the most robust produced during the EAF, in both cases it is based on a sub-sample rather than all of the Eco Team participants. The sub-sample was
those people whose contact details had been recorded and who chose to return data. It cannot be assumed therefore that the behaviour recorded by the sub-sample can be applied to the rest of the Eco Team members and scaled up to cover the whole EAF Eco Team population.

**Detailed methods for scaling up or calculating impact were not always explained** – especially for aspects such as CO₂ savings (e.g. BF), planet savings (e.g. LSx) and other transformations or extrapolations.

**Interpretation of the data was sometimes questionable** - e.g. projects reaching strong conclusions from the results from just a few interviews; some projects combined data from intermediaries, those directly participating in community-level groups and their wider audiences through events and other activities.

**Use of the data in the analysis**

All 34 projects produced final evaluation reports, of varying depth and rigour. All of these reports were read, assessed for robustness, and summarised as part of the Brook Lyndhurst programme review. They were a crucial source of information on behaviour change outcomes and lessons learned about particular approaches. The data have been used extensively in the analysis of outcomes in chapter 7 and in the discussion about lessons learned in chapter 8.

While the evidence produced by projects in this round of the EAF is most certainly an advance on what has been produced historically, the limitations outlined above mean that there are still gaps in the evidence, specifically with respect to behaviour change outcomes. The limitations have translated into:

- little high-quality data on ‘hard’ behavioural outcomes;
- difficulty in distinguishing between changes in attitudes and behaviours what would have happened anyway and those that were the direct results of projects’ work.

At the EAF programme level, this means that it is still difficult to establish a complete picture of what the funding outcomes have been; it is difficult to compare results across different sectors and different types of projects; and it is difficult to gauge exactly what has proved to be the best value for money.

For these reasons, the data on outputs and outcomes are presented separately from our interpretation of what worked. The latter is informed not only by the measured outputs and outcomes, but also the rich qualitative data from Brook Lyndhurst’s annual visits and discussions with the projects.

### 4.3 The Brook Lyndhurst programme-level evaluation

As explained in the Introduction, key principles behind the Brook Lyndhurst evaluation were that it:

- **should be formative** – that is, it should run in parallel to the Fund throughout its life and use the lessons learned to inform delivery of the programme;
- **should be research led** – to provide an analysis of successes and barriers in using community-based behaviour change models to promote sustainable living;
- **would develop and use data from a variety of different sources and angles** - so that a comprehensive and rounded judgement could be reached about what the EAF had achieved.

To achieve these objectives the following research tasks were carried out:

1. Annual project visits
2. Annual electronic survey with the 34 projects
3. Participant interviews selected from a sample of projects
4. A national benchmarking survey of public attitudes and behaviour
5. Annual feedback sessions with the Defra EAF team
6. Annual networking workshops with the projects and Defra
7. A desk review of progress reports and final evaluation reports

The specifics of each element are outlined below.

**Project visits**

Each project was visited every year of the ‘05–’08 funding by Brook Lyndhurst. The visits typically lasted between two and three hours (resulting in 200-300 hours of interview material). Although the interviews
were relatively informal, they followed a topic guide which was developed and agreed with Defra.° The interviews were digitally recorded and researchers wrote up notes according to a standard proforma.

- Year 1 focused on getting to know the projects, their skills and capacities, and how they had fared during the project set-up phase. It highlighted the urgent need for evaluation support.
- Year 2 focused on progress in project delivery, what they had learned about the models and approaches being used, and further challenges regarding evaluation.
- Year 3 focused on achievements over the course of EAF and how they could be proved, what projects had learned about engaging people in sustainable consumption, and the implications of their work for policy.

**Strengths**
The qualitative data gathered via the visit interviews is an extremely rich source of evidence. In particular, the visits provided a breadth and depth of understanding that would not have been possible through other means (e.g. on organisational barriers, how the engagement model was working or not). It allowed us to build a real sense of what the projects were doing, the barriers they were facing, and how they were tackling them. This further enhanced our ability to probe, understand and critique what projects reported in their progress reports and final evaluations.

**Limitations**
As an evidence source on its own, the material from the visit interviews has some limitations, however. Some of these are generic to qualitative data – the information gathered is dependent on the knowledge and interpretation of the person being interviewed, and that person may have a particular story to tell – but others relate specifically to the EAF. In this last respect, the two main limitations were:

- **the data collected is often not directly comparable across projects.** Although a common topic guide was used, interviews had to be tailored to each individual project within this overall framework because of the sheer diversity of projects. This meant that not all areas received the same weight in every interview.
- **the volume of data generated makes it difficult to do full justice to the material.** Brook Lyndhurst has 200-300 hours of recordings from the visits and despite extensive visit notes being drawn up, it is almost inevitable that some of the finer detail is not captured in the analysis.

**Use of the data in the analysis**
The qualitative material from the visits was used extensively in the formative stages of the evaluation to develop a rolling analysis of what was working and what wasn’t – both in terms of engagement models and actual behaviour change. The hypotheses developed in years 1 and 2 were explored further in the year 3 work, and tested against the outcomes reported by projects in their evaluation reports. The qualitative evidence therefore informed the analysis of outputs and outcomes in chapters 6 and 7, and was drawn on extensively to develop the interpretation of what worked in chapter 8.

**The annual e-survey**
Each year, projects were sent a link to an electronic survey which they were asked to complete. The purpose of the survey was to collect comparable, standardised data on the key themes that were covered qualitatively in the visit interviews. The content therefore covered much the same ground as that outlined above for the visits. Nearly all projects completed the survey each year, but one or two did not (depending on year).

**Strengths**
The surveys generated data that could be used to demonstrate the weight of certain perceptions, activities, or priorities across the EAF as a whole, to substantiate (or not) hypotheses being developed from the qualitative evidence (e.g. lack of formal evaluation; reliance on certain tools such as awareness raising techniques). It was a useful complement to other sources of evidence.

**Limitations**
The main limitations arose from trying to apply a standard survey template to such diverse projects. Projects’ diversity meant that:

---

° The Year 3 guide can be found in Appendix D while earlier guides are provided in the year 1 and Year 2 evaluation reports.
- **finding questions which applied equally to all projects was difficult** so that some questions may not have been interpreted in the same way in all projects and not all of the response categories were applicable in every case;

- **questions asking projects about audience reach did not work.** "Reach" meant very different things in different projects depending on the engagement model being used; and projects sometimes "guesstimated" reach because they did not have robust figures. Similar issues arose with counts of volunteers, and "partnerships". These data were only useful with reference to other sources, such as the outputs reports;

- **it is preferable not to interpret the e-survey results in percentages terms** because the small base sizes may make certain figures look unduly significant. However, this makes it more difficult to compare these results with those generated by other areas of the evaluation.

### Participant interviews

Brook Lyndhurst conducted 174 semi-structured interviews with project participants, spread across Years 2 and 3:

- 86 with public participants (e.g. schoolchildren, householders, members of action groups)
- 66 with intermediaries (e.g. leaders of community-based groups or changing organisation projects, volunteers, ambassadors)
- 22 with businesses (e.g. commercial partners, food producers, restaurant owners)

The purpose of the surveys was to get a second opinion from the participants’ perspective on what projects had achieved and how they had motivated people.

A target number of interviews was set for each project according to a sample frame agreed with Defra, which aimed for a roughly even split between public participants and intermediary/business participants. A further aim was good coverage of participants who had been involved in community groups, both as participants and leaders. Certain types of project were excluded (e.g. policy landscape; those that could not provide follow-up contacts). Selection of respondents was dependent on contacts provided by the projects and then their willingness to be interviewed.

#### Strengths

The interviews provided quantitative data on claimed behaviour change that could be used as an indicator of change across the EAF as a whole. The combination of closed ended questions and open discussion provided useful insights on:

- participants’ understanding of SCP issues;
- their relationships with the funded organisations;
- the hooks that got them involved;
- the barriers that they faced both in terms of getting involved and in terms of making changes to their lives;
- the impact that their participation had on their attitudes and behaviours.

#### Limitations

The principal limitation arises from the nature of the sample (and it size). It was envisaged originally that the survey would have access to many more participants than proved possible in practice, and that a more representative sample would be drawn as a result. As it is, the sample is highly self-selecting and the results need to be viewed in this light. The main sampling constraints and sources of bias were:

- **reliance on projects to nominate interviewees** so that it is likely that we interviewed people who the projects had most contact with, or those who were more enthusiastic towards them (although some participants expressed negative views about their experience);

- **some projects were hesitant to provide contact details for those they had worked with,** or simply did not have those details (e.g. in the case of those attending events) and as a consequence we did not achieve the target number of interviews for some projects according to the sample frame;

- **potential respondents were often very busy and, on some occasions, reluctant to be interviewed** which again impacted on our ability to achieve an even spread.

#### Use of the data in the analysis

The participant survey data has been used mainly in places where there are other sources of data with which to triangulate it, because of the limitations outlined above. As a qualitative sample it is large and
provides enough insight to be able to make generalisations about aspects such as feelings about the environment, behaviour change motivations and barriers.

**Use of the ICM omnibus**

In order to benchmark responses from participants in EAF projects, and to provide an indication of additionality, selected questions that were asked of participants were included in two rounds of the regular ICM telephone omnibus. The timing of these two rounds matched the two bursts of interviewing of project participants in May and November 2007.

**Strengths**
The sample is a nationally representative sample of the UK population and the survey is executed to the highest market research standards by ICM, which is a leading polling and research company.

**Limitations**
Although the participant interviews were conducted by telephone at more or less the same time as the omnibus survey the sample frame was very different (as outlined above). The results need to be viewed in the light that we are comparing a self-selecting sample of active citizens from the EAF participants with a general population sample from the omnibus.

**Use of the data in the analysis**
The data have been interrogated in two ways: to compare the amount of action that EAF participants claim to have taken to reduce their environmental impact compared to a general UK sample; to put into context the behavioural areas they say they changed the most when compared to activity that is already happening amongst the wider public.

**Annual workshops**
Annual workshops involving all the EAF projects were held at the end of each year. The purpose of the workshops was to inform projects of emerging findings from the evaluation, to capture their reactions, discuss key issues, and provide networking opportunities. The Year 3 workshop followed a slightly different format; its aim was to disseminate both the work of the projects and the results of the evaluation to a wider audience of policy makers and potential funders, from both within and outside Defra.

The workshops were used principally as a sounding board and check on emerging findings from the evaluation, which proved extremely useful. The feedback from all three years has informed the development of thinking and analysis in this and interim reports.

**Defra feedback sessions**
Following each year’s project visits, the Brook Lyndhurst and Defra EAF teams met to discuss the projects’ progress and emergent findings. The sessions provided an opportunity to check evaluation findings with Defra’s account managers (who had more contact with the projects on a day-to-day basis); and to feedback insight to Defra as the evaluation developed. The insights provided by these meetings have been incorporated with the other qualitative evidence from the evaluation.

**4.4 Links to behaviour change theory and research**

As well as stimulating activity on the ground, Defra wanted to learn more through the EAF about how behaviour change works in practice, and how this relates to the motivations and barriers identified in the theoretical literature. EAF was one of the first opportunities for Defra to test on the ground some of the ideas on behaviour change that lay at the heart of the UK Sustainable Development Strategy. In particular, projects were funded which appeared to have scope to tackle the so-called value-action gap\(^{32}\) - to go beyond awareness raising and secure measurable change in behaviour in their communities.

Defra’s 4Es model provided a framework against which project approaches and successes could be assessed (figure 4). The model was predicated on the idea that behaviour change interventions need to use a package of self-reinforcing measures in order to translate awareness into action and to ‘unlock’ people’s unconscious ‘bad habits’. The 4Es model has been used in this review as a framework for describing the behaviour change tools used by projects (chapter 5).

\(^{32}\) Put simply, the idea that raising awareness and changing people’s views about the environment will not automatically lead to pro-environmental behaviour.
The 4Es framework was itself developed from reviews of the practice and theoretical literature at that time, notably Professor Tim Jackson’s reviews of behaviour change theory. Key behavioural drivers that were identified in Jackson’s work included:

- The important role that ‘personal cognition’ plays in choice – including moral values and personal capacities, such as self-esteem and confidence;
- The role of existing peer, social and cultural norms in constraining ‘acceptable’ choices;
- The role of institutional structures in shaping choice – in particular, by limiting or expanding the range of choices available;
- The symbolic role of consumer goods – and its important contribution to psychological well-being, social and family relationships etc;
- The importance of habit and routine in understanding the dynamic of behavioural ‘lock-in’.

Other authors (e.g. Ekins et al) similarly identified the important confluence of personal drivers and external social and institutional factors as drivers of behaviour. The ESRC Environment and Human Behaviour programme led by Ekins also highlighted the important role of human agency, which can perhaps best be translated as individuals believing they have the power to change things through their own actions. More lately Darnton (2008) has added to this literature providing a detailed review and synthesis of models and theories of behaviour and change.

Since the start of the EAF in 2005, Defra has commissioned further research projects that have investigated how aspects of behaviour change theory can be operationalised to motivate consumers to adopt more pro-environmental behaviour, including (currently) projects looking at the role of personal and social identity, and the role of social networks and catalytic individuals. During the time that EAF has been in operation,

---


there has also been growing interest in social marketing approaches. Social marketing has various guises but one accepted approach is where behaviour goals are identified and agreed, the target population is profiled and segmented, barriers to change in communities and segments are identified, external ones are removed and the community is then involved in the development of interventions to motivate change, and progress is continuously monitored. These various developments in Defra’s evidence base and approach have been taken into account in the evolution of the analytical framework for the EAF review.

Much of the academic work on behaviour change is complex and technical and is not repeated in detail here. Its usefulness to the EAF review is to describe a checklist of motivational factors against which the methods that the projects have used can be assessed. A crude translation of the drivers identified in the theoretical literature suggests that the following are key factors in motivating individuals to change:

- Believing that the issue is important
- Knowing what your own impact is
- Wanting to change your impact
- Feeling comfortable it’s something for ‘people like me’
- Knowing what specific actions you can take to change your impact
- Having the know-how and tools to be able to enact the change
- Feeling confident that you can achieve what needs to be done
- Being supported by those around you, practically and emotionally

These factors informed the development of a ‘behaviour change basics’ guide that was provided to the EAF projects at the Year 1 network event. They were then incorporated and built on in the design of standard evaluation questions on motivations to be used in surveys of participants (by both Brook Lyndhurst and the projects). Similar factors were also included in questions asked of the projects in the annual e-surveys. The table below shows how the response codes in the participant questions (left-hand column) relate to behavioural drivers (right-hand column). Participants were asked “thinking about why the project has helped you to reduce your environmental impact, how important have the following factors been…”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard questions on motivational factors – response codes</th>
<th>Rationale (i.e. motivation or barrier from behaviour change literature that this aspect addresses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Given me facts on how my everyday life impacts on the environment | -Build knowledge to influence cognition of problem & influence feelings about how important the problem is, personally. In turn, influence individual's willingness to act.  
-Make it personal – show people how their behaviour links with environmental impact |
| Made me feel more strongly that environmental action is my personal responsibility, not someone else’s | -Influence internal personal norms: that this is something that matters to me, something I want to be doing something about. |
| Made me believe that what I do actually makes a difference to the environment | -Influence personal norms: I want to do something about this and it is worth the effort.  
-The "power of one". |
| Made me more confident I can actually do the things that are needed to reduce my impact | -Self-efficacy: I can do it, I won't fail, and I won't make myself look stupid. |
| Given me practical advice on what I can do to reduce my impact | -Supports self-efficacy by helping people put intentions into practice.  
-Reduces the effort barrier (i.e. increases prospect of reward for unit of effort put in).  
-Reduces access to information barrier. |

36 See Defra’s Framework for Pro-Environmental Behaviours

37 This translation was informed by Brook Lyndhurst’s think piece for Defra on Triggering Widespread Adoption of Sustainable Behaviour (2006),
Given me new products or services so I can take action to reduce my environmental impact

- Tackles habitual lock-in.
- Reduces effort barrier.
- Appeals to ‘personal reward’ motivation.

Given me information on where to go for advice/to get environment friendly products

- Reduces access to information barrier.
- Reduces effort barrier.
- Breaks into habitual thinking regarding, choice sets.
- Personal identity and social identity.

Persuaded me that being ‘green’ is normal

- Social identity: shows me I’m not strange.
- Personal affirmation from group peer support.
- Social learning: others can provide me with useful tips that I trust because they come from people like me.
- Appeal to personal reward norm (does not rely on altruistic personalites).

Helped me meet other people like me who are trying to reduce environmental impact in their everyday lives

- Reduces access to information barrier.
- Reduces effort barrier.
- Breaks into habitual thinking regarding, choice sets.
- Personal identity and social identity.

Shown me what personal benefits I can get from reducing my environmental impact

- Descriptive social norms: it’s more usual than I think.
- Self-efficacy: if others can do it then so can I.

Shown me examples of what other people are doing to reduce environmental impacts in their own lives

- Descriptive social norms: it’s more usual than I think.
- Injunctive social norm: I should be doing it because it’s expected behaviour
- Personal norm: power of one, it’s worth me doing it personally because big institutions are taking it seriously.

Shown me what government & business are doing on the environment

- Descriptive social norms: it’s more usual than I think.
- Injunctive social norm: I should be doing it because it’s expected behaviour
- Personal norm: power of one, it’s worth me doing it personally because big institutions are taking it seriously.

| Table 5 | Rationale behind the standard questions designed for the projects |

The responses to these questions are used in chapters 7 and 8 in the assessment of outcomes and what worked in terms of changing behaviour.

### 4.5 Successes, barriers and lessons from the evaluation process

Projects’ experiences of the evaluation process are covered in chapter 9 in relation to their overall experience of the managements and requirements of the fund. Here we are concerned with lessons that can be identified about evaluation methods and securing data quality in this type of evaluation.

#### Successes

The following components were central to the success of the programme level evaluation:

**Gauging insight from a wide range of different sources**, including frank discussions with project managers and interviews with project participants;

**Triangulation of data sources** so as not to be overly reliant on one account of what projects have achieved and/or how they have achieved it;

**Following the developments from the beginning of the fund** to be able to track progress and learn from projects’ experiences right the way through;

**Having in-depth face-to-face contact with projects** in addition to their paper reports submitted to Defra which provided a better understanding of what they were actually doing or had achieved;

**The large quantity of qualitative evidence** produced both by projects and the evaluation team which avoided undue reliance on poor quality or incomparable quantitative data.

#### Barriers to evaluation

In Year 2 we reported that few projects had the financial or staff resources needed to undertake large-scale or repeat surveys. We also reported that it was hard to attribute changes in attitudes or awareness to the project themselves rather than to background noise. Our Year 3 conclusions concur with this earlier analysis. The main barriers to projects providing full, good quality data seemed to be:

**Projects not being set up with evaluation in mind** and therefore:
• not integrating data collection into work plans (esp. in Year 1);
• not conducting baseline evaluations (esp. in Year 1);
• conducting types of work for which impacts are difficult to evaluate (e.g. work which involved one-off contacts with participants; work which focused on raising awareness or providing information);
• attempting to change behaviour in areas or with audiences for which behaviour change is difficult to gauge (e.g. working with schoolchildren);
• working in areas for which any changes in behaviour will happen beyond the time-duration of the projects (e.g. attempts at building capacity in local communities);
• not having regular access to or contact with project audiences;
• not being able to report on the full extent of project activities

**Lack of resourcing or evaluation knowledge in projects which undermined the ability to deliver a comprehensive evaluation of outcomes.** This included:

• a lack of skills within projects regarding how to conduct evaluation, notably on the methods that could be used, on how to design questionnaires and discussion guides and how to ensure adequate response rates;

• a lack of skills within projects regarding what conclusions can be drawn from the data gathered and how these data should be presented, notably on understanding the confidence they can have in the data collected and providing the basis for claims that are made (e.g. sample sizes);

• problematic attribution of successes where there have been several sources of funding for one project or a project has worked in partnership with others - several projects have delivered their project in partnership with other organisations (e.g. Carplus; MSC; RYA/ BMF) or have received several sources of funding for the core of their work (e.g. NFWI);

• in a minority of cases, a lack of commitment to the evaluation process, notably where projects were not entirely dependent on EAF funding for their survival, or where there were so few resources available to projects that evaluation directly detracted from being able to deliver on project objectives, or where there was some feeling that evaluation gets in the way of ‘doing’.

“*When you start to measure it, sometimes it disappears*”

In most cases the barriers highlighted above are not specific to EAF funded, community-based SCP projects, but it may be that community-based projects are particularly unfamiliar with incorporating evaluation into their work-streams as standard and are therefore less skilled in this area. These barriers and limitations have translated into:

• variable quality in outcome data (see section 4.2)
• gaps in coverage (including outputs and outcomes)
• difficulty in pinpointing changes in attitudes and behaviours that were the direct result of projects’ work
• difficulty in comparing results across different sectors and different types of projects;
• difficulty in making a reliable assessment of what has proved to be the best value for money (e.g. what kind of models, approaches and structures used).

Defra responded by offering projects one-to-one evaluation support and providing easily digestible information about behaviour change theories. Further discussion of this can be found in chapter 9.

**Evaluation lessons for the future**

Even though this round of the EAF evaluation generated more, and higher quality, data than in previous rounds, there is still room for improvement. Lessons to take forward to any future fund involving third sector behaviour change projects are:

To establish a full picture of project activities, fund evaluators need to be able to ‘triangulate’ from different sources of information:

• in particular, they need to have contact with the projects throughout the duration of the fund in order to fully learn from their experiences;
• they need to have direct access to the projects’ audience. This needs to be agreed with projects at the outset and provision put in place for contact to happen later (e.g. re-contact permission for surveys).

**Projects need initial guidance and on-going support** to ensure that they appreciate from the beginning what it is they are expected to prove, to develop robust methods for generating evidence, and appropriate
analysis of data collected. This could be done via call-off support (as in the EAF) or by having an evaluation specialist as part of the project team.

**For the funder to draw full benefit from the fund level evaluation** they should be involved in the development of the overall evaluation approach; and they should have regular contact with the evaluators so that interim findings can shape internal thinking and policy. Having an experienced research manager inside Defra has been extremely valuable to the Brook Lyndhurst evaluation team, to provide on-going guidance and challenge. The Year 2 report also suggested that someone with a research background (internally or externally) needs to monitor the scope and quality of information being provided in regular project progress reports, so that additional measures to protect data quality can be taken if and when needed.

**Standard reporting frameworks (e.g. the evaluation handbook) and survey questions can be useful** to allow cross comparison where projects are likely to produce data that are not easily comparable. The e-surveys in the EAF proved to be a useful back-up to the extensive qualitative data collected in visit interviews and were easy to control and administer.

Where standard questions are being asked of participants, it would be desirable to pilot them with the target audiences to ensure that they can be understood easily. Use of these questions should be tightly specified and monitored to ensure consistency in responses between projects (for example, in terms of activities the questions relate to, sample selection and the survey vehicles they are used on). Even so, the EAF experience has indicated that there may always be limitations in using standard questions with community led projects (because they tend to be so different and have differing levels of skill), and provision needs to be made for other sources of data to be collected to complement any standard metrics.
5 Delivery and engagement methods

An initial typology of EAF projects was given in chapter 3 under four headings:

1. Community action projects
2. Change in organisation projects
3. Market development projects
4. Policy landscape projects.

The typology is described in further detail here, outlining the various delivery models and approaches used by different project types to engage their communities. It is followed by a description of specific behaviour change tools that the projects employed.  

5.1 Community action projects

This was the largest grouping of projects, which had one principal characteristic in common: they engaged individuals in communities in sustainable living activities, either by having contact with them directly, or at arms length through other community ‘activists’ (by supporting community action groups, community leaders, and/or volunteers working with the public).

In order to appreciate which kinds of project achieved significant outcomes (chapter 7), and what the key success factors were (chapter 8), it is important to understand as well the different models of ‘community action’ funded by the EAF. While the boundaries between different models are blurred – because projects often used similar tools in essentially different packages - seven distinctive sub-types can be identified, as follows:

1. Community action groups – facilitating communities to devise and deliver their own environmental activities

The common aim of these projects was to support grass roots action on sustainability and to help embed action in communities for the long term. Typically, these projects supported a group of people (and sometimes individuals) who are active on SCP issues in their own communities. The groups were usually interested not only in changing their own lives, but also reaching out to others and bringing about wider changes in their community.

Some groups were recruited from scratch by the EAF project (e.g. from a particular village or street; around a particular topic); others were recruited from existing social groups or networks (e.g. a parents’ group; active members of a church congregation), or existing action groups.

Support from the EAF project involved either providing facilitators for the groups, and/or being a source of call-off support and advice which groups could turn to when they needed it. Projects often also ran other complementary activities, for example, local events, training, visits, or outreach to schools and other community ‘institutions’ (e.g. village halls etc).

The EAF projects did not play a direct role in deciding on or organising the initiatives which were adopted, but supported the groups in their activities. The ‘parent’ EAF project usually did not direct groups towards specific environmental behaviours or target outcomes. Reflecting the diversity of what groups chose to do and how they operated, their achievements were evaluated in a wide variety of ways by the ‘parent’ EAF projects.

Projects working in this way included AFSL, Common Ground, CSV, Eden, SA, STSD, SPAN, WWT and WWF.

2. EcoTeams - groups engaging in a pre-defined set of activities

A more prescriptive version of the community group model was GAP’s EcoTeams, both its own teams and those run in collaboration with the NFWI.

---

38 It may be useful to refer to the summary of each project’s work (given in section 1 of the appendices) to contextualise this overview.

39 The term “activist” is used as shorthand in the report to refer to “active citizens” rather than more narrowly to “political activists”.
The principal objective in EcoTeams is to create measurable change in specific behaviours of the people taking part in the groups (rather than the wider community), within a relatively short timescale, using a pre-defined action template. Having learned about how to change key aspects of their own behaviour first, the hope is that some teams or individuals will then go on to do more, both in their own lives and in their wider communities.

The groups are led either by an external facilitator or someone from the group who is trained to lead the Eco Team. GAP refers to these two approaches as "fully facilitated" and "semi-facilitated".

For the EAF EcoTeams, participants were recruited either through door-knocking, or via their affiliation with an existing group (e.g. being a member of the NFWI; working in a business or local authority being supported by GAP to run EcoTeams).

The principal difference between EcoTeams and other community action group models is the initial sharp focus on the individual in the group and on specific behaviours, rather than letting the group choose its own priorities for activities it wants to deliver for itself and the wider community. The duration of on-going facilitation support may also be less in EcoTeams than in some of the other community action group models.

3. Working in schools

A few projects focused specifically on schools (e.g. Envision and Peace Child). Others undertook a schools-focused project as part of their larger EAF project (CSV, YHA, NT) or did outreach in schools to support their work with supply-chain stakeholders (FSC and MSC). BabyGROE similarly did outreach work in Sure Start centres to increase awareness of its magazine and the issues it covered.

The degree of prescription involved in the projects varied. For example:

- Envision ran community action groups in schools, supporting older students over the course of a year to devise and deliver their own projects;
- Two projects set specific outcome objectives – CSV’s Growing Gains to get children to grow their own fruit and vegetables, and the National Trust to get schools to reduce their energy consumption;
- Peace Child used ‘Lifestyle Contracts’, and the YHA used footprinting tools and pledges, to educate children about their own impacts and to encourage them to choose a set of behaviours they would change.

The frequency and depth of contact in these projects also varied. For example:

- Envision and CSV had on-going contact with their groups;
- the NT ran six two-hour workshops in each school, supported by an energy audit from Norfolk County Council’s property services, and an energy saving week challenge (plus a follow-up with selected schools the next year);
- Peace Child had an initial contact visit and a follow-up visit supported by regular checking of contracts within the school by teachers and parents;
- YHA had an initial burst of intensive contact with school groups on residential visits to its hostels.

4. Working with and through faith communities

Two projects worked with faith communities:

- LSx worked with mosques and Hindu temples in London to devise and deliver environmentally themed talks, events and social activities.
- The CF continued its work to support the Church of England, by distributing its Parish Pump newsletter to congregations, and by capacity building work with Bishops and others to develop training and new working practices (e.g. energy audits of churches).

LSx’s work took the form of one-off demonstration projects while the CF has a continuing relationship with the Church of England (and, it reports, increasingly with other faiths).

---

40 In this model, new groups of 5-10 people are recruited to meet every month for 4-5 months to work through a pre-defined set of environmental topics. The model is based around a workbook which provides information about specific topics (e.g. waste, energy, water, sustainable shopping), gets the group to talk about them together, and requires participants to monitor their own impacts in relation to the topics discussed. Data on specific behaviours are recorded on a central database by GAP and results are fed back to individual group members and their group leader.
The overall objective of both projects was to raise awareness of the issues and educate people about what they could do in messages tailored to their faith, in the hope that they would then choose to change their behaviour of their own volition. In both cases, contact with most of the people reached was fairly light-touch or one-off (e.g. through sermons, events or newsletters), although the LSx used community ambassadors to back-up its communications work, and the CF had (and still has) regular contact with church leaders.

5. Working with low income communities

Two projects targeted low income communities directly. The Devon & Cornwall Housing Association (DCHA) worked both to change its own environmental performance (in its offices and housing) and to engage low income residents in environmental awareness raising activities and actions. LSx ran an engagement project with residents of a social housing estate in London, in addition to its work with faith communities.

In both cases, the work aimed to educate residents about the issues and encouraging voluntary small changes in day-to-day behaviour, rather than directing residents to specific behaviour change outcomes.

6. Doorstep support - targeting individual households with a package of tailored advice, support, and sustainable products or services

Three projects (Carplus, PECT, NEA) ran a variant of a model which targeted households individually to make voluntary changes to their lifestyles. The projects encouraged action by undertaking an initial survey of the household’s behaviour, provided products or a service to encourage them to change, then later followed-up the initial contact (to varying degrees of depth). In all three cases, participants were recruited through door-knocking in defined geographical areas (supplemented by contact through energy companies for some of NEA’s participants).

- Carplus worked with a car club operator in York to raise awareness of the club and monitor change in travel behaviour in residents living in the area covered by the club. It targeted residents by postal survey and provided feedback to them in the form of a personalised travel and overall eco-footprint, based on information they had provided in the survey.

- PECT doorstepped residents of a new housing development in Peterborough, undertook a survey of their current behaviours, provided advice on what they could change, and gave out a welcome pack containing products (e.g. light bulbs, fat traps, Ecover detergent) and information leaflets from companies and organisations that could offer further help.

- National Energy Action (NEA) leafleted households then follow-up interested households with an initial survey, advice and the offer of eco-products (e.g. light bulbs, kettles, water saving devices). In addition, smart meters (or simpler electri-save displays) were installed in suitable homes to increase real-time awareness of energy use. NEA worked closely with a partner energy supplier to develop this ‘offer’ to consumers, and the project was used as a pilot to test whether this is a useful market development for energy supply companies.

None of the projects involved continuous engagement with households, although the smart meters provided a continuing presence and reminder in NEA’s case, and follow-up surveys in all three cases provided a reminder opportunity.

7. Running public education campaigns and large-scale public events

Some ‘community action’ projects communicated with the public mainly at arms length, through mass reach campaigns delivered through defined channels. This included BabyGROE on sustainable baby products through hospitals and midwives; ACS on clothing re-use through charity shops; and Sponge on home-buying through estate agents.

Some other projects (including some of the membership organisations below) had contact with their audience mainly through public events, newsletters or general publications, which they had either devised themselves or supported others to deliver.

Contact with target audiences was generally one-off and light touch in this type of project, although they may have achieved large-scale reach. The event based activity in other models described above was often
like this too\footnote{e.g. AFSL securing pledges at events, CF through its workshops, Eden through its ‘Green build fortnight’ events, CSBT through training workshops for the public, Soil Association through its annual food festival, Common Ground in its support to groups running Apple Day events.}. The hope of the projects was that this light-touch exposure would provoke people to think about their lives and then make changes – but projects were often unable to track or re-contact those who had received their information, and therefore verify whether change had actually happened.

5.2 Changing organisations projects

The second category of projects covers those which worked on change either within their organisation, or through their memberships. They adopted one or more of the following three approaches:

1. Engaging with members and visitors to encourage sustainable lifestyles

Some EAF projects set out specifically to encourage their members or their visitors to engage in sustainable living (e.g. NT, YHA, NFWI, RYA/BMF). By virtue of their size, these organisations offered the potential to reach very large audiences. These projects are in effect a further variant of the community action model, focused on communities of interest, and often on a national rather than local scale. Approaches included:

- **Information tailored to the specific interests of members** – e.g. the boating community served by the RYA/BMF.
- **Demonstration activities at visitor sites** – e.g. NT working on food in its cafes, greening its Basecamp volunteer holidays and holiday properties, installing new composting facilities, and training staff to talk about it.
- **Educational activities on residential holidays** – e.g. YHA
- **Consultation on members’ views on the environment** to define environmental projects to take forward and provide a mandate for action – NFWI’s 90@90 consultation;
- **Cascading information on activities through the membership**, both to educate (e.g. RYA) and drive recruitment to specific projects (e.g. NFWI EcoTeams).

There was a clear drive in these projects to lead by example so that members or customers could be encouraged to do the same. For example:

- in the NFWI this was reflected in a drive to build more sustainable buildings at its training college (Denman) and to produce a less harmful magazine, by printing it on recycled paper, using vegetable ink and wrapping it in a compostable bag;
- in the YHA there were attempts to make buildings more sustainable and to reduce business mileage as well as to encourage guests to do the same;
- in the National Trust there were efforts to decrease the energy consumption in their properties, to link what was sold in coffee shops to what was produced on the properties and in their local area, to sell more sustainable produce in their shops and to reduce their waste.

2. Changing the way their own organisations operate

Reflecting this drive to ‘walk the talk’ organisations tended also to work on changing how they run their own operations (e.g. DCHA, NFWI, NT, RYA/ BMF, YHA). Activities under this heading included:

- **designing/ re-designing internal policies** - e.g. DCHA’s new corporate environmental strategy; YHA’s staff guidance on travelling to meetings;
- **putting staff training into place** - e.g. YHA including SCP training as part of initial staff induction courses; NEA sending all its staff on a City and Guilds course in Fuel Poverty/Sustainable Energy;
- **re-organising internal systems** - e.g. NT’s envelope re-use scheme, DCHA re-specifying staff roles so they are more closely linked with geographical areas to reduce business mileage;
- **putting better facilities in place** - e.g. DCHA installing lockers and showers to make it possible for people to cycle into work; NT and YHA encouraging ‘greener’ operations at its residential sites for visitors; NT installing energy saving measures in its properties;
- **using internal seminars, meetings and project steering groups to influence others within the organisation/ change organisational culture** – often incorporating senior members of the organisation (e.g. NT, NFWI, Soil Association, WWT and WWF).
3. Supporting external organisations to develop pro-environmental change programmes

This last category included the CF supporting the Church of England, and the EAUC supporting higher education institutions to develop sustainable procurement practices.

Effort in these EAF projects concentrated on building knowledge and capacity within the organisations they worked with. For example, the CF delivered workshops and seminars to give church members the tools to link their faith’s theological basis for environmental concern to what they could do on a practical basis. The EAUC developed and delivered specific training programmes and hand-holding support for those responsible for procurement in further and higher education institutions.

5.3 Market development projects

All of the market development projects funded by the EAF operated in environments where the products they were promoting have to compete with more established products. They all wished to achieve an increase in the market share of sustainable products in particular markets and sectors and, to do this, needed to work on influencing consumer choice and/or supply-chain and procurement behaviour. Many of the projects were therefore concerned with developing a stronger business case for sustainable products amongst buyers, and removing information barriers. Projects focused on different aspects, as follows:

1. Removing information barriers to final consumers (i.e. the public)

A number of projects communicated directly to final consumers in order to stimulate demand for sustainable products, to educate consumers about product performance, and signpost them to products. Projects included:

- BabyGR promoting more ‘natural’ products and services for mothers through its magazine and advertisers;
- Carplus promoting the car club it was monitoring to local residents;
- CSBT providing training courses to the public on sustainable building products and techniques;
- The Soil Association informing consumers about organic food through its “why organic” website;
- RYA/BMF providing a ‘green directory’ on which marine businesses can list more sustainable products and services;
- Sponge developing a home buyers’ guide with questions to ask sellers and estate agents about the building’s environmental performance.

“Participants see a lack of information about sustainable lifestyles as a barrier to sustainable activity” Sponge (final evaluation report)

2. Improving information flows between demand and supply sides

A number of projects worked to bridge a knowledge gap between the supply and demand sides.

Sustain’s main emphasis was to enhance the flow of information between stakeholders in London’s food sector, through running an information network, running stakeholder events, and working with businesses to signpost them to buyers or suppliers.

BioRegional set up a buyers and suppliers club to support wider use of sustainable construction products, piloting the club with housing associations and one commercial developer. Their approach sought to remove cost barriers for developers: discounts were to be offered to developers in the expectation that bulk purchasing by the buyers club would result in economies of scale for suppliers; and developers’ search costs would be reduced by providing access to proven and accredited suppliers of sustainable products. BioRegional’s role was to facilitate the exchange by setting up a website that would list suppliers accredited by BioRegional and record transaction information, and to recruit members to the buyers’ club.

In a slightly different approach, Sponge commissioned consumer research to build a business case that purchasers want to buy sustainable homes (Eco Chic or Eco Geek?), which it could present to house builders and estate agents. This was supported by its home buyers guide for purchasers to use when approaching sellers or estate agents.

[42] www.BabyGRof.co.uk
Brokering supply-chain relationships to increase the availability of sustainable products to consumers

Some projects took their approach beyond information exchange to actively broker new relationships in supply chains. The most notable projects here were the MSC and FSC.

The MSC worked with ‘gatekeepers’ on the demand side (i.e. Local Authority buyers of school catering supplies) and on the supply side with foodservice companies to increase the number of MSC products available to LEA buyers. A similar model was used with selected restaurants. MSC worked at several points in the supply chain, not only to persuade suppliers of the business case, but also helping stakeholders to gain chain of custody certificates, and working at the fisheries end to increase supply.

The FSC similarly worked with retailers to expand product ranges, supported by awareness training for staff in retail stores, retailer led consumer campaigns and schools outreach.

Both projects involved intensive engagement with a relatively small number of key individuals in the supply chains. Relationship building and hand-holding were key elements of their engagement models. The FSC also undertook outreach work with consumers, to raise consumer awareness and help support the development of a business case for the products they were promoting.

NEA’s community action project outlined above also falls under this heading. It worked closely with an energy supplier to develop a potential new service for households to help them manage their energy consumption.

Removing supply-side limitations

In addition to the MSC working on sustainable fisheries, BF worked with farmers to develop a supply of pure plant oil as a substitute for mainstream vehicle fuel, to support the vehicles that BF intended to convert.

The project run by the Association of Charity Shops was effectively a ‘reverse consumption’ project which also focused on supply – in this case, aiming to increase the quantity and quality of used clothing coming into the re-use market, and building stronger relationships between organisations within the re-use sector.

The project ran a consumer-facing campaign (Choose2Reuse) through charity shops and local media to engage consumers in more sustainable behaviour (i.e. reuse) in the hope that this would enhance supply for the reuse sector.

5.4 Policy landscape projects

Only one project focused entirely on influencing the policy landscape (Green Alliance), which it did through a mix of face-to-face contact with influential people, seminars and workshops. The project provided opportunities for stakeholders to debate and discuss issues in a neutral setting outside the formal political process.

Other projects participated in policy work as a consequence of their wider project objectives. They contributed to government consultation exercises, or published reports to contribute to public debate. Examples include:

- BF’s policy submissions on the taxation status of PPO and their work to publicise PPO in the media;
- NEA’s consultation response to the review of the Home Energy Conservation Act;
- Green Alliance’s product levy and zero waste reports;
- Sustain’s contribution to the “Feeding the Olympics”;
- Sponge’s ‘Eco Chic or Eco Geek’ work.

5.5 Behaviour change tools: the 4 Es

Projects used a wide variety of behaviour change tools to deliver their work, most often combined in a package to best fit their overall approach. Table 6 illustrates the main tools used, organised around Defra’s four Es framework:

- **engaging** audiences
- **enabling** them to take action
- **encouraging** them to do so; and

---

43 e.g. [http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/climate-change/power-plants-the-greenest-fuel-423582.html](http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/climate-change/power-plants-the-greenest-fuel-423582.html)
• exemplifying what can be done

Additional comment is made on how the tools work as behavioural drivers where relevant. The table is simply a means of summarising the techniques used and it should be noted that some of the tools cut across more than one of the four Es headings, or tackle more than one motivational driver. The specifics and variations of some of the key behaviour change tools are discussed further in relation to an analysis of what worked in chapter 8.

---

44 See section 4.4 for an overview of behavioural drivers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>e.g.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Es</strong></td>
<td><strong>Action</strong></td>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Targeting people through social networks, community engagement & outreach** | AFSL, BabyGROE, CF, CSV, DCHA, Eden, Envision, SPAN, FSC, GAP, LSx, NFWI, Peace Child, PECT, RYA/BMF, SA, ST, WWT, WWF | This has been a strong feature of the EAF programme. It reflects the focus of the Fund on community and voluntary sector organisations which generally have a strong community engagement ethos. In theory, groups enable people to feel part of something bigger and that, collectively, individual action makes a difference; they see other people 'like me' taking action and that personal contributions are valued by others. Engagement activities of EAF projects have involved facilitating community action groups (see section 5.1 above), training and supporting community ambassadors to offer guidance and advice to their communities (see “intermediaries and ambassadors below”), and other forms of community outreach work (e.g. FSC going into schools to boost demand for certified products; BF talking to farmers’ groups about PPO; NT running a schools energy saving outreach programme). In some cases there was ‘deep engagement’ with repeated contact over time, and in others engagement was one-off ‘lighter touch’.
| **Cascading through membership organisations** | NFWI, CF, RYA/BMF | The NFWI used its existing model of channelling information from the central office to WI federations and on to local groups, to inform members about its four EAF projects and to drive recruitment to its EcoTeams. The CF was similarly able work with the Church of England in getting energy audit requests to all parish churches; the RYA/BMF was able to use membership contacts to reach those who then registered an interest in its Green Blue project and receiving further information. Other projects used membership groups and communities of interest as access audiences that might otherwise have been difficult to access directly – e.g. LSx’s use of intermediaries to engage faith groups and tenant’s association and volunteer residents to engage residents on a housing estate. |
| **Intermediaries, ambassadors and champions** | AFSL, BabyGROE, CSV, MSC, NEA, RYA/ BMF, SA | Many projects worked with “intermediaries” or “ambassadors” to engage (and encourage) a wider audience. They were both: **professionals** - used because of their direct access to the public and their standing as trusted and respected sources of information (e.g. BabyGROE’s midwives and Peace Child’s teachers); **community champions** - used because they understand the community, are trusted and will embed change within the community beyond the end of the project (e.g. CF’s support of the clergy; CSV’s promotion of “active citizenship” through its ‘Street Champions’ and ‘Concrete to Coriander’ projects; and AFL’s volunteer Local Project Managers).
| **Using ‘hooks’ to initiate interest/promote tangible benefits** | DCHA, Eden, LSx, MSC, NFWI, RYA/ BMF, SA | A number of projects designed ways of appealing to interests other than the environment. In some cases projects shifted messages away from ‘traditional themes’ of responsibility, obligation and altruism to highlighting personal benefits in terms of health, money, time, leisure and enjoyment (e.g. DCHA). The projects working with faith communities (e.g. LSx, CF) linked responsibilities and obligations towards the environment with pre-existing religious beliefs, particularly a religious identity as carer and custodian. The RYA/ BMF produced a CD-ROM with information tailored to the specific concerns and outlook of boat users (e.g. anti-fouling).
| **Holding events** | All groups | Most EAF projects used events to raise awareness, distribute information and showcase their work to potential participants and other organisations. There was a great deal of variation in what they used events for, from Food Festivals or boat shows attracting thousands of visitors (SA, RYA/BMF), to workshops with only a handful of people; and from open public events (e.g. Apple Days supported by Common Ground) to staff training seminars (e.g. NT, YHA, EAUC). |
| **Using media and formal publicity channels** | ACS, FSC, LSx | A few projects purposively used mainstream media and other forms of publicity to raise awareness and engage the public at arm’s length. Using mainstream media offers the potential of large reach but limits the depth of contact that can be achieved. ACS advertised the “Choose2reuse” project in its shops and also used television and radio coverage; LSx used specialist media (e.g. the Community Channel) in its work to deliver environmental messages to ethnic groups; and FSC has ‘piggy backed’ onto advertising for mainstream brands which use the FSC logo or stock FSC products.
| **Celebrity endorsement** | BabyGROE, MSC, RYA/ BMF | Some projects recruited celebrities to back their initiatives as a way of extending their reach and influence. For example, MSC has used Ainsley Harriot in its ‘Fish & kids’ project; and RYA/ BMF used the Olympic rowing team as ambassadors. Some groups have joined partnerships beyond those taking part directly in their project in an attempt to have a more widespread impact. This includes publications which are available nationally (e.g. Common Ground’s “England in Particular” and “The Apple Sauce book”) as well as those aimed at particular audiences (e.g. CF’s ”How many light bulbs does it take to change a Christian?”; Green Alliance’s work on the Waste Strategy and the Conservative Party’s Quality of Life review).
| **Developing publications for wider distribution** | Common Ground, CF, GA, Sponge | Organisations often involved other members of staff in the development of their EAF project, as a way of generating interest and engagement in the wider organisation. In some organisations this was done through having influential members of staff helping to steer the project (e.g. through steering groups – Soil Association, NT, NFWI); while in others it was done less formally through day to day contact between EAF project staff and others. In some projects, staff were also encouraged to think about changes they could make in delivering their usual activities (e.g. NT Greening the Basecamps). |
| **Staff involvement in developing the project** | CSBT, DCHA, NT, NFWI, RYA/ BMF, SA, WWF | |

---

**Chapter 5: Delivery and engagement methods**

*The Apple Sauce book was used because of their direct access to the public and their standing as trusted and respected sources of information (e.g. BabyGROE’s midwives and Peace Child’s teachers);* **community champions** - used because they understand the community, are trusted and will embed change within the community beyond the end of the project (e.g. CF’s support of the clergy; CSV’s promotion of “active citizenship” through its ‘Street Champions’ and ‘Concrete to Coriander’ projects; and AFL’s volunteer Local Project Managers).

**Using ‘hooks’ to initiate interest/promote tangible benefits**

A number of projects designed ways of appealing to interests other than the environment. In some cases projects shifted messages away from ‘traditional themes’ of responsibility, obligation and altruism to highlighting personal benefits in terms of health, money, time, leisure and enjoyment (e.g. DCHA). The projects working with faith communities (e.g. LSx, CF) linked responsibilities and obligations towards the environment with pre-existing religious beliefs, particularly a religious identity as carer and custodian. The RYA/ BMF produced a CD-ROM with information tailored to the specific concerns and outlook of boat users (e.g. anti-fouling).

**Holding events**

Most EAF projects used events to raise awareness, distribute information and showcase their work to potential participants and other organisations. There was a great deal of variation in what they used events for, from Food Festivals or boat shows attracting thousands of visitors (SA, RYA/BMF), to workshops with only a handful of people; and from open public events (e.g. Apple Days supported by Common Ground) to staff training seminars (e.g. NT, YHA, EAUC).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 Es</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>e.g.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enable</strong></td>
<td>Providing information to participants</td>
<td>All groups</td>
<td>All EAF projects provided information to participants as an integral part of their work (and this has been a high priority in all years). It was delivered through face-to-face contact on the doorstep, at workshops and events (e.g. CSV and PECT) and through leaflets, websites and organisational publications. The nature of the information provided ranged from very <strong>general awareness raising content</strong> (&quot;recycling is good because...&quot;) to <strong>very specific tips</strong> (&quot;how to use your composter...&quot;) and <strong>signposting</strong> to sources providing sustainable products (BioRegional, CSBT, SA, Sustain, RYA/ BMF). As noted under “engage” some projects have also <strong>tailored information</strong> to the interests and values of specific audiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Enable** | Websites | BabyGROE, BioRegional, CSBT, Common Ground, Soil Association, RYA/BMF | Websites have mainly been used as a tool for information provision but organisations have tried to achieve different things with this channel:  
- **engagement** (e.g. the Soil Association’s "Why Organic?" site generating interest in organic food);  
- **enabling** (e.g. several providing hints and tips, BioRegional and others linking suppliers to purchasers; **Why Organic** visitors being directed to sources of information, RYA/ BMF providing an environmental code of practice, PECT hosting a community forum on its website);  
- **encouragement** (showing people that they are not alone in what they are doing; GAP using their site to provide performance feedback for EcoTeams);  
- and **exemplification** (e.g. giving case studies). |
| **Enable** | Workshops, networking events, seminars and courses | CSBT, EAUC, GA, PECT, NFWI, NT, Sponge, Sustain | Workshops, networking events and courses were used to raise interest in particular subjects (i.e. **engage**) as well as to give people the tools to take action (i.e. **enable**) - for example in making sure they had the right contacts (e.g. Green Alliance, Sponge, Sustain), access to the right information (e.g. CSBT, Sponge) or the right capabilities (EAUC). Part of the enabling process has been to show people how things are done – i.e. to **exemplify** (e.g. NFWI’s composting workshops and National Trust’s demonstration events).  
Projects have argued that workshops help to act as a catalyst and help to mainstream behaviours as well as to build capacity. |
| **Enable** | Developing participant skills & training | CSBT, CF, EAUC, LSx, RYA/ BMF, YHA | Training was provided by some projects to help people, either in the home or workplace, to develop skills and capacity to put SCP into practice through better knowledge, ‘hard’ skills (e.g. qualifications) or ‘soft’ skills, (e.g. communication) skills. Projects have tailored work to specific audiences: EAUC for example developed a set of bespoke training packages for those working on procurement in higher education; RYA/BMF developed guidelines that will be included in member training. |
| **Enable** | Providing ‘freebies’ or ‘gadgets’ | Envision, Eden, NEA, PECT, RYF/BMA, LSx, NT | Some projects provided tools to facilitate the transition to sustainable lifestyles (e.g. PECT’s ‘welcome packs’ for households new to the area; Envision’s “issues bag” for students to use in encouraging others to change their behaviour; NEA’s use of water saving devices and smart meters, LSx’s free samples given out by ambassadors, NT’s subsidy of energy saving measures for its schools outreach project). |
| **Enable** | Making it easier- providing services & infra-structure | ACS, BF, BioRegional, CSV, Eden, FSC, MSC, STSD | Some projects have provided services in order to make it easier for people to take on sustainable behaviours e.g. ACS establishing workplace-based “Choose2Reuse” clothes donation schemes; BF carrying out engine conversions and conducting R&D on PPO. Others have provided services to the general public (such as recycling) where these were not previously available e.g. CSV’s “Run-a-Muck” green waste collection. Carplus monitored the impact of the introduction of a car club in York. |
| **Enable** | Making products available | BF, CSBT, EAUC, FSC, MSC | Part of enabling consumers is making products available which correspond to the choices they would like to make. A number of EAF projects have been working on doing this, for example in liaising with suppliers to ensure that products are available to particular audiences (EAUC for higher education institutions, MSC for the catering trade, FSC for the general public; BioRegional for house builders) (see also section 5.3 above). |
### Encourage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 Es</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>e.g.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitation support</strong></td>
<td>AFSL, CF, EAUC, Envision, SA, SPAN, STSD, WWT, WWF</td>
<td>Many projects made a concerted effort to directly support participants and action groups. This has taken the form of group facilitation (AFSL, Envision, SPAN, WWF), or simply ensuring regular contact (e.g. Soil Association and Somerset Trust contacting their community-led group; EAUC providing “organisational hand holding” to higher education institutions looking to change their procurement practices).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pledges</strong></td>
<td>AFSL, ACS, DCHA, LSx, Peace Child, STSD, WWF</td>
<td>Several projects used pledges to encourage participants to change behaviour as part of their other work; “Lifestyle Contracts” based on pledges formed the core of Peace Child’s EAF project. The idea underlying pledges is that making a public commitment to do something will make people feel a stronger sense that they should do it (i.e. it helps create an injunctive norm). Some projects followed up the initial pledge (to varying degrees) to reinforce this sense. Peace Child took the pledge model furthest by encouraging parents, teachers and children to monitor whether they stuck to their pledges over the course of a month (recording progress on a classroom chart), then offered certificates and rewards to those who did well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home visits</strong></td>
<td>PECT, NEA, AFSL</td>
<td>A few projects encouraged changes in behaviour through home visits, sometimes with follow-ups a few months later (see section 5.1) although there is marked variation in the numbers of people visited and the depth of engagement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Audits, footprinting & measuring impact** | AFSL, Carplus, CF, DCHA, Eden, GAP, NT, Studentforce, Sustain, YHA | Audits were used in different ways. Their main motivational purpose was:
- to encourage individuals or organisations to take action by showing them the impact of their current behaviour; and
- provide advice on what can be done to reduce impact (enabling).
Initial home visit surveys performed the same purpose for NEA and PECT (though were not strictly audits). Audits and measurement were applied to individual households (GAP, Carplus) and community buildings (CF, Eden, Studentforce). Audits generally supported other engagement work (e.g. the National Trust schools outreach offering an energy audit by the county council; Eden enabling community building managers to raise funds for and install insulation). Other organisations monitored their own energy use (NT, YHA, DCHA) and DCHA undertook an investigation into which areas were contributing most to energy use in its housing stock. |

### Exemplify

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 Es</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>e.g.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leading by example</strong></td>
<td>DCHA, NFWI, NT, YHA</td>
<td>Many projects themselves adopted sustainable behaviours so as to encourage others to do so (i.e. they tried to practice what they preached). Few initially thought this to be core to their work, but in many cases being involved in EAF led them to change their own behaviour (e.g. DCHA reorganising its community support so that employees travelled fewer miles; NFWI adopting sustainable building principles in its new college buildings).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning through experience</strong></td>
<td>CG, CSV, CSBT, DCHA, Envision, NT, YHA</td>
<td>Many projects used positive experiences as a way of engaging an audience, encouraging them and exemplifying what might be done. Some also hoped the experience would act as a catalyst (e.g. Envision’s model of experiential activity backed up by learning and reflection sessions; Common Ground’s belief that celebration and positive messages are far more effective than telling; National Trust’s “Greening the basecamps” introducing sustainable living to people on working holidays; YHA’s “Green Shoots” project, developing activities for school groups staying at YHA properties).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Using public places</strong></td>
<td>Eden, Studentforce WWF</td>
<td>Some organisations concentrated their efforts on ‘greening’ public places in the hope that people would learn from using them and, perhaps, follow the examples through into their own lives. Eden instigated recycling systems in community buildings to enhance domestic recycling and the National Trust designated some of its properties “exemplar properties” to demonstrate both to the public and to other parts of the Trust what it could do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Outputs

The following chapter provides a brief descriptive account of:

1. the scale of this activity
2. what project activity looked like
3. reach of the projects’ activities

The account is concerned principally with the activities that the EAF projects delivered – such as events, publications, services, products, gadgets, public engagement, and support to local community groups. It also considers the audience reach of the EAF, as far as it can be assessed from the information reported by the projects. The outcomes and impacts of these activities are outlined in chapter 7 with respect to behaviour change and the capacity of communities to deliver sustainable consumption.

As already mentioned, because third sector projects typically survive on a patchwork of grant funding from many sources, the achievements reported may be attributable to more than one source.

6.1 The scale of project activity

Headline achievements

The information shown in the table below demonstrates the considerable amount and diversity of activity that took place. It is difficult to summarise or generalise but, in short, the EAF has supported the following headline achievements:

- the involvement of at least 78,000 participants – and probably far more;45
- the support of around 190 community action groups, including many entirely new groups;
- the involvement of at least 3,000 people in EcoTeams (across funding to both GAP and NFWI);
- the involvement of between 5,500 and 6,000 volunteers;46
- the running of hundreds of workshops and training courses;47
- the receipt of pledges from at least 10,000 people;48
- the auditing of hundreds of buildings and installation of energy saving measures (e.g. Studentforce, Eden, NEA, DCHA);
- the design of websites that have received hundreds of thousands of visitors;49
- the creation of a multitude of toolkits and other resources;50
- the development of service infrastructure (e.g. recycling services; service directories);
- the formation of hundreds of partnerships with businesses, local authorities and other groups;51
- the distribution of magazines and other printed material to hundreds of thousands of individuals and households;52
- the organisation of hundreds of events, attracting hundreds of thousands of visitors;53
- the generation of local and national media coverage;54
- research and development activity e.g. into PPO (BF) and environmental mitigation measures (RYA/ BMF).

45 e.g. 16,000 churches through baseline energy audits, 20,000 in CSV’s run-a-muck organic waste collection, 15,000 through YHA’s educational and environmental activities, over 7600 through the Peace Child programme, 939 through NFWI’s EcoTeams, around 900 students in the Envision groups.
46 Based on figures quoted by the projects in the year 3 e-survey (n=30)
47 e.g. CF ran over 70 workshops and courses, CSBT ran 60 sustainable building workshops, Eden ran 16 sustainability workshops, LSx conducted 9 workshops on Sustainable procurement, YHA held activities for 350 school groups and held 79 summer camps.
48 AFSL received pledges from c. 2,400 people, ACS from c. 2,000, Peace Child from c. 7,600.
49 e.g. ACS claim their site has received over 33,000 visitors, Common Ground say they receive 1,000 hits a day, MSC claim to get 5,000 hits a month; Soil Association claim 400,000 hits over three years.
50 e.g. NFWI’s living local toolkit and guidance of lift sharing, RYA/BMF’s marine business toolkit and children’s games and activity sheets, EAUC’s guidance documents and resources on sustainable procurement, Sponge’s Home Buyers guide with a print run of 5,000 etc.
51 e.g. AFSL claims to have forged partnerships with 49 other organisations, Eden’s collaborative waste project enabled over 60 businesses to recycle commercial waste, EAUC engaged 21 further and higher institutions as project partners.
52 e.g. FSC published information in 1.25 million school diaries; 1.4 million copies of BabyGROE’s magazine were distributed over 3 years; the Soil Association newsletter is sent to 132,000 people every month.
53 e.g. hundreds of small events run by community groups and under the Apple Day banner and large events such as the Soil Association’s annual food festival which has attracted 180,000 visitors over the 3 years.
54 e.g. ACS, Common Ground, FSC, Green Alliance.
Variation in scale of outputs according to project funding

The question of value for money is considered in more detail in chapter 7, taking into account both outputs and outcomes. A number of points are worth making initially about the scale of outputs, however.

The level of project activity does not seem correlated with the amount of funding that projects received

Some of the highest levels of activity have been seen in projects that were awarded relatively high grants (e.g. YHA), but the bulk of very active projects were awarded mid-sized grants (e.g. Eden, CSV and Peace Child who were each awarded between £210,000 and £220,000 over the entire three year period). Low levels of activity were generated by both small and large projects.

Certain projects have clearly punched above their funding weight

DCHA is as a good example of this (it was awarded £93,500 and claimed £90,500) and probably also the CF.

There was no clear pattern in which projects achieved high levels of activity

- Those with high numbers of reported outputs include some community action projects and projects working on changing organisations;
- They also include both projects which were formed from scratch (e.g. NT) and projects which were continuations of organisations’ existing work (e.g. Peace Child).

Similarly, low levels of outputs came from a mixture of project types:

- As might be expected, these included the projects that were set up to test an idea or concept where the number of people they worked with may have been small but considerable resource was spent on the learning aspects;
- Market development projects who found it difficult to enter into particular markets and/or reach their target audience.

6.2 What outputs were delivered?

The following table is a moderately detailed summary of the outputs that projects themselves reported in their Year 2 and Year 3 output reports and final evaluation reports. The outputs have not been verified independently by Brook Lyndhurst and are not meant to be an exhaustive list; however they are an indication of what EAF funding has achieved in terms of project activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EAF Project</th>
<th>Summary of outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Action for Sustainable Living      | - Secured 11,500 pledges from approx. 2,400 people - an average of 5 pledges per person. Pledge numbers vary from c. 1,200 for switching to energy-saving bulbs and reducing waste to <100 for installing water metres and microgeneration.  
- Initiated a wide range of projects, from one-off events to ongoing action groups (c.20) including an estimated 44 ‘substantial’ projects.  
- Formed 49 partnerships with other organisations including LAs, schools, shops, environmental groups, advice centres and religious or ethnic groups. Examples of partnership working include students from Manchester Metropolitan University helping AFSL carry out a Waste Watch Survey in partnership with Emerge. |
| Association of Charity Shops       | - Sent newsletter bulletins to stakeholders and project partners throughout funding period.  
- Sent ‘Reuse Champion’ information pack to 40+ volunteer centres along with a list of participating shops.  
- Achieved television coverage of the campaign in two regions.  
- 2,000 pledges made at 3 green Santa events across the Anglia region.  
- Website has received 33,376 visitors. |

55 Based on the project visit interviews though their evaluation report makes it hard to substantiate precisely.
56 Although, as previously discussed, the levels of activity of projects like the NFWI’s 90@90 are very dependent on how one deals with the issue of attribution. In the NFWI’s case, EAF funding, strictly speaking, only sponsored the initial membership consultation and project coordination, in which case there was very little project activity.
57 The Year 3 data available at the time of writing were for quarter 1 and quarter 2
58 Except by reference to the qualitative information gathered in the project visits which provides a cross-checking source.
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- **Local authority toolkit being developed to provide resources to carry out a "Choose2Reuse" campaign.**
- **Campaign launch events for the 'Choose2Reuse at work'.**
- **370 outlets and 12 furniture groups participated in October campaign aimed to increase the buying of reused goods through promotional materials and iconographic artwork.**
- **490 outlets participated in the January campaign inviting members of the public to donate gifts to a ‘Green Santa’ in 6 shopping centres.**
- **Accrued over 5,100 ‘reuse hours’.**
- **Recruited 50 new volunteers.**
- **Handed out 1,500 pledge cards.**
- **Interviewed 1,000 people as part of public awareness research.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BabyGROE “New Parents and Environmentally Friendly Products”</strong></td>
<td>Designed and distributed 1.4 million BabyGROE magazines over 3 years. Increased distribution outlets (to 387). Attended 35 conferences, shows and networking events with estimated reach of over 100,000 people. Established a network of 10 ambassadors to promote BabyGROE at a local level. 3 annual conferences. Recruited 11 members across a range of businesses and geographical areas. Recruited and assessed 30 suppliers of sustainable building products. Assessed all products and rated them against the 10 One Planet Living Principles and EcoHomes standard for 2005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BioRegional Development Group “One Planet Products”</strong></td>
<td>Converted 44 work cars and vans, 2 tractors, 2 taxis, 1 bus plus trial of 5 haulage vehicles to run on PPO. 80,000 litres of PPO used by cars, vans etc… plus 100,800 litres by haulage vehicles over 6 month trial. Set up of a biofuel education centre and a national association. Conducted research and development into PPO including the coordination of a Europe-wide companion cropping trial and research into oil-bearing crops capable of being grown in arid areas. Carried out PPO awareness raising activities e.g. to familiarise farmers with the technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BF “Bio-fleet”</strong></td>
<td>Recruited 136 members to the car club (as of September 2007). Introduced Toyota Prius hybrid vehicle. Produced leaflets to inform survey participants of the car club service. Conducted baseline and two follow-up surveys with local residents including individual carbon footprint information to each participating household in year 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carplus “Measuring Carbon Benefits of Car Clubs Versus Ownership”</strong></td>
<td>Published ‘England in Particular’. Ranked 4 in the Times Top Ten Books of 2006 (around 25,000 copies sold). Published “The Apple Source Book” to celebrate varieties of apple grown in England. Published pamphlets on local food and produce (several thousand copies distributed). Produced Community Orchards handbook and worked to support community orchards. Created website reported to receive 1,000+ visitors per day. Supported The Apple Day - 100s of events nationwide. Attended events, meetings and festivals (numbers not given). Generated media coverage: articles (100 in national press), radio and television appearances, lectures, newsletters, posters and exhibitions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common Ground “Producing the Goods”</strong></td>
<td>Growing Gains - delivered in 62 schools in Birmingham and lessons applied to programmes in Rochdale, Reddish and Manchester. Training sessions run with teachers in Birmingham and Bristol. Concrete to Coriander - 3 new sites developed in Birmingham. Annual gardening competition with over 100 participants. Run a Muck - Training and information sessions run at 12 schools and c.20 community organisations. Green garden waste collected from c.20,000 households at peak of service (now taken over by LA). South Bristol Environment Centre - 230 volunteers involved in 7 activity days. Company challenge events run for 45 employees of 2 businesses. Pedal Pushers - 2 editions of Healthy Lifestyles newsletters (distribution 1,000). 10 public events in parks, offices and schools involving c. 140 people. Street Champions - 120 Street Champions recruited from priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>“Developing the Parish Pump Programme”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 activities delivered (2006/07 only) involving 400+ residents and schoolchildren.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual conferences involving 70-200 street champions and key partners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ran 70+ events incl. day workshops, training events, seminars, presentations, meetings, retreats, Diocesan Synods and church services initially focussed around the World Summit in South Africa and then towards sustainable production and consumption.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produced 6 editions of ‘Parish Pump News’ (6,000 copies printed + available online).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produced publications that were national e.g. ‘How many light bulbs does it take to change a Christian’, regional e.g. ‘For Creed and Creation’ (distributed to 5,000 churches in London) and local e.g. ‘Chichester EcoFaith Parish Pack’ in scope.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoted baseline energy measurements as part of the “Shrinking the Footprint” initiative through all 43 dioceses to 16,000 churches, diocesan offices, bishops’ offices and houses (around 25% took part initially. Follow-up to take place in 2008).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSBT</th>
<th>“Building Sustainably in Cornwall”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Produced workforce development plans for 18 of the 248 companies involved in CSBT’s work during EAF.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ran 60 courses and several events with a total of 420 attendees on subjects such as biodiesel, timber and wood, solar water heating and recycled materials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DCHA</th>
<th>“Promoting and Monitoring SCAP Within the Housing Sector”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established and enacted an internal environmental policy and SCP action plan (included adding “becoming a more environmentally responsible organisation” to group aims; auditing offices, monitoring the use of energy and water, improving recycling facilities, installing cycle lockers and a shower in head office).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added sustainability section to DCHA website and environmental guidance to staff intranet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosted events (e.g. internal green-themed staff conference, climate change conference for social landlords; Green business event for maintenance contractors; Wildlife event with RSPB; green living events for residents).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procured ‘green’ energy for offices and communal areas in housing schemes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoted sustainable living across three LAs in Devon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducted quality of life survey among residents at six schemes + sheltered housing sites and followed up with visit from energy efficiency advisor/ tailored advice at events.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with partners to provide energy efficiency measures to residents (e.g. to install 352 A-rated condensing boilers, 110x cavity wall insulation and 251x loft insulation).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published green living section in residents’ newsletter (distributed to all 9,000 h/h).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained residents and awarded grants for family green activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established green website for residents’ environmental green group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launched green living awards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eden LA 21</th>
<th>“The Cumbria DEVICE programme”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainable Community Buildings</strong> – Conducted 52 energy audits covering energy management, heating, lighting, water use, ventilation and building fabric.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Centre Recycling</strong> - Provided collection receptacles for recycled materials at 33+ community centres around Cumbria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped establish rotas and systems at each venue by which volunteers transferred materials to recycling collection centres.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaborative Waste Project</strong> – Worked with a series of small businesses to overcome economies of scale through sharing recycling facilities or being part of a collection service. EAF funded 50% of cost (up to £750) of providing recycling facilities to enable over 60 businesses to recycle commercial waste which previously went to landfill.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Build Fortnight (‘06 and ‘07)</strong> – Gave 47 presentations, events and tours of buildings (attendance 1,000+ each year).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainable Community Groups</strong> - 5 pilot groups plus 11 further groups which conducted activities such as developing a farmers’ market, organising a walking bus for school children, tree planting, building a bus shelter, organising swap days, building and distributing bird boxes, distributing compost bins and establishing a bike bank for community use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ran 16+ workshops on communicating sustainability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 groups delivered events to wider audiences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produced Consumer Green Guides for two districts in Cumbria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAUC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>&quot;SCP in the Further Education and Higher Education Sector&quot;</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engaged 21 further and higher education institutions as project partners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Established baselines of current procurement practices and developed action plans for each institution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Designed a series of training modules on: developing policies and strategies, social issues in sustainable procurement, risk based approaches, supplier engagement and train the trainer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developed tools and skills amongst the partner organisations (trained 400 representatives).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Produced guidance documents and web materials (reach of 10,750).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provided hands-on support to train staff and promote sustainable procurement within the partner institutions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conducted network events and steering group meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Envision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>&quot;Schools and Colleges programme&quot;</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• EAF funded c.25 schools per year (out of 100 where Envision is active) to take part in the Envision programme involving continuous engagement for a year with a group of students in each school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Each year c.250-600 students participated in the programme as well as c.50 adult volunteers. (Examples of initiatives are: launching recycling in a school which has never recycled before; conducting awareness campaigns about world water scarcity; lobbying senior management for organic and fair-trade food to be sold in schools; a campaign on reducing consumption and reducing waste; working with a primary school to create a mural on waste).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Set up of &quot;the Envision Challenge&quot; in which 525 children participated (Envision students were set a sustainability task and could post picture evidence of completing it on Envision website).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Distributed Eco Packs to students (containing water hippos, energy saving light bulbs, herb garden seeds, green gym information, climate change calendar and posters from the Energy Saving Trust).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hosted kick off events, reflection sessions and closing ceremonies in London and Birmingham for each year of the fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hosted training workshops for volunteers and students (e.g. how to make a video, how to plan a campaign, food issues, and climate change).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>&quot;Developing FSC Market in England&quot;</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encouraging British Public to seek out FSC-certified products:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Published double page spread on world forests and work of FSC in 1.25 million school diaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Printed and distributed 30,000 flyers to promote children and photographic competitions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ‘Piggy-backed’ on retailers’ promotional activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Convincing industry sectors to stock FSC-certified products and the paper and construction sectors to embrace the system:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Worked on explaining Chain of Custody system to printers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organised two events for the paper sector and attended two exhibitions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promoted FSC amongst architects and contractors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Held two seminars and attended and/or exhibited at three conferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developed partnerships with a range of companies and retailers (enabling wider promotion of certified products).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developed case studies on real impact of FSC at a forest level (in response to retailer demand).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promoted case studies on the FSC UK website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Designed, produced and subsequently updated illustrated factsheets (e.g. on FSC and the Public Sector, the Construction Sector, the Paper Sector).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educating retail counter staff to assist in search for FSC-certified products:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Worked with Homebase to produce a staff DVD. Homebase then carried out “huddles” for store staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Helped organise a responsible timber sourcing workshop for head office staff (including buyers and QA staff).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Posted FSC information on intranet site and included articles in internal magazine.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>&quot;EcoTeams&quot;</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Since the initiation of the programme 3,602 households (699 teams) participated in EcoTeams (looking at issues such as waste, electricity, heating energy and water).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GAP tested various delivery methods (for cost and reach).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Established body of data on effective community engagement tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developed attitude and behaviour survey with the New Economics Foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Produced EcoTeams handbook to accompany the programme (designed using feedback from the pilot studies to provide greater flexibility and interactivity).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

55 It is unclear how many of those have directly been funded by this round of EAF
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment Action Fund (EAF): A Review of Sustainable Consumption and Production Projects for Defra</th>
<th>Chapter 6: Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Green Alliance**<br>"Closing the Loop" | • Developed web-based data collection system for EcoTeams (so participants are able to enter their data directly - making programme more participative and increasing GAP's capacity).  
• Published two reports (on product levies and a zero waste UK).  
• Produced a protocol for compostable packaging.  
• Hosted of a number of seminars, events and meetings.  
• Generated media coverage for work on zero waste (incl. national press and television).  
• Responded to consultations. |
| **LSx**<br>"Diverse London: Creating Richer Choices for All" | • Muslims and recycling demo project – Organised events (six sermons, four lectures, three coffee mornings and five art-based children’s activities). Claim to have reached 13,500.  
• Hindu demo project – Organised events (three temple talks, five workshops, two children’s activities and three festivals). Claim to have engaged 3,000.  
• Pepys estate demonstration project - Site visits, participation at Open Day and community engagement meeting; training and one-to-one support of Ambassadors. Claim to have reached 250.  
• SME support ('Eco Design Network’) – Organised events (nine events on sustainable procurement and business).  
• Community based work - Organised events (7 events incl. farm visits and green fairs).  
• Distributed tools and devices including energy saving light bulbs, recycled pencils, toilet flush devices, ‘power downs’ etc... at events, meetings, and to Ambassadors and champions.  
• Published briefing sheets (on CO2, water, foot printing, doing your bit at home, tips for creative business, tips for individuals, and on farmers markets).  
• Worked in partnership with commercial catering suppliers to make MSC certified fish available to the catering industry.  
• Fish & kids – Attended meetings and conferences to raise awareness of MSC amongst local authorities (LAs).  
• Worked with LAs and school catering suppliers to make certified sustainable fish available on school menus.  
• Designed and distributed educational resource pack for all primary schools.  
• Secured endorsement from Ainsley Harriott.  
• Created “fish & kids” website to make resources available to teachers, and activities available to schoolchildren (received an average of c.600 unique visitors a month in 2006, c.1,000 in 2007 and c.3,500 per month – c.5,000 ‘hits’- in 2008 to date).  
• Increased the number of suppliers stocking MSC certified produce.  
• Fish & kitchen – Engaged pub and restaurant chains to raise awareness of overfishing.  
• Worked with them to make MSC certified fish available on their menus.  
• Launched two electricity metering trials (including control groups) – one in London and one in Herefordshire.  
• Recruited trial participants through door knocking and through information about the trials being sent to customers by their energy suppliers.  
• Conducted household surveys and implemented energy and water saving measures (e.g. 912 energy saving light bulbs, 799 radiator panels, 2 draught proof kits, 135 energy efficient kettles and 512 savas-flushes).  
• Installed 206 smart meters in London and loaned devices to a further 151 households.  
• Loaned 40 Electrisave meters in Herefordshire and loaned them to 188 households.  
• Launched Local Energy Savers Scheme in Herefordshire. |
| **MSC**<br>"Working With The Foodservice Industry" | • National Energy Action<br>"Domestic Environmental Management in Action" | • Managed 90 @ 90 members’ consultation.  
• Ran 124 EcoTeams (with 939 people taking part).  
• Organised 2 sustainable transport workshops run with CarPlus (attendance 30).  
• Organised 7 home composting workshops (attendance 200 h/hs).  
• Published guidance notes on establishing lift sharing schemes.  
• Published a “living local” toolkit to help campaigning for locally produced food. (Distributed to NFWI offices and 4,000 downloads). |
| **NFWI**<br>“90 @ 90” | • Energy Outreach - Outreach officer visited the 8 participating schools for six two-hour sessions. 5 schools then installed energy saving measures and held |  
| **National Trust** |  

50 These EcoTeams are also counted as part of the GAP total  
61 Please note that all initiatives outside the original consultation were funded by other organisations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **“Small Steps – Big Change”**       | - Organised conference to share good practice and encourage energy saving in schools (20 schools participated).  
  - **Internal energy programme** - Conducted energy surveys at 7 National Trust Properties.  
  - Organised a 'Switch Off, Keep Cool' week to help staff implement changes (e.g. shutting computers down, turning down thermostats, moving furniture away from heaters).  
  - Produced and distributed stickers for envelope re-use.  
  - **Greening the basecamps** - 'Green' resources sent out to 10 basecamps (including posters and water-saving devices).  
  - Developed a ‘Basecamp Bistro CD’ for basecamp leaders. Hard copies of cookery book sent to basecamps  
  - **Ugly vegetable project** – Organised competitions.  
  - **Activities at NT properties** - Food-related activities at several properties: seasonal cookery workshops (x9), demonstration sites for composting, composting and gardening days, growing activities, food fairs, local produce market, competitions, exhibitions, seed gathering, guided walks, installation of accelerated composter (Cotehele) and recycling baler (Fountains Abbey), school and visitor activity packs (for various properties), growing activities with local schools, and creating kitchen gardens with plots for local community groups.  
  - Media coverage in internal and external press (e.g. members’ magazine, NT website, NT intranet, ugly vegetable competition reported on national radio, television, and in broadsheet newspapers).  
  - Design of project website.  
  - **Lifestyle contracts** - Conducted c. 150 baseline and follow-up school visits.  
  - Awarded 7,618 lifestyle contracts (to children who had successfully completed their pledges).  
  - **Ambassador programme** - Recruited and trained 342 secondary school ambassadors (and designed and provided ambassador packs) who in turn conducted 84 school visits.  
  - **Transport programme** - Trained 40 transport ambassadors (with TfL) who gave workshops in 11 schools.  
  - Published book and website on sustainable transport around the globe in partnership with TfL.  
  - **Outreach work** - Gave presentations and workshops (incl. 15 workshops at Scouts’ Jamboree).  
  - Conducted research work with UWE, WWF and Eco Schools. |
| **Peace Child**                      |                                                                                               |
| **“Be the Change”**                 |                                                                                               |
| **PECT**                            | - Conducted 954 household visits (in 30% of cases residents were re-contacted and given follow-up questionnaires).  
  - Worked with EST and SusTrans to offer personalised energy and travel guides to residents who wished to know more about sustainable travel.  
  - Provided households with 'welcome bag' containing eco products (e.g. light bulbs and washing liquid) packed by volunteers.  
  - Recruited 20 sustainable living champions and created a sustainable living champion network.  
  - Recruited 10 water champions (Anglian Water retrofitted the houses of 8 of these with water saving devices).  
  - Designed website (approx. 1,550 visits per month) and online forum (20 users).  
  - Hosted 47 events and seminars corresponding to needs / interest highlighted in the baseline survey e.g. Apple Day, farmers’ market, nature reserve event, workshops on growing vegetables and what happens to recyclable waste (Attendance from 1,000+ for Apple Day and farmers’ market to 5-10 people at MRF visit). |
| **RYA/ BMF**                        | - Attended events - 4 boat shows each year with stand and events.  
  - Organised events - Providing advice and promoting the Green Boat Checklist (for which demand has increased at each event).  
  - Conducted talks - 120+ with an average audience size of 50 i.e. 6,000 people.  
  - Designed website – 750 hits per month initially to 2,000 now.  
  - Published - E-newsletter every two months (distribution of 831); an environmental Code of Practice for the marine business; guides to the issues; environmental checklist; recycling posters; a clubs’ handbook for easy access to environment and planning information; 2 wall planners with key messages about energy efficiency and antifoul.  
  - Produced a “Marine Business Toolkit” with Groundwork (includes self-assessment tools for business owners).  
  - Worked in partnerships – With Groundwork (see above); with MDL Ltd to design low cost solution to antifoul wash down from boats; with the RYA Yachtmaster Club. |
| **“Seeding Sustainable Communities”**|                                                                                               |
| **“The Green Blue”**                |                                                                                               |
## Outputs
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### Soil Association

**“Action Organic”**

- Developed a ‘green directory’ for marine businesses to list alternative products and services (over 100 products and services now listed).
- Created an award scheme for hybrid engine use in boating.
- Produced children’s games, activity sheets, identity cards, CDs of all publications for harbour guides; tea-towels with key inland messages; CDs of Green Blue ambassador Mike Golding OBE, and an interactive CD-ROM.
- Commissioned independent research into environmental mitigation measures open to inland waterways users, the carbon footprint of the recreational fleet in the UK and use of alternative fuels for boats in the UK.

#### Why organic website
- Established the ‘whyorganic.org’ website (400,000+ hits over 3 yrs).
- Organised web-based promotions.
- Produced monthly newsletters - 132,000 registered.

#### Local action group
- Directly supported c.40 local action groups, involving c. 2,000 volunteers. (Their activities included setting up a community supported agriculture scheme; setting up a buying group to make organic food more affordable; running plant and seed swaps, holding events, distributing organic directories and hosting educational visits).

- Produced 21 information and promotional resources; ran 25 events (e.g. workshops, conversation cafes and film screenings).
- Supported over 50 events run by the local groups themselves.
- Generated press coverage (e.g. Time Out, Tastes of Britain, You and Yours, The Independent, Organic North).
- Answered telephone and e-mail enquiries regarding local groups and related topics (between 100 and 300 per year).
- Organised annual networking event for local groups.

#### Organic food festival
- Ran annual organic food festival (609 stallholders, 180,000 visitors and 420 new Soil Association members over the three years).

- **Other work** - Held “conversation cafes” at events.
- **Community groups** - Assisted 61 community groups to set up and start taking action (32 still running). Overall, 89 groups were supported over the three years. Examples of actions taken by the groups are: events and talks (e.g. showings of “the inconvenient truth”), promotion of renewable energy, organising plastics collections, wood recycling, installing water saving devices, office composting schemes etc.

- A groups network was initiated in the last few months of the project with 13 groups attending the first networking meeting.
- Produced tip sheets and scorecards (self-assessment forms) – approx. 7,000 copies distributed on 15 different subjects. Around 2,000 also sent electronically.

- **Other activities** - Supported 540 ‘activists’ through information and advice.
- Organised 45 case study visits (e.g. to Ecohomes, renovation sites, cob buildings, etc.) - total participation around 2,100.
- Maintained regional directory of suppliers.

### Somerset Trust

**“Community Choices for Sustainable Living”**

- Assisted 61 community groups to set up and start taking action (32 still running). Overall, 89 groups were supported over the three years. Examples of actions taken by the groups are: events and talks (e.g. showings of “the inconvenient truth”), promotion of renewable energy, organising plastics collections, wood recycling, installing water saving devices, office composting schemes etc.

- A groups network was initiated in the last few months of the project with 13 groups attending the first networking meeting.
- Produced tip sheets and scorecards (self-assessment forms) – approx. 7,000 copies distributed on 15 different subjects. Around 2,000 also sent electronically.

- **Other activities** - Supported 540 ‘activists’ through information and advice.
- Organised 45 case study visits (e.g. to Ecohomes, renovation sites, cob buildings, etc.) - total participation around 2,100.
- Maintained regional directory of suppliers.

### SPAN partners\(^1\)

**“Sustainable Production in Active Neighbourhoods (SPAN)”**

- Supported 10 pilot projects (local-action groups) concerned with growing food, trees or other plants - Organised three facilitators meetings (incorporating facilitator training).
- Held events and meetings including SPAN gathering involving all participants and support staff.
- Conducted two issue-based workshops on monitoring and evaluation and on working across different languages and cultures.
- Developed a website to host improved, downloadable resources.
- Designed publications - e.g. leaflet explaining SPAN project, SPAN manifesto.
- Developed (with the pilot projects) a toolkit of different working methods and enabling resources to enable community groups to support sustainable food.

### Sponge

**“Building the Market for Sustainable Lifestyles”**

- Published - “Eco Chic or Eco Geek? The Desirability of Sustainable Homes” as a result of research conducted with the general public and a “Buyers’ guide to a greener home” to address the reported lack of information among consumers (initial print run 5,000).

---

\(^1\) The SPAN partners were: Community Composting Network, Federation of City Farms & Community Gardens, Garden Organic, Permaculture Association UK, Women’s Environmental Network,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Studentforce</strong></td>
<td><strong>“Community Checks”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Held events - three CPD events designed to investigate the marketability of homes that deliver sustainable lifestyles (85 attending delegates).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Completed 120 ‘Community Check’ and ‘Re-Check’ audits of community buildings for which they trained 81 volunteers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organised 25+ learning visits and events associated with green building and sustainable consumption (attendance over 200 people).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Developed a free online toolkit for local authorities and other organisations to set up their own ‘Community Check’ schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Published bimonthly newsletters, press releases and online news items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustain</strong></td>
<td><strong>“London Food Link”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Membership doubled from 90 to 180 members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Events: organised 15 events and attended around 150 others. (Regular attendance at their own events has risen from 50 to 80 over the 3 yrs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Published 11 issues of the Jellied Eel magazine for members and for non-members through events, cafes, etc... (distribution started at 500 copies, now 1,000).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Published 4 reports: Recipe for a Greener Curry; One Planet Dining; Feeding the Olympics; Edible Cities; as well as Sustainable Food Guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Produced 10 issues of Greater London farmers’ newsletter in partnership with the NFU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Developed online ‘Local Food Finder’ resource for buyers in London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organised visits to food projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Answered queries (180 from 150 organisations last year).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WWT</strong></td>
<td><strong>“Wiltshire Climate Friendly Communities”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Produced initial leaflet to attract attention to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Set up15 local action groups (the majority of which will continue after the end of the funding as part of a local network).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Groups have held green fairs in 9 areas (as well as other activities e.g. creating a plastic bag free town; tackling local energy use, working on waste minimisation and organising talks and visits).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• One group (Urchfont) has conducted waste and energy trials (with 13 and 18 households respectively).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Produced quarterly newsletter (distributed to around 350 people).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Held networking events for the groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Organised visits to inspiring places (e.g. NT Heelis building, Ashton Hayes conference, Bristol eco-house, Garden Organic at Ryton).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Held 39 events during 2007 Climate Friendly Fortnight with the project groups. (Claimed attendance over 1,100).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WWF</strong></td>
<td><strong>“Community Learning and Action for Sustainable Development”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Worked with four community groups using learning engagement model of behaviour change: a church group, a group of parents and teachers at an infant school and two village groups (one after the other).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Groups held events and activities (e.g. the church group conducted an energy audit of the church, installed recycling and composting facilities, installed water butts and hippos, installed energy efficient lights, hosted presentations and workshops, lead assemblies etc.; the school group organised swap events for books, clothes and unwanted items, ran a waste-free lunchbox project, held a water event, gave away 100 hippos etc.; the second village group ran workshops on climate change, ecological footprints and recycling, chemicals and health and chemicals in the home and organised a visit to a housing development).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Held 3 day-long workshops to disseminate findings from the project to wider stakeholder audiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Researched and published review on current thinking on behaviour change and methods for community engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YHA</strong></td>
<td><strong>“The Green Shoots Project”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Delivered curriculum-linked educational activities to approximately 7,000 young people and other environmental activities to about 8,000 (split between seven modules: general, energy, water, waste and recycling, food, transport, and shopping and consumption).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 350 school groups experienced Green Shoots activities (ranging from short sessions e.g. 1-hour Global Footprints to full day events).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 1,630 children (95% KS2 and 5% KS3) did the Eco-Warrior activity (including activities on a range of environmental issues).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 360 of the above, plus a further 450, also did eco-art (including the Global Footprint game and posters on helping the environment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Held 79 Summer Camps with an environmental education / awareness component (link to John Muir Trust and awards).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

63 Group sizes varied from 2 core people to the population of a town
## Table 7 | Summary of project outputs
Source: information provided in Year 2 output reports, Year 3 quarter 1 and 2 output reports and final evaluation reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 3,075 John Muir Awards were achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Trained 230 YHA staff members at 24 events, including 12 3-day courses and 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adopted stricter guidance on travel and meetings, aided by improvements such</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as teleconferencing technology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.3 Project Reach

It is impossible to say with any precision what the total reach of activities undertaken in the EAF has been (i.e. the number of people 'engaged' by the projects) other than the summary above, or what the total reach has been for individual projects or types of projects. There are several reasons for this:

- not all projects provided numeric data on the total numbers of activities they delivered;
- some did not measure or estimate robustly how many people they reached as a result of activities such as events or publications.
- in some cases, 'engagement' constituted a large number of individually small items (e.g. responding to ad hoc enquiries or emails, having conversations) and it would have been unreasonable to log all of it.

#### Where projects were able to estimate reach

Projects appeared to have a good idea of the reach of things that are directly in their control, or figures they can easily check, for example:

- the distribution of magazines and publications (BabyGROE, CG, CF, FSC, ST)
- the number of schools they have visited (CSV, Envision),
- how many audits they have conducted (Eden, Studentforce),
- the number of people signed up to their services (GAP, Sustain).
- the numbers of pledges people have made (AfSL, Peace Child)
- the number of times their website has been visited (CG, DCHA, PECT, RYA/ BMF, SA).

#### Where it was difficult to estimate reach

However, they are far less sure of the reach of events (e.g. workshops, training courses, etc.) and any engagement for which they've relied on intermediaries (e.g. the number of people that ambassadors or community action groups had contact with).

The latter makes it especially difficult to estimate the total scale of "action in communities" brought about by the EAF overall, and therefore to say how effective this is as a model of engaging with the public on environmental behaviours on a purely headcount basis.

In addition, the figures available do not take into account the quality or depth of the contact. For example, public events may have reached many people for a one-off encounter with the project, while other projects which achieved apparently small reach had continuing contact with either the action groups they were supporting, or their target audiences directly (e.g. some of those working with stakeholders in supply chains).

### The nominal reach of the EAF

Taking into account all these caveats, the figure of 78,000 given in section 6.2 above is a best estimate of a minimum scale of those 'actively' engaged in the projects (i.e. that undertook a specific activity as a result of the project rather than were simply reached by a magazine, publication or open public event). If publications, events and so on are included then the reach of EAF projects amounted to millions of people (e.g. FSC placing information in 1.25 million school diaries; BabyGROE distributing 1.4 million magazines; 570,000 schoolchildren being offered the option of certified fish on their school menus).

While these figures provide a broad indicator of the scale of activity in the EAF, in our judgement they have only limited meaning as an evaluation metric for this kind of activity, where depth and quality are at least as important (see chapter 8).

---

64 This is not an exhaustive list, but is meant to be illustrative of projects' activities.
Methods for achieving project reach

The factors to which projects attributed their success – in terms of both audience engagement and achieving behaviour changes – are considered in detail in chapter 8. It is worth noting briefly here, though, that project reach differed between those using different tools, and in different types of project.

**Certain tools seemed to have reached particularly high numbers of people**

These include:

- **events** (e.g. Soil Association’s annual food festival);
- **publications** (including magazines, newsletters, pamphlets and books); and
- **websites** (e.g. MSC’s 5,000 hits per month).

For each of these, we estimate contact with hundreds of thousands of members of the public; but little is known about the depth of audience engagement and associated change in these cases.

**Certain types of projects also seem more likely to have reached large audiences, namely:**

- **market development projects** (e.g. through the use of mass marketing - FSC);
- **projects working with large organisations**, often because they can access those organisations’ members or clients as well as their staff (e.g. NT, YHA);
- **projects working with large pre-existing groups** (e.g. schoolchildren – MSC, Peace Child).
Outcomes

This chapter assesses the extent to which the activities that projects delivered have resulted in environmental behaviour change, and the extent to which they have built the commitment and capacity of communities to support action on sustainable consumption.

In particular, it looks at the outcome data provided by the projects, both on ‘soft outcomes’ (i.e. claimed changes in behaviour which have been brought about by projects’ activities) and, where these are available, on ‘hard outcomes’ (i.e. measured changes in sustainable consumption and environmental impact). The strengths and weaknesses of these data sources have been discussed in chapter 4. The data are used to look at:

1. the perceptions of projects and participants as to what changed
2. documented changes in headline behaviours
3. wider social outcomes in terms of personal and community capacity for change
4. outcomes by project types
5. additionality, spill-over effects and longevity

Again, please note that the achievements reported may be attributable to more than one source.

7.1 Participant and project perceptions of the impact of the EAF

What do participants say they achieved?

According to the participants interviewed by Brook Lyndhurst, the most common reason to get involved in the project was their environmental or social beliefs (67%, n=86). Yet many of them (70%) also said that taking part in the project had changed the way they think and feel about their lifestyles. A large majority (88%) also reported that they are now doing more than they were before to reduce their environmental impact, including 1 in 3 who are “doing much more” and the rest “a bit more” (Figure 5).

![Participants' Claimed Behaviour Change](image)

Figure 5 | “Overall, as a result of taking part in this project, which one of the following statements most closely applies to you…?" "I'm now doing much more than before to reduce my environmental impact / I'm now doing a bit more than before to reduce my environmental impact"

Results from projects’ use of the Brook Lyndhurst’s standard evaluation questions in their own evaluations

‘BL’ figures from Brook Lyndhurst public participants and intermediary interviews

Base sizes vary – numbers included in brackets.
Project intermediaries\textsuperscript{65} interviewed by Brook Lyndhurst were less convinced that the people they had been working with had changed their behaviour as much, but overall 83\% said that project participants were doing at least a bit more than before to reduce their impact.

The data collected from participants for projects’ own evaluations show much the same pattern\textsuperscript{66}. Across all projects that asked the standard evaluation questions, large majorities of participants said they are now doing more to reduce their environmental impact as a result of taking part in the project (Figure 5). The change is more often a “bit more” than “much more”, though not in all projects. The most positive responses tended to come from projects where participants had worked together in groups (e.g. AFSL, NFWI, GAP, WWT, SA).

The NFWI results are interesting because the NFWI asked the questions of their EcoTeam leaders (who would also have been participants in many cases). These were ‘standard’ members of the organisation who took on the leader role just for this project and were trained accordingly. Although highly speculative, the fact that such a high proportion felt they were doing much more than before to reduce their environmental impact may show the effect of putting people who were not ‘the usual suspects’ in a position where they were not only trained, but had to encourage others to take action and had to take ownership of the group’s performance.

Only the National Trust figures stand out as being particularly low but this may be explained by the fact that the National Trust asked the questions of volunteer staff (i.e. intermediaries) rather than the people the volunteers came into contact with.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Biggest_change_for_participants.png}
\caption{Biggest Change for Participants}
\end{figure}

Looking at specific behaviours reported by the participants surveyed by Brook Lyndhurst:

- \textbf{recycling} and \textbf{energy efficiency} were the areas most often reported as the biggest changes (by 30\% and 27\% respectively, \(n=71\)) (Figure 6). As was shown earlier (section 3.5), these were also the two areas most frequently mentioned by the projects as a priority for their work.

\textsuperscript{65} I.e. those helping to deliver the project by working with participants directly (\(n=65\)). Some were also participants themselves (e.g. Eco Team leaders). See chapter 5 for more detail.

\textsuperscript{66} But note that the data were gathered using different techniques, and with different types of audience so that the percentages themselves are not entirely comparable. Here we are concerned more with the pattern of response as a broad indicator of behaviour change.
• more surprisingly, **transport** was the next most frequently mentioned “biggest change” by participants, whereas reducing car travel was a priority in the work of only a few projects;
• while **food** ranked much lower down in participants’ reporting of “biggest changes” than it did in projects’ priorities.

**What do projects think they achieved?**

The projects were asked in the Year 3 e-survey to say how much impact they thought they had achieved on various behavioural and capacity building aspects.

Figure 8 shows the areas in which the projects felt they had made the most impact. **Recycling** stands out by quite some margin – with 14 projects reporting a significant impact, more than twice as high as for any other behaviour. This figure is identical to the 14 projects that had said reducing waste was a high priority for the project (see chapter 3). In no other behavioural area did the percentage reporting a significant impact come close to the percentage that had said it was a high priority, suggesting perhaps that recycling was the easiest behaviour to change.

That said, the broad ranking of claimed impacts (significant and moderate) matches up to that of the priority work areas for the projects – with **recycling and energy use** being the areas of greatest reported impact across the EAF, followed by **sustainable food, CO₂ reductions** and **water use**. Issues around **sustainable travel** were the areas in which fewest projects reported an impact.

![Project Impacts - Behaviours](image)

**Figure 7**

*Can you say, in your opinion, how much impact you think your project has had on the following?*

*Based on projects’ responses to the Year 3 e-survey*

*Base = 32 answering this question*

As shown in figure 8, the projects also felt they had made notable impacts with respect to participants’ awareness of sustainable living, their capacity to undertake action, and their willingness to change. These aspects are covered further in section 7.3.
Notably, the specific behaviours where the projects think they have made the most difference match the areas in which the general public feels it is doing more (this is demonstrated in table 8). Recycling and reducing energy top the list while buying sustainable products and using the car less are done much less by the UK public, and have changed less too. With the exception of transport (which ranked higher in participant responses) the pattern is also similar to that of the biggest changes made by participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>Proportion of projects feeling they have made a significant impact in this area</th>
<th>Proportion of participants feeling this was the area in which they’d made the biggest change</th>
<th>Proportion of the general public feeling that they are doing a lot more to reduce their impact in this area than a year ago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>44% (14)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>22% (7)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>6% (2)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste reduction</td>
<td>22% (7)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption/sus. products</td>
<td>22% (7)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>13% (4)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>19% (6)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 | Changes to behaviour
Project managers (N=32): Can you say, in your opinion, how much impact you think your project has had on the following?
Project participants (N=71): What is the biggest change that you’ve made?
General public (N=2014): Compared to a year ago, are you doing the following more, less or about the same?
Many projects observed qualitatively that they had benefited from growing public interest in environmental issues more generally, so it is not surprising that they seemed to achieve impacts where the audience was more ready to change. The question then is the extent to which the EAF activities simply rode the wave, or whether they enhanced and galvanised growing public interest. The question of additionality is considered in section 7.5.

Figure 9 | Thinking overall, how much has the amount you, personally, do to reduce your impact on the environment changed in the last year? Would you say you are doing ….
Base =2014 (ICM omnibus May 2007 – n=1000 & Nov 2007 – n=1,014);

### 7.2 Specific behaviours

The outcomes data from the projects’ evaluation reports is the main source of evidence on whether the perceptions described above can be substantiated. The evaluations generated so much data, and data which are so diverse, that it is very difficult to find a way to summarise and generalise the outcomes of the EAF while still doing justice to the detail of its achievements.

In order to simplify the presentation of outcomes, they are described here under each of Defra’s headline behaviours. The data shown are meant to give a flavour of projects’ findings and are not an exhaustive list. The description does however reflect the weight of evidence reported across the specific behaviours.

It is important to bear in mind that this is a very reductionist presentation of EAF achievements. In particular, it does not give a full enough account of many of the community action projects which were attempting to change lifestyles ‘in the round’, or those that collected large numbers of pledges. Their achievements need also to be considered in terms of changing ‘hearts and minds’ in relation to everyday life, and the cumulative total of the small actions that they persuaded participants to adopt. These dimensions are considered later in section 7.3 and chapter 8.

Under each behaviour heading below, examples of ‘soft’ outcome data are presented first, followed by evidence of ‘hard’ outcomes (as defined in chapter 4). The ‘hard’ outcome heading sometimes includes examples which could also be described as project outputs; these cases generally arise where behaviour

---

67 Further data is provided in Appendix C, the spreadsheet provided to Defra and projects’ own evaluation reports.
change is not entirely voluntary but may have come about through provision of ‘gadgets’ to participants, or where choice editing has restricted access to less sustainable products.

The overall headlines

The outcome data support the general picture of impact described above. The EAF appears to have had most success in encouraging either small to moderate increases in existing behaviours (e.g. recycling) and the adoption of many small, low impact behaviours in other areas (e.g. energy saving and water). There were also documented successes in encouraging the purchase of sustainable food, where projects had focused on this area.

Some of the best evidenced and biggest changes occurred where an organisation was changing its own practices as part of its wider engagement with sustainability, and also in some of the market development projects where projects had helped to re-engineer supply chains in favour of sustainable products.

There were few successes in areas which would have required major lifestyle changes by participants, such as micro-generation, flying and car use - but this also reflects the fact that few projects focused on them.

Insulation

Soft outcomes – little claim data: few projects produced outcome data on insulation although AfSL collected some pledges in this area and found that at least a few did go onto fulfil them (e.g. they collected 441 pledges on draft proofing68 and, of the small number who then took part in follow-up interviews, 11 of the 18 who had made this pledge claimed to have installed it); 10/34 WWT group participants took some action in this area (e.g. cavity wall insulation, draft proofing).

Hard outcomes – a few examples of success through partnership working69:
DCHA - showing 110 cavity wall and 251 loft insulations in the social housing it manages;
Eden - showing a saving of approximately 200-300 tonnes of CO₂ per annum as a result of its work to support the installation of insulation in community buildings (e.g. village halls etc).

Better energy management

Soft outcomes – claim data showing a large number of small changes: many projects demonstrated achievements on energy management, particularly on turning appliances off standby and turning lights off when leaving rooms e.g. 80% of the school students participating in the Envision survey indicated the project had some impact on them in relation to energy issues; 52% of past EcoTeam participants interviewed by GAP still switched appliances off at the wall when not in use; the percentage of children taking part in Peace Child’s “Be the change” saying they would always turn the light off when leaving a room increased from 37% to 81%.

Hard outcomes – demonstrable energy reduction in some community action and changing organisation projects, for example:
- DCHA - installation of 352 A-rated condensing boilers and various methods to give better temperature control in its social housing;
- GAP and NFWI from their EcoTeams:
  - reduced electricity consumption of 5.1% and 3% respectively across their groups;
  - reduced heating energy consumption by 17.8% and 21% respectively).
- National Trust reported:
  - 18% energy savings in the schools participating in its energy-saving week and outreach programme70
  - and 25% reduction in the consumption of the 7 properties involved in their energy saving week, saving, 154 kg of CO₂ per property

68 compared to 189 for not flying where alternatives are available, but 1251 for switching to low energy bulbs
69 i.e. in projects working with partners to install insulation since the EAF grants could not be used for this purpose.
70 Energy Busters was an outreach programme which involved 6 two-hour workshops in each participating school, energy audits undertaken by the county council property services, an action plan which the pupils helped prioritise, subsidies for installing energy saving equipment, and inter-school competitions, as well as the energy saving week.
NEA estimate that 233.4 tonnes of CO$_2$ was saved through the installation of light bulbs, energy efficient kettles, radiator panels, etc in households it worked with.\textsuperscript{71}

WWT - showed energy savings equivalent to 23 tonnes of CO$_2$ in the Urchfont community action group energy trial (13 households).

YHA - showed energy consumption of hostels reduced by 16% and its overall CO$_2$ emissions dropping by 56% from a combination of reduced energy consumption, reduced business mileage, but mostly from a switch to a green energy supply.

**Case study | GAP and NFWI EcoTeams**

EcoTeams are small groups of households who meet once a month for approximately five months to learn how to reduce their environmental impact, and in doing so measure their waste and recycling production, and energy and water consumption. Both GAP and NFWI ran EcoTeams as part of their EAF funded activities and have been able to achieve significant behaviour changes amongst their participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Reduction achieved</th>
<th>GAP (Base: 1096 households)</th>
<th>NFWI (Base: 257 households)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residual waste</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total waste</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating energy</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$ reduction</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Households which achieved a reduction</th>
<th>GAP (Base: 1096 households)</th>
<th>NFWI (Base: 257 households)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residual waste</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total waste</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating energy</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$ reduction</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Domestic micro-generation**

**Soft outcomes – very little claim data**: only two projects produced outcome data on micro-generation. AFSL received 93 pledges from participants to generate their own energy but no-one had done this at the follow-up interview stage\textsuperscript{72}; two WWT group participants claimed to have installed an alternative energy source.\textsuperscript{73}

**Hard outcome data – no evidence.**

**Increasing recycling and waste segregation**

**Soft outcomes - claim data showing widespread success**: many projects have outcome data on waste and recycling as it was a popular area of activity. Eden found that of the 33 community centres they

\textsuperscript{71} NEA will also be able demonstrate actual energy savings in households provided with smart meters but delays in the project (which were largely outside the control of NEA) mean that data were not available at the time of writing this report.

\textsuperscript{72} of the 13 who had made this pledge and responded to the follow-up.

\textsuperscript{73} this may indicate that WWT group participants tended to be relatively ‘dark green’.
provided with receptacles, 24 had increased their recycling and that 79% of their community group participants said the project had made them change their recycling habits74; PECT found in its follow-up survey that home composting rates had doubled in households it had visited; RYA/ BMF found that amongst those who had registered with The Green Blue over the last 2 years, 18% stated they recycled a lot more since receiving its advice75; Somerset Trust claimed that 95% of its respondents always recycle and 85% compost frequently76.

**Hard outcomes – good success from community action and changing organisation projects:**

- CSV - a 15% increase in participation rates following the awareness work they did on their green waste collections (now run by the council);
- DCHA - a doubling of recycling rates at its Exeter office;
- Eden - an average of 43 bin bags of plastic containers, 21 bags of glass, 42 of paper and card etc... collected per venue per year from each of the community buildings in which it had installed a recycling collection scheme;
- GAP and NFWI from their EcoTeams - participants increased the proportion of their waste that was recycled, by 4.7% and 7% respectively.

**Case study | EDEN**

As part of their DEVICE programme, EDEN initiated the ‘Cumbria Community Centre Recycling Initiative’ to promote and facilitate recycling at community meeting places around Cumbria. Each venue was provided with recycling containers according to the amount and type of waste generated. One of the conditions of providing the containers was that EDEN required a record to be kept of the amounts of each type of material the centres were collecting. To assist with this, EDEN also visited each venue in order to liaise with members of staff and decide on the best procedure for recording volumes of materials and transferring materials to recycling collection points.

**Waste less**

**Soft outcomes – claim data showing success in certain areas,** for example re-using plastic bags. PECT reported 17% of respondents claiming to buy fewer disposable products, 47% increasing their use of reusable bags, 22% joining the mail preference service and 27% reducing their overall waste77. AfSL received 305 pledges on taking unwanted clothes to charity shops however Envision’s success in increasing the proportion of pupils “often” buying second hand clothes was only in getting the figure from 4% to 6%78 - showing that there is still a lot of work to be done to change attitudes in this area.

**Waste less – strong successes in some community action projects:**

- DCHA - showing a decrease in production of bulky waste from its Exeter office;
- GAP and NFWI from their EcoTeams – showed that residual waste (i.e. bin waste not recycled) decreased by 19% and 22% respectively;
- WWT - showing household waste reductions of 35% in the Urchfont Waste Trials.

**Responsible water usage**

**Soft outcomes – claim data showing relatively high success, particularly on installation of ‘gadgets’**. A fair number of projects have outcome data on water – some relating to general consumption and some relating to the installation of gadgets. As a whole, this is an area in which people seem willing to take action. It is interesting to note that there may be differing levels of acceptability for water saving behaviours – e.g. AfSL received 735 pledges to install cistern devices, which was less than a third the number pledging to use grey water or install a water butt, while only 94 pledged to install a water meter (at the follow-up stage, 20/30, 15/29 and 6/10 respectively had seen these through). NEA found the proportion of respondents reporting to have a save-a-flush device increased from 19% to 39%, and those reporting to have a water butt increased from 37% to 58%79. National Trust found that 50/57 volunteers intended to fit water-saving devices at home and Peace Child had success with children claiming always to turn the tap off when brushing their teeth.

---

74 N=62
75 N=345
76 NB the sample size is unknown
77 Baseline = 954 residents, follow-up = 288 residents
78 Baseline = not given, follow-up = c. 294
79 Baseline = 85 residents, follow-up = 76
Hard outcomes – some success for a limited number of community action projects:
- GAP and NFWI from their EcoTeams - decreasing water consumption by 11.2% and 14% respectively;
- NEA - estimate 373,760 litres of water saved through the installation of 512 Savaflushes;
- PECT - showing their water champions reduced their waste use by an average of 10% through retrofitting devices.

Buy/ use more energy-efficient vehicles

Soft outcomes - very little claim data. Few projects worked in this area so there was little outcome data. CSBT however found that 3 participants at their Bio-diesel course were using low emission vehicles 6 months later and WWT found that 2 of their community group participants had bought efficient vehicles.

Buy/ use more energy-efficient vehicles – success from one market development project:
BF reported 316.8 tonnes of CO₂ savings created by having converted private and commercial vehicle engines to run on PPO.

Use car less

Soft outcomes - some people willing to make the effort. Not many projects had outcome data for reducing car use, but where there was data it seemed relatively positive. AfSL received 117 pledges to use car sharing for some journeys and found 8 out of 18 claiming to have fulfilled this pledge in its follow-up interviews; and both PECT and GAP found that around a third (32% and 35% respectively) said they were using their cars less. In the survey of past Envision graduates, 23% indicated that Envision had a high or a very high impact, and 83% some impact, on their transport choices\(^80\). Many projects, though, reported qualitatively that this was a difficult behaviour to change (see chapter 8.2).

Hard outcomes – some success, particularly on business mileage:
DCHA – reported an increase in staff cycling and car sharing to get to work and showed a 10% decrease in business mileage – despite increasing staff numbers;
YHA - showed business mileage decreasing by 23%.

Case study | Carplus

Carplus set out specifically to test the carbon saving benefits of a car club in York. They surveyed people in the area and calculated a carbon footprint from the data, which was relayed back to the household. They then followed baseline respondents through two follow-up surveys whether or not they joined the car club (only 12 of the original 380 surveyed at baseline joined the club and completed all three surveys). Carbon footprints were compared between surveys 1 and 2 (n=102). Headline results include:

- Car club members had decreased their car trips by 16%
- Average annual mileage amongst all survey respondents declined by 11.5% (but a large part of the change can be attributed to a small percentage of very high mileage drivers cutting back; some drove more) (n=66)
- 22% said they now use the car less; 23% said they walk or cycle more, and 17% that they use public transport more
- The travel carbon footprint of respondents fell by 10.7%, and their overall ecological footprint by 8.3% (though the results were skewed by the high mileage drivers)

The audience segmentation showed that "aspiring environmentalists" were over-represented in all three surveys – which suggests they may have been receptive to the information anyway and that some were then nudged to actually change their behaviour. Carplus identified fears over loss of control over convenience and flexibility as the major barrier to joining the car club, while this was over-ridden by a sense of environmental obligation by car club members.

Reduce non-essential flying:

Soft outcomes - little claim data showing very little success. Flying was not an issue addressed by many projects and even where it was few participants were willing to act. AfSL only received a small number of pledges (189 out of 11,772 in total) not to fly if an alternative is available (although 15 out of 25 claimed to be honouring this pledge in the follow-up interviews) and 3 WWT participants said they had reduced long-haul flights or stopped flying.

\(^80\) N=60
Hard outcomes — no data.

Buy energy-efficient products

**Soft outcomes - success on light bulbs:** AfSL received a very high number of pledges on switching to low-energy bulbs (1251); in the follow-up interviews, 28 out of 33 claimed to be doing this. PECT found that 87% of residents had used the bulbs given to them in their welcome packs, but only 28% went on to buy more. In the follow-ups with GAP participants, 32% had also replaced white goods with energy-efficient models. 42 of the 50 National Trust volunteers surveyed said they intended to buy energy saving devices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>PECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PECT’s ‘Seeding Sustainable Communities’ project involved visiting householders on their doorsteps, carrying out a survey and offering a free ‘sustainable living welcome bag’. The bag itself was made from reusable jute and contained items such as fat traps, mouse mat, Ecover washing up liquid and powder, bird seeds, vegetable seeds and energy saving light bulbs. A community directory and information to facilitate behaviour change were also included.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A follow up survey revealed that many householders had been using the items in the bag. The two most popular items were the reusable shopping bags and the energy efficient light bulbs. 87% (n=288) used light bulbs and also continued using them. 88% said they had used the reusable shopping bag, and 57% had continued to use it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hard outcomes - no data.

Eat food locally in season/ adopt a diet with lower GHG/ environmental impacts

**Soft outcomes – some success in home grown, local, seasonal, organic and sustainable food:** A few of PECT and WWT’s participants had joined organic box schemes and 93% of Envision’s graduates indicated that participation in the programme had positively affected their activity on food (with the emphasis being on fair trade, organic and local produce\(^{83}\)). Most other outcomes came from projects working specifically on food though (e.g. 5 of 6 of CSV’s Concrete to Coriander participants surveyed grow their own vegetables). The Soil Association have data showing that contact with the SA website encouraged registrants to eat more seasonal food (82%) and encouraged them to grow their own fruit and vegetables (53%)\(^{82}\); Action Organic group members growing their own food increased from 20% to over 55%\(^{83}\) and attendees at Sustain’s July 07 event felt, on the whole, that they were doing increasing amounts to support a sustainable food system. MSC’s work resulted in an increase from 15% to 35% in LEA buyers purchasing MSC products for schools.

**Hard outcomes - strong success through one market development project:**
The most notable success was the MSC which opened up access to sustainable fish to over 500,000 schoolchildren by working through the schools foodservice supply chain, and to the public in restaurants. Its notable achievements were:

- increases in number of food service suppliers with chain of custody certificates from 2 to 10;
- increases in the number of products sold by these suppliers from 5 to 103;
- increases in LEAs\(^{84}\) with chain of custody certificates from 0 to 9;
- increases in the number of schools selling MSC products from 0 to 2000;
- increases in the number of commercial restaurant businesses selling MSC fish from 0 to 8 (143 outlets);
- increase in the value of retailer sales of 57% from Apr 05 to Apr 06, and 56% between Apr 06 and Apr 07).

The NFWI also demonstrated increased local food sales in a shop in Devon where it ran a pilot to promote local food.

Buy environmentally friendly products

**Soft outcomes – successes in a wide range of areas:** Outcomes here have been varied, from buying from local shops (430 AfSL pledges, with 21 of 33 follow-up participants saying they had fulfilled them), to

\(^{81}\) N=60
\(^{82}\) N=118
\(^{83}\) Baseline = 121 group members, follow-up = 186 group members
\(^{84}\) Local Education Authorities
trying reusable or eco-disposable nappies (28% of BabyGROE readers), sales of FSC certified windows (BioRegional) and increasing the number of higher education institutions with a sustainable purchasing policy (EAUC). FSC also reported an increase in the number of people who said they would choose FSC products in the future (from 17% to 22%).

EAUC supported 16 further and higher education institutions to make progress on adopting sustainable procurement policies, and trained nearly 400 people in procurement practice. This is likely to catalyse future purchasing of eco-products, but on an unknown scale. The hope is that the 'early adopters' which EAUC has managed to recruit will create exemplars in the higher education sector which is anyway looking at ways to adopt government guidance on sustainable procurement.

**Hard outcomes – a few examples of success through market development projects:**
FSC - showing increasing numbers of FSC certified companies in the UK, from 391 to 1191; the first construction company to have obtained certification; and a doubling of certified printers during 2007.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project impact</th>
<th>Significant impact</th>
<th>Moderate impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of participants/members about sustainable consumption or sustainable living</td>
<td>29/32</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity, knowledge and skills of participants/members to take action on sustainability and change their behaviour</td>
<td>29/32</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness of participants/members to take action on sustainability and change their behaviour</td>
<td>28/32</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3 Building participants’ and communities’ capacity to change

Two of Defra’s original objectives for the EAF (see chapter 1) were:

- building the commitment of individuals in communities to take action on sustainable consumption
- building the capacity of communities to work together and support each other

These aspects were at the heart of many of the community action projects and awareness raising activities but they have proved difficult to measure and provide evidence of their impact (as explained in chapter 4). The following discussion draws from various EAF evaluation sources to provide an overview of achievements under these headings. These are not the only things that the projects achieved and they should be taken together with the qualitative accounts of “success factors” in chapter 8.

Projects’ perceptions

A large majority of the projects (64%) felt they had achieved a significant impact in raising awareness and nearly all felt they had achieved at least a moderate impact (table 9). The number saying they had achieved a significant impact rose substantially between Year 2 (when only a third said this) and Year 3 (two-thirds). It is possible perhaps that projects became more confident of their impacts as a result of compiling their evaluation evidence.
Concerns were raised in the Year 1 and Year 2 evaluation reports that awareness raising was all that some of the projects were doing and the EAF would not achieve its other ambition of moving beyond awareness to action as a result. The evidence from the evaluations in Year 3 suggests that many projects did in fact go beyond awareness raising. There were still some, though, which could not demonstrate that they had (usually because their evaluation did not or could not show how audiences responded to their information or activities).

In addition to general awareness raising, projects also built specific knowledge to enable action now or in the future, for example through subject specific training, providing guidance on specific actions to do, or tips on how to do them. Nearly half of projects thought they had achieved a significant impact in this area. A similar number reported a significant impact on changing the willingness of participants to take action.

In both cases, however, the strength of the achievement seems to be less than the aspiration that projects had at the start of the EAF. The discrepancy between project priorities and project achievements (in table 9) may suggest that awareness raising has been more easily achieved than other capacity building goals.

Not many thought they had delivered a significant impact on either building community action (10) or developing community social capital and wider social benefits (5), but this reflects the fact that fewer had these as high priorities. Almost two-thirds nonetheless claimed at least a moderate impact on building community action, and nearly half on wider social benefits.

### Participants’ perceptions

The standard questions used in participant surveys (Brook Lyndhurst and some of the projects’ evaluations) provide an indication of where the projects were most effective in building personal capacity to change.

The questions were designed to find out how projects had motivated individuals to take action and they relate to drivers identified in the behaviour change literature (as explained in chapter 4). Participants were asked, “thinking about why the project has helped you to reduce your environmental impact, how important have the following factors been...“.

Because of the limitations of the data set out in chapter 4, in table 10 percentage figures have been converted to an average score and then these have been ranked within each project. The top three ranked factors as rated by participants have then been highlighted to illustrate which factors were repeatedly rated as important.

In some of the projects (e.g. GAP, WWT, Soil Association, Sustain and CSBT) most factors were rated at least fairly important by a majority of participants. Looking just at the top ranked factors based on average scores, however, four areas of projects’ motivational support stand out:

- Building a stronger sense of personal responsibility
- Practical advice on what to do
- Being given facts on how participants’ daily life impacts on the environment
- Being made to believe that personal action actually makes a difference

Demonstrating what government or business, or what others are doing, were generally ranked the lowest. Not surprisingly “meeting others like me” generally scored higher in community action group projects, although it was ranked third by National Trust volunteers. This fits with other qualitative evidence which suggests that their project helped environmentally minded people to do more when they saw others in the organisation taking action.
### Project Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project approach</th>
<th>Given me facts</th>
<th>Stronger personal responsibility</th>
<th>Made me believe I can make a difference</th>
<th>Made me more confident</th>
<th>Gave me practical advice</th>
<th>Provided new products/services</th>
<th>Signposted information</th>
<th>Persuaded me that green is normal</th>
<th>Enabled me to meet others like me</th>
<th>Showed me personal benefits</th>
<th>Demonstrated what others are doing</th>
<th>Demonstrated what govern &amp; business are doing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustain</td>
<td>business networking</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSBT</td>
<td>training</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Assoc.</td>
<td>groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFSL</td>
<td>groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWT</td>
<td>groups</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carplus</td>
<td>home survey + footprint</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PECT</td>
<td>home survey &amp; pack</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>home survey &amp; gadgets</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YHA</td>
<td>children</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YHA</td>
<td>staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Trust</td>
<td>volunteer staff</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFWI</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 | Ranks of average scores for motivational factors asked in standard questions
Evidence of building personal capacity

Much of the evidence of the impact of EAF projects on building personal capacity is anecdotal; but the frequency with which it was mentioned elsewhere (e.g. project visits, the networking days, and in evaluation reports) suggests that projects did have an important impact in these areas, even if their only evidence was seeing it first-hand with the people they were working with.

The following examples are drawn from evaluation reports and surveys to substantiate some of the common themes mentioned in the qualitative evidence, but they should not be seen as the only examples of success.

Creating inspiration
Eden reported that 96% of event participants \((n=100)\) felt inspired or informed to incorporate features of sustainability into their own lives; LSx stated that 94% of those at the Muslim coffee\(^{55}\) morning said they had been encouraged to live a greener lifestyle.

Generating commitment
35% of the people LSx surveyed in its Hinduism and H\(_2\)O project \((n=100)\) expressed an interest in getting further involved and making a difference; 84% \((n=63)\) of Eden’s community group members felt a deeper sense of commitment to taking environmental action as part of their community. These are in addition to the response from the standard evaluation questions reported above showing that a stronger sense of personal responsibility was one of the main outcomes of projects’ work.

Building confidence
Some reported evidence of becoming more confident in talking to others about environmental issues (e.g. GAP; Eden); in using formal skills such as presenting (e.g. Peace Child); and in speaking to other groups (WWF). WWF reported increased aspirations among group members, particularly them wanting to do more campaigning; Envision students reported positive impact on communication skills, teamworking skills, organisational skills and leadership qualities;

68% \((n=45)\) of NFWI EcoTeam members felt it was very important that the EcoTeams had made them more confident about doing what was needed to reduce their environmental impact.

General knowledge about sustainability
Eden’s data from community group participants show 89% having increased knowledge of sustainability and 92% \((n=62)\) being encouraged to think about wider sustainability issues.

Knowledge about a specific sustainability issue
In its work to increase purchase of sustainable fish in schools, the MSC showed that unprompted awareness of overfishing amongst LEA buyers went from 35% to 55% \((n=54\) and \(n=60)\); correct recognition of the MSC logo from 13% to 25%; and these changes supported an increase from 15% to 35% of LEA buyers purchasing MSC products for schools.

The Soil Association’s survey of its website users \((n=118)\) showed that 42% thought it to be very useful; 57% said it made them think about food they buy; and 79% said it encouraged them to eat more organic food.

In eight schools completing its Energy Busters and energy saving week activity, the National Trust found that the number of pupils able to explain the impact of burning fossil fuels rose from 50% to just over 70%; being able to identify at least three energy wastes from 10% to 65%; and being able to identify at least three ways to save energy from 56% to 80%.\(^{86}\) The schools observed an average 17% energy reduction during the energy saving week.

Increasing the accuracy of knowledge around high impact behaviours
In the ‘eco warrior’ pledge activities run by the YHA (with school groups on visits to their hostels) they report that children’s awareness focused initially on recycling but by the end of the visit had shifted more towards energy use, global warming & personal action (though recycling remained the second most mentioned).

NEA noted significant changes in householder understanding of which energy and water saving activities make the most difference: e.g. those believing wall insulation could make a big difference increased from

\(^{55}\) Base unknown

\(^{86}\) The base size is not given but the eight schools covered 18 year groups and all children were encouraged to complete the questionnaire.
38% to 66% over the course of 12 months; for loft insulation it rose from 70% to 87%; and for water butts from 53% to 82% \((n=85 \text{ and } 76)\). They noted, however, that the change in actual behaviour was less than change in knowledge on average.

**Increasing knowledge through training**

EAUC showed an increase in the number of staff with knowledge of sustainable purchasing in the further and higher educations organisations it worked with (from 9 to 398); 77% of staff surveyed at Focus DIY and 59% at Homebase stated their knowledge of FSC wood had increased over the last 12 months\(^87\).

**Practical advice tailored to a specific audience**

In its survey of people who had registered with its Green Blue project on responsible boating \((n=345)\), the RYA/BMF showed that 43% considered its advice very useful and 46% quite useful; a third in each group said they had then done at least one of the recommended actions.

**Signposting to products**

95% of BabyGROE’s respondents \((n=1,100)\) felt the magazine had given them a better understanding of environmental issues; 63% said they are more likely to use the baby care and other products advertised; and 44% said they had purchased from one of the magazine’s advertisers.

**Evidence of building community capacity**

As shown above, half of projects thought they had had some impact on building community social capital and two-thirds on building community action for the future. Projects encountered similar difficulties in measuring these wider impacts as they had done on other less tangible aspects of their work. Even so, there are **five areas** where there is a weight of qualitative evidence and some survey evidence of success.

1. **Increased social interaction and community social cohesion**

Some projects (e.g. WWF) emphasised that building sustainability into communities requires the development of social cohesion (i.e. increasing opportunities for interaction and the strength of social bonds) in addition to a direct focus on environmental action. Their argument is that this model can support more enduring change than if people are targeted individually because momentum is created and held jointly rather than resting on the continued enthusiasm of single individuals.\(^88\) The following are selected examples of achievement under this heading.

CSV’s ‘Concrete to Coriander’ project in Birmingham provided opportunities for Asian women to meet together to grow their own food. All participants reported increased social interaction, better physical and mental health, and increased access to fruit and vegetables.

AFSL similarly reported that people valued the social aspects of being part of a community environmental action group. Eden reported that 79% of its community group participants said they knew more people locally as a result of involvement in the project. PECT provided a community directory in its welcome pack to residents at one housing development and reported that 8% joined a local club after the home visits.

NFWI Eco Team participants reported that being part of a group had been one of the most important aspects of their involvement, with 77% \((n=45)\) feeling that group meetings were effective in motivating them and supporting them to make changes. GAP said that group working was one of the key success factors in EcoTeams (see chapter 8 for further discussion of success factors for groups).

In its evaluation of DCHA’s Sustainable Living project with social housing residents, Exeter University noted that “the main benefit [of the project] was social networking and inclusion. Changes in daily practices had occurred and these were framed as improvements in quality of life”. DCHA notes in its own evaluation that quality of life gains were an important outcome of the project, helping its low income residents to save money and become involved in activities such as healthy living.

2. **Development of community action groups and community activists**

The evidence given in chapter 6 showed that the EAF has supported at least 180 community action groups, more than 3,000 people through EcoTeams, and at least 78,000 people have been involved with EAF activities overall (albeit at different depths of engagement).

\(^{87}\text{ Bases unknown}\)

\(^{88}\text{ The WWF initial research report and their evaluation is a good source of discussion and evidence on this theme.}\)
With the data available, it is impossible to conclude precisely how much of this current activity and interest catalysed by the projects will endure. The evidence to hand indicates that some of it undoubtedly will, but we cannot say how much for certain.

Positive examples include Somerset Trust, who set up 61 groups, 32 of which they are still supporting; they say 25 projects that were initiated will continue as self-sustaining entities; 13 groups are involved in plans for a permanent network of groups.

SPAN’s grass roots groups appear to have made important progress according to their evaluation and some are now in a position to go further. The programmes run by WWF and WWT will both be built on within their organisations to support more groups in future. Having learned about working with ambassadors, LSx say they will continue to use this model to engage with more of London’s diverse communities.

Some of the EAF work has also catalysed community activism where it was not present before. The NFWI believes that precedent and ethos of the EAF work has helped it to recruit 7,000 members to its new Carbon Challenge project, so helping to build environmental action throughout the organisation.

NFWI also cited an example of one of its Eco Team leaders going on to set up several other teams; GAP similarly noted that they “lose contact” as past members go on to set up their own groups making it difficult to come up with a precise figure for the number of teams completed. Envision has evidence of its ‘graduates’ continuing to volunteer in later in life.

Perhaps even more important than these specific examples, both the staff and the volunteers who worked on EAF projects represent an important community resource, many of them having learned a great deal about behaviour change approaches in the last three years. Data from the Year 3 e-survey show that 147 staff were in post on EAF projects at the end of the Fund. At least 66 of these will continue to work on the same project while other posts are subject to funding. Figures for volunteers are less reliable but suggest that the projects will remain in contact with at least 1,000 volunteers who have worked on their EAF projects. Suggestions on how this expertise might be deployed are developed in chapter 10.

3. Building stronger networks in communities
In recent research elsewhere, NESTA has identified building the social ‘glue’ in communities as an important building block for social innovation. Several EAF projects were involved in supporting or building such networks but there is little hard evaluation evidence on the outcomes. As a result, it is not possible to conclude how effective or not projects were in delivering this outcome. There are a few examples of small-scale success, however.

Sustain reported that their work with stakeholders in London’s food sector had a greater impact on creating successful partnerships and building knowledge, than it did on changing behaviour of buyers or suppliers. Its reported outputs provide further evidence – 180 enquiries from 150 organisations that Sustain advised over 11 months; 681 e-forum messages sent; 338 downloads of Sustain reports; 617 downloads of its sustainable food guidelines.

SPAN set up a network of partner organisations with different expertise to provide advice and hands-on facilitation support to grass roots sustainability projects. The external evaluation identified a number of projects where SPAN’s input had been important. According to one project manager: "We wouldn’t have been able to start without SPAN – would have been floundering around. We now have knowledge and know where to find help."

More generally, on the basis of the project visit interviews over the three years, there is no doubt that many organisations (e.g. Eden, PECT, LSx, ACS, WWF) built useful links or partnerships with other organisations which can help them to deliver behaviour change programmes in the future. This development of the internal capacity of some of the EAF projects themselves represents an important addition to the ‘glue’ of communities and their capacity to continue to provoke change. It is an important part of the EAF legacy and is covered further in chapter 10.

4. Influencing organisations and supply chains
A similarly important outcome of the EAF has been the change in the way some large membership organisations and stakeholders in supply chains think and operate. (e.g. NT, NFWI, YHA, RYA/BMF;
stakeholders working with DCHA, EAUC, ACS, MSC and FSC). Again, this is covered in chapter 10, but the following comment provides a substantive illustration:

“The project has had a profound effect on the way we manage our homes and the information and advice and community development services we provide resident households. Without this project I don’t think we would have taken the time to stand back and evaluate what we do beyond the day to day pressures of meeting regulations, building more homes and responsive customer service. This is only the beginning - there is so much more to do that the momentum has to be kept up.

DCHA (in the Year 3 e-survey)

5. Building resources that can be used by others working at community level to bring about action on sustainable consumption/lifestyles

As a result of the EAF, there are now a myriad of tools and resources in place, specifically:

- knowledge about how to deliver tailored workshops and training courses;
- the creation of toolkits and similar resources; and
- the learning from the research and development work that some projects did, and the project evaluations more generally

Many are sector or subject specific (e.g. the RYA/ BMF marine business toolkit, the NFWI’s guidance on lift-sharing, the National Trust’s composting demonstration, EAUC’s training modules, ACS re-use campaign toolkit) but others provide more generic models (e.g. GAP’s data capture website, Peace Child’s lifestyle contract, Carplus’ footprint questionnaire, behaviour change evaluation questionnaires more generally).

One of the key challenges following the end of the Fund will be to make sure that the investment made in creating these resources and building this capacity is fully built on. It has been a serious criticism of past funds, and of the third sector more generally, that the wheel is often re-invented when others have already invested time and money looking into solutions for a particular problem.

At the end of Year 2, we recommended that it might be appropriate for Defra to investigate how the resources that projects have designed could be made more widely available (e.g. through open access or licensing). Further thoughts are outlined in chapter 10 (‘Legacy’).

7.4 Outcomes by project types

Outcomes can also be analysed according to the typology of projects given in chapter 3, first in terms of behavioural outcomes and then value for money.

Impact on behaviours by project types

Certain types of projects have had particular successes in certain areas:

**Community action projects** have had demonstrable successes (small and large) of: prompting better energy management; increasing recycling; and decreasing waste production in their target communities. Although measured, impacts in other areas have been weaker (e.g. in projects’ work on water), and notable achievements on travel (perceived and measured) are limited to a couple of projects only.

Environmental savings have been clearly evidenced in EcoTeams especially. Other projects have been more circumspect in claiming significant impacts in these areas, though half or more of the EAF projects think they have had at least a modest impact on energy, waste, buying sustainable food and reducing CO₂ (see section 7.1).

**Market development projects** have achieved notable successes in some key areas (several on food, and one each on FSC wood and bio-fuel vehicles). They have shown less success in fuelling more radical changes in general consumption patterns (e.g. in changing the way we shop) although their aim was primarily to ‘green’ supply chains rather than changing consumption patterns.

**Changing organisations projects** have been able to show success in better energy management, increasing recycling and waste segregation and decreasing car use within their own organisations (e.g. DCHA, YHA, NT). They have also shown how projects can achieve large-scale reach of their engagement work by targeting audiences or cascading messages through their memberships and/or visitors (e.g. CF, YHA and NT). The NFWI has been able to demonstrate large numbers of people changing their behaviour as a result.
Projects working to influence the policy landscape cannot demonstrate any direct impact on behaviours. They are confident however that they will influence behaviour indirectly through public policy and can point to important outputs in some cases (e.g. Green Alliance in its contributions to a compostable packaging standard and the Conservative Party quality of life review; BF on the tax position of PPO).

The observations made above about community action projects, raise an important question about the scale of their achievement when judged across the EAF as a whole, and when focusing only on change in Defra’s headline behaviours (as opposed to the wider community benefits outlined earlier). The evidence shows that the EAF did indeed result in many small changes (and sometimes big ones) in individuals’ behaviour, but that change could often only be evidenced for tens or hundreds of people. This is not necessarily proof that large scale impact did not happen, just that the full extent of the impact remains unknown.

The EAF experience has again highlighted gaps in the knowledge base on methodologies for measuring (or perhaps, capturing) the full impact of behaviour change projects, especially those:

- involving voluntary participation by the public (where a self-selection bias is intrinsic to the engagement model);
- focusing on lifestyles in the round (which clouds the definition of “outcomes”);
- using packages of different engagement tools to encourage and support change (which makes attribution extremely challenging)

The projects’ own evaluations from the EAF provide a methodological resource to critique and build upon, and should be taken note of in Defra’s forthcoming action research projects.

Value for money

Value for money cannot be assessed on a consistent basis because of the diversity of projects, the variation in depth versus breadth of community engagement, the blurred boundaries around how much of the each project the EAF funded, and an absence of unit cost data for individual project activities or components. That said, some broad generalisations can be made on the basis of projects’ outputs (chapter 6) and the outcomes reported above.

In thinking about how project success relates to the size of grants awarded, there is little correlation between project funding and either reported outputs or project outcomes.

- Some of the projects receiving the most funding have been unable to demonstrate significant behaviour change outcomes, either claimed or measured, though they may have delivered a wide range of project outputs. This is because they concentrated on awareness raising and/or were not able to follow up participants in their evaluation.
- Some of the projects receiving the smallest grants (c. £90,000 - £150,000) have produced evidence of delivering many outputs, of influencing their communities and their attitudes and, in some cases, actual changes in behaviour.

Notable examples include:

Some of those receiving large grants have used the funds mainly for publications or events for which impact on either awareness raising or behaviour cannot be demonstrated clearly. They have generally delivered a wide range of activities, and have some indication of how the activities have been received, but they cannot show how this has contributed to sustainable consumption.

The three projects working directly on sustainable construction found it especially hard to demonstrate outcomes or impact although together they received just under £600,000. In one case, impact was low because of delays to the project (which still has potential to deliver considerable environmental benefits if it continues); in the other two cases the evaluations did not collect enough evidence to demonstrate impact clearly.

The savings made by organisations working on internal change have, in some cases, proved very cost effective – DCHA has generated internal change (including decreases in business mileage, increases in recycling and waste segregation and decreases in waste production) in addition to the social inclusion work it has conducted with residents with one of the smallest grants (£90,50091);
Successful market development projects have been able to deliver considerable project outcomes for the amount of grant received, through being very focused in their activity (e.g. MSC and BF).

It is impossible to determine the relative value for money of the community action projects because they used such different engagement methods, worked with very different types of audience, and often benefitted from access to extra resources. The following comments can be made, however:

- EcoTeams appear to be an effective way of reaching large numbers of people for short duration engagement that results in measurable behaviour changes⁹². GAP reported that the semi-facilitated model was less resource intensive and less costly to run than the fully facilitated model.
- Projects that provided support to community action groups (ranging from facilitation to more arms length support) were each able to support between 20 and 90 groups, depending on the depth of engagement and the number of other activities they undertook (e.g. service provision, events, training, newsletters etc.).
- The projects testing an action learning model (SPAN and WWF) were able to support fewer groups for the grants they received than other community action projects. These projects need to be judged on the learning that they generated as well as the amount of activity they supported on the ground.
- The projects that engaged people through door-knocking, advice and gadgets/services (Carplus, PECT and NEA), were able to demonstrate changes in attitudes and some small-scale changes in behaviour⁹³. NEA and PECT achieved wide reach in their initial contact with participants (1,000 – 1,500 households).

7.5 Additionality

Behaviours

As outlined in section 7.1 above, the areas in which projects felt they had an effect are very similar to those in which the general public claim to have been taking action. In evaluating the success of the EAF, a key question is then the extent to which activity was new or additional, or whether it would have happened anyway.

To address this question, participants’ responses on how much more they are now doing to reduce their environmental impact were compared to those of a national UK sample⁹⁴ ⁹⁵.

Figure 10 shows that EAF participants are doing more than they were before they took part in the EAF project; and they are doing so in far greater proportions than the general public. The large scale of the difference between EAF participants and the UK public provides us with confidence that EAF participants did more than they would have done otherwise, and that EAF projects successfully built on wider shifts in public attitudes towards the environment.

Further evidence is provided by the NEA evaluation survey which showed that, while claimed behaviour changes had been modest in the intervention sample, they were greater there than in the control sample who had not been engaged by the project. A feeling by projects that they had pushed already interested people a little bit further was also a commonly expressed theme in the visit interviews (and is explored more in chapter 8).

⁹² NB Though the EAF funds were complemented by other funding (Defra and other) in both the GAP and NFWI cases, which supported other aspects of the teams.
⁹³ More data on energy saving impacts of NEA’s Demia project will be produced later.
⁹⁴ Participants were asked how much more they are doing as a result of taking part in the EAF project; UK public were asked how much more they are now doing compared to twelve months ago. A question was asked about involvement in community environmental groups to identify “UK active”.
⁹⁵ See chapter 4 for a description of the method and data limitations. The main limitations were differences in the survey contexts and structure of the samples, and that these are self-reported claims rather than observed changes.
In addition, projects themselves have historic data and data from other markets which show the level of change to be additional:

- some projects are able to compare the targeted markets with markets in which no interventions have taken place:
  - MSC (an international certification and accreditation body) has not seen any instances of its certification being used in the catering trade abroad. Neither has it seen this happen in other parts of the UK which were not served by 'fish and kids' and 'fish and kitchen' but which would presumably have been subjected to the same cultural influences.
  - The increase in the proportion of the public which have "knowingly purchased" FSC wood and paper products has not been matched in other areas that were not directly targeted in their campaign (e.g. such as furniture and toys), according to the FSC evaluation report.

- some have historic data which show very different patterns of behaviour after their EAF project began:
  - during the period leading up to EAF, FSC did little promotional work to encourage companies to gain chain of custody certifications. Between 2002 and 2005, a total of 170 companies were issued with new certificates. Between 2005 and 2008, 800 new certificates were issued.

Lastly, qualitative comments made in the participant interviews indicate that change may have happened more quickly, and with a greater degree of confidence, than it would have done otherwise.

“We realised this was something we should be tackling but we didn’t really know too much how to go about it, what was best practice. So we thought by being in the EAUC we’d sort of get led, someone would take our hand and tell us what we need to be doing, ‘this is how to go about it’. If we’d have tackled it ourselves, we would have made progress but I don’t think we would have progressed as much as we have by being a member.”

EAUC participant

“I think I can feel quite panicky about these things but I think it made you feel more in control or that you could have some limited control over it. Whether that’s madness or not it helped psychologically I
Activities

Another key concern for evaluation is whether or not the programme displaced other activity or activity that would have come about by other means. The picture built up over the three years of the visits to projects suggests that most of the projects were doing things that would not otherwise have happened, either in their own organisations or in the wider community.

Within communities examples include CSV’s initiation of an organic waste collection which was then later taken over by the local council. Eden managed to encourage community buildings in Cumbria to undertake energy saving measures and raise funds for installation: no-one else at the time was doing this. Some organisations (e.g. WWT, STSD, Eden, AFSL) set up and supported entirely new community action groups that may not otherwise have existed; other projects provided support to grass roots groups that they may have found hard to get elsewhere (e.g. SPAN, WWF, SA). Some projects (e.g. AFSL) would not have existed at all without the EAF.

Some projects were also able to leverage extra resources because of their community sector status, not only the very significant amount of volunteer time involved in some EAF projects, but also help, support or freebies from local businesses (e.g. Eden, PECT).

Within organisations, project managers often reported that the EAF had acted as a catalyst for the wider organisation to reflect on its own environmental performance and ‘put it’s house in order’ (e.g. YHA, NT, NFWI). In the National Trust, the project gave some ‘green minded’ volunteers and staff the confidence to stand out by taking action; the NFWI said that the EAF 90@90 member consultation had helped to build a new environmental ethos in the organisation.

“The project has normalised environmental and green behaviour”, and led to a “massive shift in awareness and understanding internally.”

NT project manager

Within businesses and supply chains. As noted earlier, the MSC entered a new area in tackling sustainable fish in schools, as did BF with pure plant oil. In other cases (e.g. EAUC) the EAF project almost certainly accelerated and made more effective the developments on sustainable procurement that were just beginning in the sector; EAUC was in a unique position to offer support.

More generally, the EAF allowed projects to undertake R&D (e.g. BF, NFWI, WWF, Carplus, Sponge), to develop and refine their engagement methods (e.g. LSx, GAP), and to take risks. They may have found it more difficult to find funding for this work from other sources which required firmer outcomes, but this point is debatable. The scale of the individual grants in the EAF also enabled some projects to run activities on a larger scale than they could have on their usual sources of grant funding. The report returns to these points in a discussion of the EAF legacy in chapter 10.

7.6 Spill-over effects

In other research, Defra is considering spill-over effects from one behaviour to another, and from one domain to another (e.g. school to home). In the context of the EAF such effects (if observed) would amount to further evidence of additionality.

This is a relatively new area of research interest and few of the projects set out to log or measure the extent to which they had achieved wider spill-overs, though some thought about it as their projects developed.

The table below provides a few examples, though the evidence is largely anecdotal and needs to be treated as illustrative rather than conclusive. Most of the examples given relate to wider impacts on other people rather than from behaviour to behaviour (with the notable exception of NEA). It may have been difficult for projects to report the behaviour-to-behaviour effect because many were targeting several aspects of lifestyles simultaneously. Moreover, by no means all projects reported spill-overs, whether to other
behaviours or to other people, and MSC said it had found no evidence of wider spin-offs of its work in schools to purchasing by parents etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Examples of spill-over effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BioRegional</td>
<td>Reported that its work to accredit suppliers to its construction buyers’ club had encouraged some suppliers to look at their overall environmental performance, not just that of their products – e.g. a supplier that has imposed a 56 mph speed limit on its vehicle fleet and put measures in place to reduce packaging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSV</td>
<td>Some of its environmental street champions who were working on composting have reportedly moved on to promote other local environmental actions in their communities. CSV also cited survey results (from small samples) showing half of parents in its Growing Gains schools project being asked by their children to buy asked them to buy more fruit &amp; vegetables, and to help out in the garden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAN</td>
<td>Indicated that activities relating to food acted as catalysts to wider environmental actions (e.g. young people eating more fresh/local vegetables)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFWI</td>
<td>Follow-on action by members of EcoTeams in Worcestershire (e.g. energy monitoring, working in a local school).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PECT</td>
<td>Several anecdotes including one woman who had passed on items from her welcome pack to neighbours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Child</td>
<td>Peace Child reported some anecdotal evidence of pester power from schoolchildren to parents; also examples where their visit had been the start of sustainability work throughout the school (e.g. carbon footprinting, appointment of energy monitors).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envision</td>
<td>Envision worked with older school students: 47% said the project had a high or very high impact on their parents, mainly in terms of food purchasing; 50% on friends; and 25% on teachers, mainly on energy and paper use. The largest reported spill over was on other children in the school (67% said very high or high impact).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Trust</td>
<td>Reported that all teachers (in 8 schools) involved in its energy outreach project felt that the work with children had influenced their personal energy use in school and at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>Reported that its work with the Church of England had now spread to other faiths who had become interested in its work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEN</td>
<td>Noted that fundraising to support the installation of insulation in community buildings had been an effective way of getting individuals to think about home energy issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>Produced good survey evidence showing that their energy-led project had generated significant increases in claimed recycling for materials other than paper, composting, buying eco-friendly products and organic food, compared to both baseline, and a non-intervention control sample. This was despite the fact that recycling was already high at baseline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 | Examples of spill-over behaviours
Source: evaluation reports and project visits

7.7 Longevity

Few projects tried to assess whether any behaviour change they observed was being sustained, which is not unreasonable given that many of the outcomes were only just becoming tangible by the end of Year 3.

Some (especially a number of the community action group projects) thought that a single focus on the amount achieved by the end of Year 3 was erroneous in any case. They suggested that a better measure for them was the capacity they had built amongst individuals and groups to continue to act in the longer term.

That said, a small number of cases provide evidence of longer term impact:

- GAP and Envision both reported (on the basis of surveys and/or interviews) that participants were very positive about the effect of the programmes on the way they lived their lives in the longer term.
• The National Trust reported that the increase in awareness and understanding of energy issues observed in children engaged in its Energy Busters programme was retained. It concluded this on the basis of a comparison between a previously engaged cohort and children in the same schools that it was just starting to work with.

• Six months after a first follow-up survey, Peace Child did a second follow-up survey with 100 children who had previously signed Lifestyle Contracts. They found that:
  - some behaviours (self-reported) were maintained at the new higher level (e.g. walking or cycling, turning off taps, and recycling);
  - some behaviours fell back from the level recorded at follow-up but stayed above the baseline level (e.g. switching off lights & the TV, choosing minimum packaging);
  - and some reverted to the baseline level (buying rechargeable batteries, taking own bags while shopping).

While longevity will in many cases depend on the continuing motivation of the individuals engaged by EAF projects, and is risky or uncertain as a result, some of the changes brought about by the EAF are more assured. Where projects have worked to change organisational practice or supply chain relationships there is a good chance that the changes they brought about will be locked in for the medium to long term, though none of this is entirely without risk of reversion.

7.8 Innovation

One of the original aims of the EAF was that projects should attempt to make some leap of innovation in social or market activity (as distinct from innovation in technology).

It is often argued (including by EAF projects) that a key strength of third sector organisations is their ability to develop and deliver innovative solutions where government may not be able to do so. Many of the EAF projects certainly thought they had been very innovative and pointed to numerous examples of where they believed this was the case (e.g. using ambassadors, door-stepping, tailoring communications to belief systems, sustainability audits and so on).

In assessing objectively whether the EAF achieved its innovation objective, the evaluation has explored two questions in particular:

• has there been any innovation in the work of the EAF projects, and if so, what does it look like?
• does this add up to a ‘leap’ of innovation in social and market activity?

In answering these questions, four possible manifestations of innovation were considered:

• invention of entirely new products or new ways of engaging audiences
• re-innovation – applying previously trialled methods with new audiences
• developing bespoke packages of engagement tools to apply in a particular project, organisation or community for the first time;
• innovative partnerships.

New products or engagement tools

Few projects delivered approaches or products that were entirely ‘new to the world’. BF’ work to develop a market for pure plant oil was a notable example; NEA’s use of smart meters as a behaviour change tool was also novel.

EAF projects also produced a number of entirely new publications or engagement toolkits that could be of use to future community led projects (e.g. ACS Choose2 Reuse; Sponge’s home buyers’ booklet, various footprinting approaches, Peace Child’s pledge model, WWF’s community action learning model). GAP’s analytical database for recording Eco Team performance was also a significant development in methods for monitoring behaviour change.

---

NB small samples in two schools.

Please see EVO2051 and EVO2052 www.defra.gov.uk/environment/business/scp/research/themes/theme3/sustain-consump0607.htm
Re-innovation – applying existing tools to new audiences

A number of projects used the EAF funding as an opportunity to further test and refine models they had used previously, either with new kinds of audience, or with larger numbers of people/organisations than they had done before (e.g. Envision and CSV increasing the number and range of schools they engaged with). Notable examples include:

- GAP - in developing its semi-facilitated delivery model for EcoTeams, run in collaboration with businesses, local authorities and membership organisations (notably the NFWI);
- LSx which extended its ambassadors and champions programmes into black and minority ethnic, and low income communities (LSx).

The use of pledges as a behaviour change tool was also moderately new but had been used before the EAF.

Developing bespoke behaviour change packages for specific settings

This was by far the most common manifestation of innovation in the EAF. It generally comprised projects spotting new opportunities to catalyse change, then developing and delivering a creative package of measures either in a community for the first time, or within an organisation. Approaches and engagement tools themselves were not especially novel, but they were generally new to the EAF organisation and/or new to the target community/audience. The innovation often resided in the way in which elements or tools were put together in a creative package to fit the opportunity identified by the projects.

There are numerous and diverse forms of this type of innovation which defy categorisation, from facilitating local community groups for the first time, to inventing door-stepping projects and the use of holiday settings to demonstrate and promote behaviour change, cascading through institutions and membership organisations, to supply chain brokering or influencing. The last two of these - working within and through membership organisations, and some of the supply chain brokering activities - should be seen as distinctively innovative and successful outcomes of the EAF. A key feature of these - and indeed a vast number of the EAF projects in general - was the uniqueness of the package developed for the problem they were trying to tackle. This raises questions about scalability and replicability which are considered in chapter 10.

Innovative partnerships

A clear achievement of the EAF was the development of new partnerships (formal and informal) which enhanced the ability of the projects to deliver what they did. Examples include:

- **sector networking and stakeholder engagement** - e.g. ACS launching a campaign across the charity shop sector and partnering with Sue Ryder; Sustain linking food producers with others in the catering trade; EAUC with higher education institutions;
- **providing access to goods or services** - e.g. Carplus partnering with Citroen who provided a fuel-efficient car to the car club; Eden with Cumbria Waste Management Environmental Trust who provided energy efficiency measures; NEA with EDF who provided smart meters and with Warmfront to provide householder grants; PECT and Envision with various organisations for the provision of freebies; MSC and foodservice companies to open up supply of sustainable fish to school meals buyers;
- **providing access to expert advice** - e.g. NT’s schools energy outreach programme supported by Norfolk County Council’s property services team
- **enabling greater reach** - e.g. DCHA and its work with other social landlords, GAP in its roll out of EcoTeams in the commercial sector;
- **enabling knowledge sharing** - e.g. WWF receiving support from local authority waste officers; EAF projects working together – NFWI with GAP and Carplus, WWF with SPAN, Sustain with MSC.

A leap of innovation

In response to the initial question - whether innovation demonstrated in projects’ work adds up to a 'leap' of innovation in social and market activity - it is possible to conclude that:

- there has been a great deal of small-scale innovation;
projects have been very successful at transferring standard engagement approaches and tools into their own organisations and projects;

many have developed creative packages of measures which are 'fit for purpose' to address the behaviour change opportunities they have identified;

this has enabled them to develop entirely new activities, to work more effectively, to extend their reach and to better serve their audiences;

projects have developed a large number of new partnerships;

All in all, however, it cannot be concluded that the EAF brought about a leap of innovation in social and market activity. It did so in some local areas, some markets and some organisations and has certainly been a catalyst for change in places; but the lessons learned need to be built upon for social innovation to occur on a bigger scale.

One of the important lessons coming out of the EAF experience regards the role of third sector organisations in the 'innovation landscape' of social change that is required if widespread adoption of pro-environmental behaviour is to become a reality. It is clear that community led organisations can identify and respond to opportunities that might be overlooked by mainstream services, because the openings are too small, too local, too specific, or simply inaccessible (e.g. in membership organisations, faith communities).

While the third sector is not inherently more innovative, flexible or responsive than (for example) the private sector, it can be a cost effective means of achieving innovation and finding creative solutions to local sustainability opportunities. The sector is generally less encumbered by bureaucracy, systems and red-tape, which enhances its ability to adapt to meet participants' needs and develop engagement packages that are fit for purpose in each case. The EAF has provided many examples of where this has been done well (and not so well too). Judging from the EAF experience, the third sector is probably not able to deliver mass environmental behaviour change on its own, but it has a lot to offer in complementing other approaches.
8 What worked?

Having presented the evidence on what EAF projects did and what they achieved, the report turns now to the question of “what worked?” - in terms of delivering changes in sustainable consumption behaviour and building the capacity of communities to support action on this front in the future. The question is answered in relation to the behaviour change tools and approaches that the projects used. The analysis is more interpretative than in previous chapters, drawing heavily on the insight gained from the project visits over the three years, as well as from the output/outcome evidence presented in previous chapters. The discussion covers:

1. The nature of the audiences engaged by the EAF
2. The motivations and barriers underlying reported behaviour changes
3. General lessons on engaging consumers in sustainable consumption
4. Lessons on running community action projects
5. Lessons on running change in organisation projects
6. Lessons on running market development projects
7. Lessons on running policy landscape projects
8. General lessons on partnerships
9. General lessons on catalytic individuals

8.1 The nature of the audiences engaged by the EAF

The level of environmental awareness of project audiences before they engaged with the EAF is important for two reasons:

- firstly, because it provides a context against which to judge the change in attitudes and behaviours reported by the projects; and
- secondly, because a criticism sometimes levelled at community-level action is that it is only successful in preaching to the converted.

There were hints throughout Brook Lyndhurst’s three-year contact with projects that – at least in some projects – participants were greener or more active in their communities than the general population. The evaluation evidence on this point is patchy and mixed in what it shows, however.

Evidence from the Year 1 e-survey showed that projects were, in aggregate, engaging a broad range of people, including those who were not very environmentally aware/ active as well as reasonably aware participants. Similarly, intermediaries interviewed by Brook Lyndhurst in Years 2 and 3 most often felt that they were either working with a mix of people or with moderate greens.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental behaviour of participants prior to involvement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A mix</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largely moderate green</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largely dark green</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largely light green</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 | Intermediaries’ views on their audience (based on interviews in Year 2 and Year 3).
Base=59 intermediaries answering this question

When participants were interviewed by Brook Lyndhurst – notably after they had been engaged in the project – they appeared to be far greener than the UK population as a whole. Compared to the UK population, they were (figure 11):
More likely to think they are informed about environmental action and feel it is their personal responsibility;

Much less likely to think the threat of climate change has been exaggerated;

Less likely to agree that it’s hard to be green; and

Much less likely to think that the government does not have the right to make people live in more environmentally friendly ways.

Intermediaries who were asked the same questions appeared to be even greener than participants.

The evidence in chapter 7 showed that many EAF projects had achieved an increase in awareness and knowledge of participants, and this will have been a factor in participant and intermediary responses. However, the scale of the differences between EAF participants or intermediaries and the UK public are so stark that it is unlikely that all the difference can be accounted for by changes which occurred during the project.

It is worth noting here, too, that two-thirds of the participants who were interviewed got involved in the project because of their environmental or social beliefs (67%), and this was the most frequent reason given. The qualitative parts of the participant interviews also tended to give this impression.

Many projects – especially the community action group models - also reported qualitatively that they had attracted people who were already interested in environmental action (e.g. Eden, WWT, CSBT, NT [Basecamps]), though these people were not always doing very much to reduce their impact. Many projects suggested that their work had expanded the horizons of green-thinking individuals and nudged them to take a bit more action (e.g. WWT, WWF, SA).

“We may well be preaching to the converted, and expanding what they do already, rather than engaging people who are not already interested in organic food.”

Soil Association evaluation report

Some of the evaluation surveys show similar results.
Carplus showed that its project had appealed disproportionately to what it called “Aspiring Environmentalists”98, but respondents reported changes in travel behaviour even so.

The evaluation of NEA’s DEMIA programme suggested that its participants were already pre-disposed to action (on energy, water and waste), but the project helped turn these good intentions into action. For example, DEMIA households were already recycling paper at high levels at baseline, but the proportion recycling materials other than paper increased significantly, and more so than in a control sample.

CSV showed that 87% of it Growing Gains participants had grown food before but this rose to 96%.

The University of East Anglia survey of a sample of GAP participants identified the majority as being from three of Defra’s more environmentally motivated or green-acting segments – positive greens, concerned consumers and waste watchers – but the GAP outcome data shows that participants clearly went on to do more.

GAP also reported that EcoTeams work best with “the middle classes”, and the Soil Association speculated that this group was its core audience.

Other projects, though, reported that they were working with people for whom environmental messages were either new, or not a high priority previously (e.g. social housing tenants – LSx and DCHA). The Exeter University evaluation of the DCHA project showed that it was especially difficult to get residents involved in environmental messages and that an appeal to quality of life proved a more effective hook. Some of the business and changing organisation projects (e.g. EAUC, MSC) were also working with people who had little prior knowledge of environmental issues.

Taking the evaluation evidence in the round, what seems clear is that many of the community action group projects, as well as some of the doorstep projects, appealed to people who were already interested in taking action, but who may have needed a push to get them started or to go further. This echoes evidence reviewed by Anable et al. in the context of transport99. Some projects undoubtedly recruited people who were already active in their communities but, in many cases, helped them to become more effective activists (e.g. AFSL, Eden, WWF, SPAN) or to focus their community activity on the environment (e.g. CF, NFWI).

8.2 The motivations and barriers underlying reported behaviour changes

Moving on to think about success factors, this section looks narrowly at behaviour change – the reasons given by participants and projects to explain observed behaviour changes, the areas of behaviour that were easiest and most difficult to change, and the drivers particular to individual behaviours. This then leads into the wider analysis of success factors in relation to engagement and delivery models in section 8.3 onwards.

Perceived causes of behaviour change

The (unprompted) reasons for changing behaviour that were most frequently offered by the participants interviewed by Brook Lyndhurst were:

• receiving information (73%)
• and action being made easy/being given practical help (36%)

The kinds of information mentioned included material about the impacts of tackling different behaviours, about things to do that they had not thought about before, tips on what to do, and signposting to services or sources of help.

These factors (and others) were also captured in the prompted responses given by the participants of projects that used the standard evaluation questions (figure 12). The analysis of these responses in chapter 7 noted that projects seemed to have helped participants the most in five key areas:

• Building a stronger sense of personal responsibility
• Practical advice on what to do
• Believing that personal action does make a difference

98 One of the segments derived in its statistical analysis of its survey sample.
99 See chapter 4.5 ‘Individual subjective factors’ in:
www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/sustainable/climatechange/areviewofpublicattitudestocl5730
• Being given facts on how their daily life impacts on the environment
• Feeling more confident that they can achieve the changes needed

Showing people how they could do things (i.e. what the practical steps were) and increasing peoples’ confidence and belief in taking action were also highly influential factors according to the (prompted) responses given by projects in the Year 3 e-survey – as well as simply making alternative choices unavailable. Factors rated the most influential, however, were making sustainable consumption the cheapest option, and the easiest option.

![Influencing Factors in Changing Behaviour](image)

**Figure 12** Based on what you have learned so far about changing behaviour, how influential are the following in persuading people to take action?
Based on responses to the Year 3 projects’ e-survey
Base=31 answering this question

**Easy and hard behaviours to change**

The evaluation evidence demonstrates that certain behaviours have indeed been a lot easier to change than others. For participants and projects, there is a clear hierarchy in the behaviours which proved easiest and hardest to change (figures 13 and 14):

- **Easiest – waste/ recycling and energy.** These were the areas in which both the projects and the participants felt they had made most impact and where there was most substantive evidence of change. Neither participants nor projects rated recycling as difficult, but a small number in both groups rated energy efficiency/saving as difficult.

- **Intermediate – consumption and water** – fewer participants and projects rated these behaviours as easy, though more rated them as easy than difficult – with the exception of food consumption which was more difficult. On balance, projects rated these aspects as moderate to difficult to change while few participants even mentioned food – either as easy, difficult, or something significant they had changed.

- **Hardest – transport.** This is interesting given that transport came third to recycling and energy in the list of the biggest changes which participants felt they had made, perhaps indicating that although it is difficult for participants to tackle transport, participants get a real sense of achievement from doing it.

---

100 See chapter 7.
101 See section 7.1
- **Hard and not done - micro-generation and green tariffs.** Projects rated switching to green tariffs as difficult, and few participants said they had done either this or install micro-generation, which is backed up by a lack of outcome data in these areas.

Several projects pointed to specific instances of participants opting for easy and/or low impact behaviours, and avoiding difficult ones. Examples are given in table 13 and the AFSL case study below shows that the most frequently achieved pledges were generally easy behaviours, while few people had taken action on high effort or high impact behaviours.
Examples of hard and easy behaviour changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DCHA</th>
<th>Noted that recycling was the most popular topic among its residents, along with low effort options such as turning the lights off and low temperature washes; interest was lower for buying low energy light bulbs and avoiding packaging.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Envision</td>
<td>It was difficult to engage school students in sustainable clothing because of the strength of fashion culture, and the easy availability of very cheap clothing on the High Street. Food was also sometimes difficult because of the complexity of the issues – Fair Trade, organic, food miles etc; and views on transport could be influenced by parents and concerns about personal safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>Recorded percentages for people who have &quot;no plans to take this action&quot; including, for example: install solar water heating 79%; food box delivery 76%; stop using bleach 65%; join green energy tariff 63%; car share/join car club 59%; install water meter 45%; borrow rent items for only occasional use 41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PECT</td>
<td>Their evaluation reported that easy or fun activities are the most popular. People are reticent to make big changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEA</td>
<td>Even in some areas in which claimed behaviours changed, high proportions still said they never did the activity – e.g. re-using water to wash the car, which stayed at 83%; 35% never or rarely check fuel consumption by reading the meter (a slight fall from 39% at baseline); 35% never buy organic food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Figures on measures actually installed show a similar picture: 912 low energy bulbs were installed as compared to 2 households accepting a hot water tank jacket and 2 draughtproofing measures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 13** | Examples of easy and difficult behaviour changes

**Case study | AfSL**

Throughout the three years funding, AfSL have operated a pledge system whereby individuals make promises to take a variety of actions. Pledges were made as part of a face-to-face encounter with an AfSL member of staff or volunteer. AfSL kept track of the pledges on a pledge database, with a copy of their pledge also being sent to the individual.

To evaluate their project, AfSL followed-up the extent to which people had been keeping their promises by contacting them at later date either via telephone or email.

In total, over 2400 people made pledges to undertake environmental actions. The most frequently made pledges were:
- switch to using low energy light bulbs (1251 pledges);
- reduce the amount of water used to flush the toilet by using a watersave cistern filler (735 pledges);
- recycle waste where possible making full use of the councils doorstep recycling scheme (494 pledges);
- draught proof windows and doors (441 pledges); and
- buy more products from shops situated in my local community (430 pledges).

Following up on these pledges, AfSL found that 53% (n=104) were ‘usually’ putting their pledges into action. They also found that implementation rates varied, with people completing some pledges more frequently than others. For example:
- 88% had achieved the pledge to ‘reuse plastic bags and think of other ways to reuse waste’;
- 87% stated they had achieved their pledge to ‘recycle waste where possible making full use of the councils doorstep recycling scheme’; and
- 85% reported making the ‘switch to using low energy light bulbs’.

Pledges which had lower implementation rates include:
- lessen the environmental and social impact of my holidays by choosing an eco-holiday (21% achieved);
- offset the CO₂ emissions of my air travel (19% achieved); and
- join an organic box scheme (17% achieved).
Motivations & barriers for specific behaviours

Both projects and participants were able to shed light on what lay behind the ease and difficulty of taking action on specific behaviours.

- **Transport**

  **The scarcity of public transport in rural areas**: the audiences for many of the projects were based in rural areas where there was little alternative to using cars (e.g. NFWI, WWT, STSD). Even where there were buses, there were claims that these do not always reflect travelling patterns (e.g. STSD).

  "People who don't actually own a car find it very difficult to get to this office. If I catch a bus from South Molton which is just a mere 12 miles that way, it takes me nearly 2 hours to get here because I have to catch one bus which takes 50 minutes to get to Barnstaple and then I have to wait about 15 to 20 minutes to get another bus to come here. And then I either have to walk from the road at the back or catch another bus to Sainsbury's and then walk 600 yards, no probably further than that isn't it."  
  DCHA staff member (evaluation report)

  **Some reported a sense of powerlessness, even anger, around transport**. There was a risk that in trying to address the issue, projects turned people off because it was not something participants felt they could address (NFWI). Transport was often perceived as an unpopular issue to promote and projects did not want to make themselves unpopular within their communities.

  **There were too many stakeholders involved with delivering transport** (e.g. local authorities) for projects to get involved in service provision themselves (although there were a few examples of projects managing to do this – e.g. Eden organising a walking bus).

  **Projects working with children found transport difficult to address because transport choices were often not in the children's hands**. Many parents had safety concerns which meant they were unwilling for their children to use alternatives (e.g. Envision, Peace Child). One project claimed that whereas children did not care where they went on holiday, their parents often did (YHA).

  **There were also safety fears relating to public transport for women travelling alone** (Studentforce).

  **Some reported that bus travel was not a choice readily made by all sections of society**: one project claimed that "the middle classes don't do buses" for example (Somerset Trust) which, despite being a minority view, highlights a general feeling that barriers are not only practical, but also related to social identity.

  **Perceptions of inconvenience and loss of control are a significant barrier to reducing car use.** Carplus, for example, found that those unwilling to join the car club in York often cited fears about loss of convenience and control, and a 'need' to have a car because of their lifestyle. The place of car ownership in peoples' self-identity and self-image is also something which is picked up in Jillian Abel's work, although she argues that this is an area which merits further attention\(^\text{102}\). Carplus also found that people were put off if they did not understand how the procedures for booking and so on worked.

  "just doesn't seem to suit our circumstances unless I prioritise the environment ... above the convenience that I enjoy having [a] car"  
  (non-member)

  "the idea of having to be that planned about things is kind of scary"  
  (non-member)

  Participants in Carplus focus groups

There were particular issues around flying - most projects did not broach the subject of flights, but as well as people not being willing to give up their holidays (WWT), some particular barriers were highlighted e.g. people from minority ethnic backgrounds travelling back to heritage communities (LSx).

\(^\text{102}\) See section 4.5.9 on self-identity and image in:  
[www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/sustainable/climatechange/areviewofpublicattitudestoc5730](http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/sustainable/climatechange/areviewofpublicattitudestoc5730)
• **Food**

**Is an area which lent itself to hands on experiences** (e.g. NT’s garden demonstrations and Ugly Vegetable competitions; CSV’s “Concrete to Coriander” and “Growing Gains”) and **positive messages/celebration** (e.g. Soil Association’s food festival; Common Ground supporting groups to run Apple Days).

**Groups could often generate local support for work they did around the issue** (e.g. farmers getting involved with events - WWT).

**Food was sometimes felt to be a complex subject and one that was full of contradictions** (e.g. whether to prioritise fairly traded food, organic food or food that is produced locally - Envision).

• **Waste and recycling**

**Recycling was already a mainstream idea:** Projects found that recycling dominated environmental debates (WWT) and people already had expectations about recycling more. Provision has become mainstreamed (NEA), it has received high profile in the media (Envision) and therefore was easy to “tap into” (Somerset Trust).

**Mainstream provision may crowd out community projects** e.g. CSV initiated an organic waste collection in Birmingham but found they no longer needed to provide the service by the end of the three years as the council stepped in. There was a particular issue surrounding match funding on the NFWI’s composting champions initiative because potential funders saw it as something that is the remit of local authorities. WRAP eventually stepped in to provide support.

• **Energy, energy management and insulation**

**Small changes relating to energy are often simple and painless** (e.g. switching appliances off standby; replacing bulbs) and are therefore easily actioned.

**Taking action on a larger scale is often complicated and people may lose interest** (e.g. Envision participants with microgeneration; DCHA noted that the complexity of energy tariffs can be off-putting).

**Issues around who controls the building may limit the scope for action,** e.g. problems with listed buildings and buildings which were not owned by users or were centrally managed (Studentforce). Some DCHA participants flagged their wish for double-glazing but the choice was out of their control and in the hands of the landlord. One project also noted that there was tension between making people feel safe and better energy management (e.g. 24 hour lighting for public buildings).

8.3 **General lessons on engaging consumers in sustainable consumption**

In addition to the drivers that can be related specifically to behaviour change outcomes, a wide range of other factors appear to have helped projects to engage their audience in environmental thinking and activities. This section looks at factors commonly mentioned by projects and at the role played by behaviour change tools identified in chapter 5.

**Access to audiences**

All of the EAF projects managed to engage their target audience, though with varying degrees of success.

**Barriers in building and construction sectors**

Projects working in the construction sector seem to have had particular difficulty. Barriers included low priority of environmental issues in everyday practice, an unconvincing business case, and the project needing to find the right market ‘gatekeepers’ to engage with.

**Privileged access to audiences**

As for engaging the public, many of the EAF projects appear to have enjoyed privileged access to their target audiences that might not be available to other (more ‘official’) institutions. This was manifested in various ways:
Many projects suggested that community sector status gave them a special identity and credibility with the public, which revolved around independence, trust, and expert knowledge of local or sustainability issues. This may help people to feel they are being encouraged and supported to do something, rather than being told by government.

The large membership organisations (e.g. NT, NFWI, RYA/BMF, YHA) had more or less ‘captive’ audiences, as did the DCHA. This enabled them to engage with large numbers of people, to speak about the issues in terms and language that made sense to their members, and it also put pressure on their parent organisations to lead by example.

Where projects working with external organisations had deep knowledge of the sector, this made them more credible to the target audience than ‘outsiders’ would have been (e.g. CF with the Church of England, and EAUC with higher education institutions).

In the case of projects in membership organisations, and specialists working to influence other organisations, there is certainly a sense that they enjoyed a special ‘licence to speak’ to the audience that would have been difficult for government or similar bodies to do. The same was noted by some projects (e.g. LSx, AFSL) in relation to their use of ambassadors/volunteers who were recruited from the target community.

**Engaging and cascading through ‘frameworks’**

More generally, a number of projects said that working through some sort of organisational ‘framework’ (e.g. faith institutions, schools, membership organisations) helped them not only to reach their audience, but also to focus and maintain momentum. The benefit of this approach is that the project can become embedded in normal practice so that it comes to be seen as routine, ordinary and, in some cases, expected (e.g. CF supporting bishops’ training days which are seen as ‘official’ training courses; NFWI EcoTeams run through local Women’s Institutes who would be meeting anyway).

Success was not guaranteed in these models, however, and the projects that seemed to have the most success (at least in terms of engagement) appear to have devoted a great deal of time to working with the people involved in running the organisations (e.g. teachers, bishops, midwives, internal staff).

**Senior level buy-in and leadership**

Securing the backing of senior staff and leaders was reported to be particularly important by those working through ‘frameworks’, as well as some of those running community action projects out of their own organisations. It was also associated with success in market development projects with respect to the businesses they worked with.

Where support was not forthcoming, it presented major stumbling blocks (e.g. EAUC found that in certain institutions it halted the whole move towards sustainable procurement). Some projects (e.g. RYA/BMF) successfully overcame initial reluctance from the top of their organisation and managed to get the organisation to a point where the work is likely to be continued. Although there may be several reasons for this, it is likely that external validation of the projects was significant (e.g. through celebrity endorsement and affiliation to the Olympics).

**Case study | NFWI (working with memberships)**

EAF sponsored the NFWI to run a three-year project aiming to change the values and attitudes of consumer behaviour within the organisation. They conducted an initial consultation with members to decide on the themes that they, as an organisation, should be working on and then launched a series of initiatives to address these.

The consultation not only ensured grass roots ‘buy in’, but also of senior members of the organisation who felt they had been provided with a mandate to go forward by its own membership. This meant they were able to apply the same principles to other areas of decision making (e.g. decisions on new buildings at the NFWI College).

One of these initiatives was working with GAP to run a series of NFWI EcoTeams. These utilised the structures the organisation already had in place to recruit both facilitators and participants and proved very successful.

Project steering groups involving senior staff proved an effective means of securing buy-in in some organisations (e.g. NT, SA) and enabled information and lessons to be spread wider within the organisation.
The NFWI model showed how consultation with members (its 90@90 review) could create a mandate for environmental action before any individual projects were launched.

Empowerment

Several projects commented that participants needed to be empowered in order to gain a sense of agency and of personal responsibility and that without this they stood little chance of taking action (e.g. Peace Child, CSBT, LSx). This sentiment is captured in the factors that projects reported above (in section 8.2) as being the most important behaviour change motivations – belief in personal responsibility and capability, confidence, and knowledge about how to act.

Looking at the evaluation evidence, however, it was often difficult to make a link between the projects that said empowerment was a critical factor and those that could provide evidence of changing attitudes and behaviours. It would probably be fair to say that “empowering” participants had different meanings in different projects and that the means through which people were empowered were also important.

Nature of the contact with participants

Three particular features appeared to influence whether engagement led to successful outcomes (either/both in terms of behaviour change or community capacity building).

Face-to-face contact was judged important in initial participant engagement and in continuing to spur participants on (e.g. EAUC, PECT, SA, Somerset Trust, ASSL). Projects reported that it helped to build trust and confidence; for example, CSV claim use of the same staff in given communities has enabled them to become trusted and to build long-lasting relationships; MSC feel face-to-face contact with local authorities has made the idea of sustainable fish less abstract and has given the confidence to establish chain of custody.

Follow-up - many groups reported that follow-up contact made their audience engagement more effective. Follow-ups acted as reminders and as a means of reinforcement as well as giving a sense of external validation and affirmation (e.g. Peace Child schools participants having to report back on their pledges every day). Follow-up was also used in community groups as a means of helping them retain their focus (e.g. Eden).

Hand-holding over a period of time was critical in some projects, particularly in the successful market development projects where entirely new relationships and practices were being developed (e.g. MSC, FSC). Where community action projects had continuing engagement with the same group of people they were able to demonstrate either significant behaviour change (GAP, NFWI) and/or increased knowledge and capability (e.g. Envision, WWF, WWT). Carplus also noted that hand-holding could overcome fears about unfamiliar behaviours, in this case the booking system of the car club it was monitoring. Eden helped community building managers to fundraise for, and install, insulation which led to sizeable energy reductions.

While many projects thought that hand-holding was effective they also found it expensive, to the point that Eden said they would double the staff input and reduce outputs by half if they were to run a similar project in future.

"The money was spent on holding those hands. It’s a people process."

EAUC visit interview

As far as we can tell, one-off contact with participants (e.g. through events, publications etc) was the least effective way of empowering and motivating participants; but because there is no follow-up evidence for these approaches it impossible to be certain.

Pitching information to the audience

It may seem obvious to say so, but projects appeared to be most effective where they really understood the nature of their audience and what makes them ‘tick’.

This is another reason why those projects working in organisations and through established ‘frameworks’ appeared to work well and, in many cases, deliver measurable change in behaviour. Those heavily embedded in their local communities (e.g. Eden, CSV) also enjoyed a depth of knowledge about target audiences that would probably be unavailable to an ‘outside’ organisation.
There is a need to create material for each basecamp’s target audience e.g. at High Wray many volunteers are not white/middle class so material aimed at this audience wouldn’t work there.

National Trust evaluation report

On the other hand, a small number of projects assumed they knew what their audience wanted but failed to deliver useful support as a result. In a few rare cases, projects appeared to have under-estimated how green their audiences would be. This was the case with some of the National Trust’s Basecamp participants (volunteer working holidays) and odd cases in some of the community action projects.

“To be honest probably not. I was already a long way down that route. It probably reinforced it but it wasn’t like it was a life-changing experience.”

GAP participant

Many projects also mentioned how important it was to be able to offer expert advice or knowledge, where that might be:

- detailed knowledge of specific local/community issues (e.g. WWT, DCHA),
- an environmental action (e.g. NEA on energy, Eden on insulation)
- a technology (e.g. BF on converting vehicles to run on pure plant oil)
- institutions (e.g. Envision and Peace Child and schools, EAUC and higher education)
- a faith (e.g. CF’s environmental trainers included clergy which conferred credibility)
- supply chains and market drivers (e.g. MSC and FSC)

Having good knowledge of the target audience has enabled projects to:

- develop appropriate projects e.g. Envision and Peace Child’s school programmes; DCHA’s work with residents.
- tailor messages to audiences e.g. RYA/ BMF designed environmental guidance specific to types of boat because they knew this was what its audience identified with; CF’s booklet, How many light bulbs does it take to change a Christian?
- take account of local/ regional differences e.g. being sensitive about there not being any alternatives to driving a car in certain areas (NFWI, WWT).
- start from where audiences ‘are at’ in terms of what they are worried about e.g. some projects noted that personal identity is often strongly associated with a local area so it can be useful to focus first on locally important issues and then make links to wider environmental problems.
- develop the right hooks to engage people e.g. LSx’s use of faith, DCHA’s use of health and lifestyle.

These finding are consistent with those outlined in Defra’s framework for pro-environmental behaviours, and provide an argument in favour of segmentation work which might aide the understanding of target audiences103.

Hooks

While most projects engaged participants in environmental issues head-on, others used alternative hooks to excite and engage their audiences.

Cost

Many projects and participants cited cost as a barrier to taking action, especially in relation to shopping behaviour or installing new equipment. For some, the general cost of living was anyway a much more pressing concern than the environment (e.g. DCHA tenants).

“We get all our tins of peaches up Tescos cause they’re 7 pence a tin, you buy them in Somerfield they are 40 or 70 even and we can’t see any difference in them. And we buy beans in Somerfield and we don’t get the dear one we get the cheap ones”

DCHA focus group participant quoted in their evaluation report

Cost arguments were used to persuade people to use less energy and in some cases to persuade them that significant investments were worthwhile in the longer term (e.g. insulation). Some projects found it to be an

especially powerful tool in persuading those working with community buildings and in the commercial sector to take action (e.g. Studentforce found the prospect of increased profit margins a strong incentive for food outlets). Carplus felt that cost was one of many factors which accumulated and finally pushed people over a tipping point to act.

**Linking to positive desires and aspirations**
DCHA also used health and quality of life as ‘hooks’ for engaging their residents on issues such as insulation, heating and energy saving. Those working with faith groups tailored environmental messages to fit with theological teaching. Food was another important hook because it lends itself to positive experiences and focuses on the everyday.

**Targeting moments of change in peoples’ lives**
A few projects targeted their work specifically to moments in people’s lives when they may be making big changes to their lifestyles, and may be open to new messages, for example, BabyGROE targeted new mothers with information about green babycare products; Sponge targeted home buyers.

**Normalising green behaviours**
This aspect was not ranked especially highly in the standard evaluation questions but it did crop up in several project and participant interviews, where people said that involvement in the EAF project had helped them, or people in their organisation, to overcome feelings that they were isolated in their environmental beliefs (e.g. NT).

“I had thought I was quite isolated initially”
DCHA participant

“When you get together often and talk... you find out then that you are not exceptional, you’re of the norm and everybody’s that way and they all think exactly the same”.
STSD intermediary

**Convenience/bring action directly to participants**
Both participants and projects believed that the ease of doing something was a significant motivator of change (as shown in section 8.2). Projects were especially aware that expending a lot of effort could be a strong barrier for participants, as could a perception that a new behaviour would make life inconvenient (this was particularly important in the Carplus project). These barriers have been described extensively elsewhere too (e.g. see Defra’s behaviour change research\(^\text{104}\)).

There are very many examples of how projects worked to make action more convenient for participants across all of the different engagement models, such as:

- ACS helped introduce clothes donation banks into workplaces
- PECT’s introductory goody bag and NEA’s gadgets removed the need for people to search for products
- YHA decided not to rely on teachers to conduct environmental activities and instead recruited and trained its own EALs\(^\text{105}\)
- MSC worked with local authorities and businesses to gain chain of custody certification for sustainable fish.

**Small steps, tangibility and early results**
The experience of EAF projects reinforced the messages in *I will if you will* about the importance of starting at a level where people are comfortable - where the actions being suggested can make sense in terms of what people are already doing, and can be fitted into existing lifestyles\(^\text{106}\).

\(^{104}\) Please see [http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/business/scp/research/](http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/business/scp/research/)

\(^{105}\) Environmental Activity Leaders

\(^{106}\) The Brook Lyndhurst report (2008) Investigating Mavens will provide further evidence on this aspect. Please see [http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/business/scp/research/](http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/business/scp/research/)
This was a key reason why some projects avoided transport, as they thought it would alienate participants. Others steered participants away from ‘difficult’ actions because the likelihood of few early results risked being de-motivating for participants (micro-generation was mentioned in this respect). It was equally a reason why the EAF projects in aggregate achieved limited success in changing ‘difficult’ behaviours.

Focusing on small steps helped participants to achieve tangible results quickly, which reinforced a sense of capability and encouraged them to continue according to the projects. Small steps were commonly recycling, avoiding packaging, turning off lights, taps and so on, but also included demonstration activities such as the National Trust’s ‘waste free lunch’, which it cited as an especially successful way of making action tangible. For those working with community groups, achieving results quickly was also an important way of demonstrating that the group was about ‘doing’ rather than simply ‘talking’. Across all the projects, making results achievable and tangible seemed to be one of the most important motivational tools employed which is reflected in the strong outcome data for small changes.

**Pledges**

Pledges were also used as a means of making action seem tangible. By suggesting a list of actions, participants were being shown directly what they could be doing and, in theory, the act of making a specific commitment created a feeling that they should be doing it.

Projects that used pledges achieved varying degrees of success, either in measuring the effect of pledges on participants, or in actually catalysing behaviour changes. According to the evaluation evidence, pledges seem to:

- be effective at communicating what people should be doing in a non-threatening way;
- work best when there is an element of scrutiny (i.e. through follow-up contact);
- be enhanced by face to face contact (i.e. rather than web based pledges);
- produce changes in behaviour among a proportion of the people who originally made pledges.

The evidence is clear that ‘easy’ pledges are the most likely to be put into action and that they do not work for catalysing action in areas that the public is less familiar with, or are perceived as ‘big’ changes. There is some limited evidence (Peace Child) that pledges on ‘small’ behaviours may be sustained.

**Freebies & gadgets**

The use of free samples or gadgets (e.g. to save water, or monitor electricity consumption), has not been widespread amongst the EAF projects, but community action projects have used them more than others. Some projects have also supported organisations (internally or externally) with subsidised energy saving measures (e.g. insulation). Projects paid for these items in different ways – either using the EAF grant money to purchase promotional products, working with business and local authority partners or sponsors, or through local fundraising.

The projects using this tool often achieved large reach – LSx ambassadors gave out around 600 cistern devices and 400 light bulbs; PECT visited 950 households; and NEA made contact with 1,850 households (see table 13).

Projects reported that such offers can help generate enthusiasm (Envision), help the project “get a foot in the door” (PECT, LSx), counteract the image of sustainable products being unavailable or unaffordable, and, again, help make behaviour change tangible and easy for participants. Once installed (e.g. energy saving light bulbs, cistern devices) they remove the need for participants to make any further effort to make environmental savings.

Where they were offered, take-up and use of freebies or gadgets varied. The National Trust noted, for example, that its offer of financial support to install devices was not always accepted (e.g. Basecamps), or that the process of getting subsidised measures installed was not always straightforward (e.g. schools outreach). PECT’s follow-up interviews provide interesting insight on the actual usage and show that items that are given out are not necessarily used.

"The lights [...] have all got shades on, and it’s a bit difficult to get the environmentally friendly bulbs to go in them”
PECT participant
NEA was able to show that it was effective in getting devices installed and estimated environmental savings which resulted\textsuperscript{107}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Number given out</th>
<th>Environmental saving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smart meter</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light bulbs</td>
<td>912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettles</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiator panels</td>
<td>799</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hot water insulation jackets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savaflush</td>
<td>512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draughtproofing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling box</td>
<td>183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - energy efficiency measures</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,850</strong></td>
<td><strong>233.3 tonnes CO\textsubscript{2}</strong> (not including smart meter impact)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total – water saving measures</strong></td>
<td><strong>512</strong></td>
<td><strong>373,760 litres</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total – recycling</strong></td>
<td><strong>183</strong></td>
<td><strong>n/a</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 | Measures provided to households by the NEA DEMIA project  
Results from 1,426 households that had home visit

Rewards

Some projects (and participants) noted that prizes or rewards could be an effective way of reinforcing a sense of achievement, and therefore motivation. Examples included DCHA’s green living awards, which encouraged competition between different housing estates by means of cash prizes; Peace Child providing awards to children who had stuck to pledges; National Trust running competitions between schools in its energy outreach programme. Some projects noted that the prizes did not have to be large (especially in work with children or schools).

Audits, carbon footprints and monitoring resource use

GAP noted that feedback to individuals on their performance is crucial to achieving the behaviour changes demonstrated in the EcoTeams model. Other projects similarly reported that audits or other measurement models were motivating when combined with individual feedback (e.g. footprinting in the Carplus project, auditing of energy use in community buildings in several projects). Where participants were monitoring resource use regularly this helped to keep desired behaviours in their minds (NT).

“we are recording our environmental performance in a more structured way, we were already doing electricity but we will now carry on measuring water and waste management…this project has been helpful as it has kept us thinking about environmental stuff”

National Trust evaluation report (basecamps)

An unintended outcome of the evaluation process was that it acted as a motivational tool for participants in some projects. Baseline surveys could act as a prompt for people to think about their behaviour, while follow-ups were a reminder to act and a signifier of continuing interest in the individual by the project (e.g. PECT). Intermediaries also appreciated the chance to reflect on what the project achieved so that they and the EAF project could refine and improve the project process (e.g. GAP, WWF).

\textsuperscript{107} Though the data on energy savings from smart meters has not been released yet.
These tools were not effective in all cases though. The use of carbon footprints to demonstrate behaviour change outcomes was not always done well - the principal issues being non-comparable samples between baseline and follow-up and significant reduction in sample sizes in the follow-up stages (Carplus is the exception and provides a good ‘how to’ example – see section 7.2). A few found the use of footprint tools de-motivating for participants because they did not show sufficient levels of change when participants felt they had been working hard (e.g. WWF). This certainly reflects some of the findings of Brook Lyndhurst’s work on the Act on CO₂ calculator\[^{108}\] which highlights an element of disengagement amongst those with high footprints, as well as a tendency for people to provide ‘best guesses’ and ‘estimates’ when they first use the calculator (which might later prove to have been too low).

Overall, work undertaken in the EAF proved that these tools are an effective means of making impacts visible and personal and of increasing feelings of agency and efficacy in participants. The key ingredients of using such tools effectively seem to be:

- **Technical robustness** – the tool itself and the way it is administered;
- **Expert knowledge of administering techniques** – using external support if necessary (e.g. the county council property services team supporting NT’s schools outreach project);
- **Simplicity in presentation and scope** – so that participants can understand the results and identify specific actions that they can achieve;
- **Personalised/individualised results** – to reinforce a sense of responsibility
- **Follow-up** – at a minimum to provide feedback, but ideally with hand-holding support to help participants find ways to reduce their environmental impact.

**Demonstration and exemplification**

Projects’ experiences highlighted a number of ways of using demonstration activities effectively to engage interest, sometimes on a moderately large scale. Because of the nature of the activities however – often one-off contact – only a few were able to show whether or how these activities enhanced capacity to act, or resulted in behaviour change.

**Learning by doing - giving people an opportunity to test out new behaviours ‘for real’** – e.g. CSV’s ‘growing gains’ programme for schoolchildren; the experience of National Trust basecamp visitors; NEA’s loan of Electrisave devices. Some of the community action group projects (and a few participants) also reported that teaching others how to do something made increased their own knowledge and capability to act.

**Celebration** - several projects argued that positive experiences and/ or celebration build commitment. Common Ground built its Apple Days around the idea of celebrating the apple, the Soil Association showcased organic food by running an annual food festivals; CSV used its ‘Growing Gains’ programme to give positive experiences of growing food to school children; and National Trust tried to design their whole programme round things that were easy to celebrate (it reported that it’s Ugly Vegetable competition attracted wide media interest and speculated that it had achieved a spill-over impact on supermarkets).

> “to create things that were easy to celebrate and that helps you to get through the drudgery & hard work”
> 
> National Trust, visit interview

While it is difficult to substantiate the direct links between demonstration activities and behaviour change outcomes, these were clearly important supporting activities where they were used as part of a package of engagement measures.

**Lock-in of new behaviours**

The behaviour change literature flags the importance of “re-freezing” new behaviours so that they endure in the longer term. EAF projects demonstrated a number of ways in which this can be done successfully.

Adapting organisational processes so that participant involvement becomes routine e.g. MSC certified fish becoming part of the foodservice supplier’s staff sales targets; EAUC helping higher education institutions to adopt sustainable procurement practice; monitoring of energy use in NT properties.

Training was a specific example of changing internal practices, with staff training being used as a means of embedding change within organisations (e.g. CF, YHA, NEA).

“The training provided by the project has meant an 80% increase in sustainable purchasing policies and strategies being present in partner institutions.”

EAUC

Building self-managing capacity
Some of the projects that supported community action groups highlighted this as a critical success factor. The WWF model in particular demonstrated how groups need to have the skills to manage themselves and know-how to respond to change, so that groups do not collapse when significant individuals leave or new barriers arise. The WWF argued that building this long-term capacity was at least as important as any immediate behaviour change outcome.

Choice editing
The approaches adopted in some cases meant that a target audience changed their behaviour without a prior change in attitudes (e.g. children eating MSC fish, DCHA residents living in eco-homes). In these instances, behaviour was not a result of informed choice but was ‘designed into’ the system so that no unsustainable choices were on offer.

The idea of choice editing was an approach which divided opinion in the projects, and was debated both in individual interviews and at project workshops. Projects using this approach were often able to achieve large scale behaviour changes (i.e. hundreds or thousands of people and/or large energy savings) but some queried whether the approach was limiting because it did not empower or encourage people to make further lifestyle changes. Risks around behaviour reverting if organisational conditions changed were also flagged.

The evidence from the EAF shows that choice editing can achieve large-scale change in consumption quickly, but it is not conclusive as to whether this is empowering or disempowering for participants. Further research is required to establish whether and where introducing measures that make pro-environmental behaviour automatic and unconscious have any wider spill-over effects on attitudes or behaviours.

Barriers
Projects identified a range of barriers to engaging their audiences, in addition to those outlined above and in section 8.2. It is worth noting the similarities between these and the barriers outlined in Defra’s framework on pro-environmental behaviours109.

Availability of products
There is still only local/regional supply of some sustainable products, which undermines promotions done on a national scale (e.g. BabyGROE). There are also product shortages in some areas (e.g. NEA being able to secure all the smart meters it needed).

Affordability
Cost was noted as a significant barrier above and several projects felt that cost had either prevented their participants from purchasing products (BabyGROE), or had even in put them off becoming project participants at all (BioRegional).

Loss of personal control
Where people feel they will lose control over certain aspects of their lifestyles if they act differently they can find it threatening; this deterrent emerged strongly from the Carplus car club evaluation; it was also evident in the fact that participants generally opted for actions that would not be too different from their current lifestyles (e.g. rejecting the idea of vegetable box schemes, or being wedded to flying).

Behaviours beyond direct control
Some participants – especially children – were unable to act because decision-making did not lie within their control. Where this was the case there was very little either they or the projects could do, for example:

Peace Child and YHA both reported that school children found it very difficult to influence purchasing or transport decisions;

Studentforce found that many building occupiers did not own their buildings and were therefore not in a position to be able to invest in the fabric of those buildings).

**Lack of choice**

Some of the businesses involved in market development projects wanted more choice than the project could provide (e.g. BioRegional, MSC and restaurants) which represented a barrier to becoming involved. Limiting choice can also be seen as a threat by the public and is reflected in the participants who said they did not want to be told what to do.

**Fear of the unknown**

A number of projects encountered a reluctance to try things that were unfamiliar. Carplus commented on this in the context of people being not wanting to drive cars that they did not know, or how the car club booking system worked; LSx noted that some households rejected Savaflush devices because they were afraid it would damage their cistern. This feature adds weight to projects’ thinking that demonstration activities and hand-holding are important behaviour change tools.

**Over-burdening**

Projects mentioned that either individuals or organisations could be overwhelmed by what they were being asked to do. PECT for example said that it would now cut the amount of information contained in its welcome pack if it were to redesign it; reflecting on its pledge scheme, AFSL found that people play safe and stick to easy actions if they are provided with too many options.

At organisational level, some projects were victims of their own success and did not have the resources available to respond to all of the demand for their support (e.g. NT, Eden, FSC).

“One barrier has been the resource that’s available...particularly the number of retailers like ourselves, Sainsbury’s and Asda that are starting to use it [FSC certified products]. We’re asking for more and more of this small organisation that’s not set up to support the demand...That’s our concern, that they don’t have the resources.”

FSC participant

One project thought that funders should consider how projects could be supported to scale-up if the demand arose.

**Infrastructure**

Several projects encountered infrastructural barriers, most notably a lack of public transport facilities to provide a viable alternative to the use of the car (e.g. Somerset Trust, WWT) or public transport not linking up with other options (Carplus). Infrastructural barriers were also present at the household level – for example, in residents of flats not having any space to dry washing (e.g. reusable nappies) and not having energy meters (e.g. GAP, NFWI, WT).

**Institutional and structural barriers**

There were a number of individual instances where delivery of some aspects of a project was hampered by institutional factors. These ranged across:

- **Internal organisational barriers** – e.g. DCHA’s merger putting increasing pressure on the organisation to reduce costs;
- **Working with and through public institutions** – e.g. BabyGROE fighting against the NHS exclusivity arrangement with Bounty to supply welcome packs to new mothers; small groups finding *self-important* [sic] and bureaucratic public institutions hard to work with;
- **Being let down by partners/ suppliers** - e.g. NEA’s experience of having to change its partner energy supplier after the first year of the project;
- **Inconsistent provision of public services across the country**, particularly recycling and public transport in rural areas e.g. National Trust trying to provide facilities for recycling in its holiday lets but having to install individual systems in each property);
- **Unclear national guidance** – e.g. BF and the tax situation of PPO.
It is fair to say, though, that most projects had a positive experience of working with public and other institutions and many effective links and partnerships were formed.

**Negative news stories**
Projects reported that negative news stories could quickly undo their work. In particular, the NFWI said that ‘the great global warming swindle’ TV programme had caused a strongly detrimental effect across the organisation, to the point where participants had lost confidence that they were ‘doing the right thing’.

**The public image of sustainable consumption**
Despite environmental issues becoming more mainstream, a certain stigma still remains attached to being (visibly) involved in environmental action. This sentiment was captured in many of our participant interviews, together with views that personal action is undermined by lack of national and international action (e.g. government, China, India etc)

While the evaluation has shown that the EAF had an impact on the attitudes and behaviour of participants, the fact that these views were being expressed even after people had been engaged in projects suggests that the work of funds like the EAF still needs to be supported by top-down communication and visible government action on climate change. Some projects also called for better co-ordination between departments with different remits to help support grass roots action on sustainability (e.g. linking community based environmental action programmes to policy-level strategy and implementation in schools, the food sector, or energy).

These views also underline the point made earlier about successful projects accepting where the public is starting from and perhaps needing to take a cautious approach at first so that people do not feel they are being preached to.

> "You turn people off if you start ranting"
> Envision, Year 2 visit

**Skills**
Some projects found it difficult to encourage certain actions because participants lacked basic skills such as cooking or sewing, or lacked skills and knowledge in particular areas such as communication or negotiation.

**Time**
Most projects found time to be a barrier both for them and for their participants; some were only starting to show results by Year 3. At participant level, busy lives and work schedules were a common cause of environmental action being crowded out (for example, time was a major barrier to being able to use the MSC logo or make claims about where fish were sourced as caterers first had to go through a verification process to prove that their products did indeed originate from MSC certified fisheries).

With respect to EAF projects as a whole, a common view was that the type of community, organisational and business engagement models used in the EAF need to be given significant time to develop if they are to establish the depth of relationships with participants that appear to be a key marker of success.

The extent to which this is analogous with activity in the private sector is ambiguous. Although private sector organisations might be expected to deliver some outcomes relatively quickly, it nevertheless takes time to develop markets, build client relationships and so forth. In addition, private sector businesses selling goods and services are in a markedly different situation to most of the EAF organisations which were not selling products per se.

The analysis turns now to look at additional lessons learned about the different kinds of engagement models used in the EAF, following the typology given in chapter 5.

### 8.4 Lessons on running community action projects

The analysis in the following sections is concerned with the characteristics of different approaches that led to successful audience engagement and support.

---

110 These themes are also common in other Defra behaviour change evidence projects and wider research.
Working in groups

A large number of the EAF projects involved participant group working of one kind or another, whether running participant groups directly, or providing facilitation support. The following is based on observations from the EAF projects and group participants about the benefits and drawbacks of working in groups, providing further elaboration of previous research on the key success factors for this style of working\textsuperscript{112}.

Advantages of participant group working

EAF projects using the participant group model were generally convinced that collective working was the key factor in building a sense of ownership over environmental issues and action, a sense of empowerment and capability, and personal motivation as a result (e.g. WWF, GAP, Eden). The Soil Association, for example, noted that the most motivated individuals it had observed were linked to the most active participant groups. Where EAF projects were able to show clear behaviour change outcomes, these were often attributed to the stimulus provided by participant group working (e.g. GAP).

Participant groups also appear to provide a structure to focus individuals’ desire to act, akin to the ‘framework’ provided by more formal structures described earlier. All of those involved in group work were very positive about what it achieved.

Group participants felt that being part of a group provided access to:

- a range of different skills/viewpoints;
- mutual support;
- new ideas and encouragement from seeing what others are doing.

"I never realised the impact that food had on the environment until I joined this group and we discussed food during something else".

Eden participant

"You end up with a mutual support group. So that if somebody says right, I've given up flying, next time I go to Scotland, I'm going on the train... then somebody else is encouraged to do the same and people exchange stories".

STSD participant

EAF project managers cited a range of advantages, including:

- increasing the confidence of participants;
- enabling social learning;
- generating buy-in from local communities;
- making issues more real and personal by making connections with other people locally who share the same concerns;
- helping people to think they are not battling big issues on their own;
- giving mutual support;
- enabling activity to continue beyond the lifespan of the funded project.

Example comments are given in table 15.

| BioRegional | "People are more supported and feel more confident when working with their peers"
| DCHA | "Confidence is built by doing. People reinforce each other, groups can be stronger than individuals and are more likely to perpetuate themselves and to help others"
| GAP | "Community groups enable social learning, which enables people to overcome barriers, and build confidence and not feel their contribution is insignificant"
| NFWI | "Any local action needs local community input and 'buy in' to be effective"
| RYA/ BMF | "Groups will evolve and take the project on beyond the EAF project; once groups are |

\textsuperscript{112} e.g. Paul Steedman for the SDC, Communities of interest or action?
Table 15 | What are the main advantages of promoting behaviour change through groups?  
Based on the Year 2 e-survey  
Base=26 answering this question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups can reach a wider audience as they pass on their experiences to others both within and beyond the group</td>
<td>well established, they can continue independently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When a member ‘falls’ another can pick them up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local groups are more aware of their community needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disadvantages of participant group working

Although participants were largely positive about being part of a group, a minority of them (10% – 20%) mentioned certain drawbacks:

- being let down by another member of the group
- tensions within the group so that people pulled in different directions
- certain individuals in the group causing problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The drawbacks of being part of a group - participants</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being let down by members of the group</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People pulling in different directions</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problematic individuals</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People leaving the group</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 | Were there any drawbacks to being part of a group?  
Based on interviews with public participants in year 2 and 3  
Base=41 answering this question

EAF projects similarly noted that group dynamics and particular individuals could undermine how well the groups functioned, including:

- the dominance of particular individuals within groups;
- dependency for group survival on the continuing enthusiasm of a key individual
- people pulling in different directions;
- people going at different speeds, leaving some people behind;
- the time taken to reach consensus and to take action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disadvantages of working in groups – EAF project managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BabyGROE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Action can be slow where there is delay in achieving a common vision or consensus”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“[You] cannot always reach all in a group where the loudest often dominate”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Group membership constantly changes, e.g. when people move or step down”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RYA/ BMF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Messages get drowned out by other, louder groups’ interest”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RYA/ BMF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Group uptake happens at different speeds, can leave some people behind”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Environmental community workers, their managers and funders are often inexperienced in community development work. They learn on the job but this is not the best use of resources as it often results in problems and may be too late”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Somerset Trust | “Some groups may have too many ideas and want to go in different directions”
---|---
YHA | “Helping to establish and run groups is time-consuming (e.g. identifying initiators, tailoring group aims)”

### Table 17 | What are the main drawbacks of promoting behaviour change through groups?

Based on the Year 2 e-survey
Base=26 answering this question

It is worth mentioning here the WWF action learning project which was principally concerned with developing ways of helping groups to become properly functioning organisations. Its research and evaluation reports provide insight on how the issues raised more generally by projects could be tackled.

### Case study | WWF (evaluating group working)

The main aim of WWF’s project was to test a method derived from learning theory for working towards sustainable living in UK communities. It supported the development of 3 community groups in order to evaluate what did and did not work and, from this, make recommendations for how to facilitate future groups.

From the start, the project involved an external behaviour change consultant whose role was to provide a link with behaviour change theory and help develop and test the ‘Community Learning and Action for Sustainable Living’ (CLASL) model (see diagram below).

Evaluation of what was and was not working was ongoing throughout the project so that the model could be tweaked in real time. The involvement of other WWF staff members in setting up the project and in sharing experiences over the course of the three years helped to embed the model within the organisation and a practical guide has been written so that others can also benefit from what has been learned.\(^{113}\)

![Diagram of the WWF CLASL model](http://www.eauc.org.uk/file_uploads/claslsummaryhowtoweb-_wwf.pdf)

---

**Other limitations of participant group action models**

From analysis of interviews with project managers and participants a more general set of limitations could be deduced:

- participant groups take a long time to establish momentum and may not be able to deliver rapid changes in environmental behaviours (though this is not the case for EcoTeams), so it is important to

---


\(^{114}\) Source: Evaluation of WWF’s CLASL Project, p.23

\(^{115}\) Levelling is used to describe the point at which a group is confident to move forward.
be clear what funders expect the outcomes to be – i.e. long-term capacity building or quick resource reductions;

- EAF projects or participant groups which come from an environmental background may not necessarily have a track-record or skills in community development, which may slow down their progress or undermine their effectiveness. Suggestions were made at the Year 2 workshop that Defra should provide advice on community capacity building if it were to run similar environmental funding programmes in future;

- the nature of the issues that participant groups tackle and the means in which they do it – focusing on small, achievable steps – may limit the areas they can tackle. Again, it is important for funders to be clear what the expected outcomes are;

- the types of person who become involved may be the more active and motivated anyway. Participant groups may help to encourage those with existing environmental concerns to go further but they do not seem to be an effective way to target the inactive or disinterested.

**Ensuring the cohesion of participant groups**

EAF projects (e.g. WWF, Eden) also found that the existence of ‘community’ could not be taken for granted, and that participant groups would not necessarily flourish even where there appeared to be some tangible connection between people. Some EAF projects, for example, found that residents living in the same street area did not necessarily have strong enough connections or common interests to function as an action group.

In fact, a key success factor for participant groups was that they had some sort of social ‘glue’ or common identity to hold them together. This could be created by the project (e.g. EcoTeams) but could also be piggy-backed through existing organisations where an environmental ethos fitted with the group’s identity (e.g. church congregations, WI groups, eco-schools). GAP found that their semi-facilitated model, run through other organisations rather than directly, was more effective and cheaper than running participant groups directly.

EAF project managers also emphasised how important it was for groups to achieve tangible success early on, so that they retained a sense of purpose and support from the community.

> “Community groups that fail to focus on simple, discrete actions risk floundering and losing support from within their community”
> EDEN

**Facilitating participant groups**

Facilitation support was one of the most obvious ways that EAF projects contributed to the cohesion and success of community action groups. As set out in chapter 5, the facilitation support offered varied significantly in terms of: the degree to which it was regular and hands-on, or ad hoc and arms length; and the degree of direction and structure imposed by the ‘parent’ EAF project on what the group worked on.

**Benefits of external facilitation of community action groups**

The main benefits of this model appear to have been helping participant groups to focus their activities, and to become effective organisations that are more likely to survive in the longer term.

EAF projects such as WWT and WWF felt that community groups benefited hugely from outside enthusiasm and encouragement in order to build momentum. Projects also reported that their engagement with participant groups over sustained periods would help groups to survive on their own. This was a target outcome for some of the EAF projects (e.g. WWF, Eden, AfSL) which they appear to have achieved. Several cases were cited where the EAF project had helped participant groups to continue in the face of significant barriers.

> “[We] had to ensure that groups developed a real sense of ownership of the group and its activities so that they continue in the longer term”
> WWF

> “AfSL came to the first few planning meetings and then handed over to the co-ordinators. At the end, lots of people wanted to move on and lost contact and AfSL brought the focus back and made it happen again...AfSL really oversaw the process and made sure it kept going”
Participant groups (via the participant interviewees) reported that an association with the EAF project backed by Defra funding also conferred greater credibility within their own communities.

"The majority of pilot groups felt that being part of the SPAN project, which was linked to five national organisations and Defra funding gave them credibility when dealing with other partners and funders’

Sustainable Production in Active Neighbourhoods (SPAN)

"The image of Wiltshire Wildlife Trust was generally seen to be helpful and most groups felt it was a good organisation to be associated with."

Wiltshire Wildlife Trust

"[the group] had particularly valued the support and resources from WWF, partly because of the personal support and also the link to a big ‘name’ organisation which helped credibility"

WWF SWAP group member

In many cases, participant groups could also draw on specialist expertise within the EAF ‘parent’ organisation, to make their work more effective.

"The CLASL worker has been really supportive, encouraging and positive. It has played a big part. Having experienced, scientific, and professional advice has been vital."

WWF Reigate group member

How should participant groups be facilitated?

Participant groups valued personal contact more than generic forms of support such as toolkits.

"The toolkit designed to guide groups in project development proved to be of little value and groups preferred direct support from the project officer"

Wiltshire Wildlife Trust

"In general, such toolkits were felt to be too formal and mechanistic for these types of groups, who were basically a few individuals giving up their free time to do something and did not want to follow a rigid process"

WWF

EAF projects were split on whether their approach should be prescriptive or top-down in what participant groups should tackle (GAP, NFWI) or whether they should provide a facilitative, bottom-up approach (e.g. Envision, SA, WWF, WWT, STSD, AFSL, SPAN) in which group participants set their own objectives.

The first model has clearly delivered some notable behaviour change outcomes across fairly large numbers of people in a short time - but there is less certainty about how this has translated into community capacity to support environmental action in the longer term. Evidence on the bottom-up model is not clear cut either; during the EAF period, facilitated groups appear to have delivered a host of small behavioural changes (and some significant ones for small numbers of people) and there is anecdotal evidence that these groups will continue to be active in the longer term. It is therefore not possible to be conclusive about which of the hands-on facilitated models is most effective.

In some cases, the models used changed as the EAF organisations learned more about what did and did not work. WWT, for example, changed from a fairly rigid model to a more flexible approach after finding that the former made it difficult for groups to take ownership of their projects and respond to local needs.

Where participant groups were supported at arms length (e.g. simply by information provision or in response to ad hoc enquiries) there was a risk that they chose to cover issues which fell outside the SCP agenda. EAF projects’ lack of contact with un-facilitated participant groups means that they were less aware
of what the groups were doing so it is difficult to say how successful the support was in either delivering behaviour change or building capacity. There is, though, some evidence that these groups are more likely to disband.

The facilitated model risked participant groups becoming dependent on continuing support from the EAF project facilitator. It has not always been easy to strike the right balance between providing facilitation and allowing groups to take ownership of their projects.

"[AFSL are] adamant about not shaping what we do. That makes it harder"
AFSL Local Action Group member

In thinking about the pros and cons of heavily facilitated versus arms length facilitation models there is a compromise to be made between the number of groups supported and the amount of support given to each one. The numbers of participant groups which each EAF organisation looked after ranged from 4 (WWF) to 61 (Somerset Trust). It is clear from this that expending a lot of time and effort on each group means that fewer can be supported at all. Regardless of the depth of facilitation provided, though, all EAF projects using this model said it needed to be involve substantial ‘people time’ in order to ensure that the participant groups being supported remained cohesive and active.

Who should facilitate participant groups?

Echoing the earlier comments made about community organisations having ‘licence to speak’ to certain audiences, participant groups responded well to involvement from a known, trusted and independent source. It seemed important for community organisations not to be too closely associated with business or government in order to gain the trust of the communities and groups they were working with.

"Communities respond especially well to ‘enablers’ that are local, independent and charitable; there is an ‘affinity’ with bodies that do not represent business interests and which are not ‘sent’ from the statutory sector"
EDEN

The individual people performing the facilitator roles were critical to the effectiveness of the facilitation.

"[name of worker]’s been the hub around which we have all revolved, ... so it’s relationships is the thing, and I think [name of worker] is really gifted in creating and enabling stable relationships to happen"
AFSL focus group member quoted in their evaluation report

EAF projects emphasised that it is a highly skilled job combining knowledge of group dynamics as well as environmental issues. Problems arose where the facilitation component of the project was not properly resourced, where people had been recruited who were not suitable facilitators, or where they needed more training (e.g. SPAN).

Champions, ambassadors & volunteers

Projects worked with volunteers in various roles, often delivering outreach on behalf of the EAF project as a community ambassador or champion.

Benefits of working with volunteers

The outcome of working with volunteers and ambassadors in EAF projects was largely positive, allowing projects to extend their reach and impact, both in terms of the number of people they could engage as well as the communities they could access. Areas of success included:

• helping to keep momentum going in community groups where the initial euphoria had worn off;
• providing a cost-effective alternative for facilitating local groups – AFSL, for example, developed a model of recruiting and supporting volunteer Local Project Managers to replace paid AFSL staff as group facilitators;
• providing access to audiences that would have been more difficult for the organisation to work with directly, by recruiting ambassadors from target communities (e.g. LSx’s work on a London housing estate where they found word of mouth approaches much more effective than formal routes such as meetings);
• helping participants to identify with, and therefore trust, the messenger and the message (e.g. Peace Child and Envision’s ambassador programmes involving peer to peer work in schools; LSx’s work with Hindu communities).

**Barriers to working with champions, ambassadors and volunteers**

The main barriers to working successfully with these individuals revolved around initial recruitment, personality types and personal interests, staying in touch and getting feedback.

Envision, for example, noted that being an effective volunteer in its school programme was strongly related to personality and ability to connect with children. Not surprisingly, projects tended to attract those with an already strong interest in community action and green issues (according to projects and our survey of intermediaries) so that they sometimes intimidated or bored participants, and wanted to promote messages other than those the project wished them to.

Projects found it difficult sometimes to convince volunteers of the value of undertaking evaluation work, so that they could not always demonstrate what they had achieved.

Volunteer contributions seemed to be most effective where projects paid careful attention to recruitment and offered good training and on-going support (e.g. Envision, AfSL). LSx also mentioned that peer to peer mentoring between ambassadors could be useful.

**Working with faith communities**

Working with faith communities was an effective means of reaching large numbers of people with messages tailored to their personal values. Little evidence is available, however, on how influential these messages have been in creating sustained change in attitudes or behaviour among ordinary members of the communities targeted, beyond the initial contact.

---

**Case study | Conservation Foundation (influential individuals)**

Conservation Foundation came to believe that in order for environmental issues to feature more prominently within faith groups, the people in the middle and top ranks of religious institutions needed to be on board. As well as providing resources for ‘ordinary’ members of congregations, they therefore organised workshops, events and publications aimed at giving senior audiences the tools to link theology to practical action.

The individuals within the Conservation Foundation team had a great deal kudos with faith groups which enabled them to access senior audiences and exert substantial influence. In particular, the team included an environmental adviser to the Church of England and a policy advisor to the Archbishops’ Council on science, medicine, technology and environmental issues.

The approach taken by the CF appears to have been successful, however, in enabling a very large faith organisation to begin to adopt a more pro-environmental stance in its everyday working. Key to this project’s success has been its work to build long-term relationships at the highest levels of the organisation by a credible and catalytic individual (see section 8.5 below), and embedding change by supporting training, information sharing, and special projects (e.g. energy audits, micro-generation).

At a smaller scale, the WWF has also worked closely in a similar support role to enable a local church group to develop projects and activities for others in their church. In both cases, community capacity building appears to promise more than faith-centred activities that have delivered light touch or one-off engagement.

**Working with low income communities**

A few projects commented about the lack of a sense of empowerment in certain communities which in turn resulted in participants feeling that taking action was not up to them (e.g. DCHA, LSx). It was noted above that some communities have more immediate personal concerns focused on the everyday cost of living.

To successfully engage people from low income communities in environmentally focused activities, projects have tends to use additional hooks and different ways of working from those that have worked with more middle class and environmentally active audiences. Successful approaches have included:
Promoting cost saving messages to engage interest in energy saving (DCHA, NEA);

Hands-on support to overcome barriers to everyday actions (e.g. recycling, providing low energy light bulbs);

Encouraging people to get involved in ‘environmental’ activities by starting with local environmental quality issues (e.g. the LSx and noise pollution);

Using social networking as a way of initiating and sustaining contact (e.g. resident-to-resident communication, estate-based events).

GAP has acknowledged that its EcoTeams model is less effective with low income groups and is developing a model for this particular audience known as Evergreen which is based more around informal contact and having fun.

In addition, the DCHA model has clearly demonstrated that a significant amount can be achieved where a permanent sustainability officer is in post in a social housing association, and choice editing options (e.g. insulation) are combined in a package with capacity building and social inclusion work with residents. Their work has also demonstrated the need for work with low income communities to be equitable; in this case, raised awareness about the energy saving benefits of the association’s eco-homes led some residents to question the fairness of higher energy use in other homes.

Working with schools

Although the EAF projects that worked with school groups adopted very different approaches and objectives¹¹⁶ they all managed to demonstrate some success in raising awareness and at least small changes in behaviour. It would probably be fair to say, however, that the main impact of these projects was educational rather than significant changes in behaviour.

Key factors that influenced success included:

- Active support from teachers – both Peace Child and Envision reported that recruiting schools can take time and be resource intensive; the YHA found it was more effective to recruit its own Environmental Activity Leaders than to rely on teacher interest;
- Having continuous or follow-up contact or, in the case of the NT outreach, intensive contact and hand-holding over a short burst of time;
- Making the projects’ work “official” – i.e. incorporated into normal lessons or homework. For example, Peace Child provided a classroom chart for recording weekly progress on pledges;
- Prizes and incentives – Envision provided goody bags; Peace Child rewards for completing pledges; and NT offered financial help to install energy saving measures, as well as prizes to classes with the best projects.
- Projects found that their models did not work as well in “difficult schools” (Peace Child, “less active” schools (Envision) or where students’ behaviour was “challenging” (YHA). The YHA noted, though, that its residential activities provided an opportunity to filter environmental information to types of young people who might not otherwise be exposed to it.

In terms of actually changing the environmental performance of schools (as opposed to the behaviour of pupils at home) the National Trust energy outreach project was a useful demonstration model. Its success appeared to lie in combining several different elements in a package which enabled the school, the teachers and the pupils to identify areas for action, to devise their own action plan to fit in with how their school works, to take action, and be incentivised with freebies and rewards. It also involved expert support from the property services department of the county council.

Doorstep support – household advice and home visits

As noted earlier, these projects were able to achieve moderately high reach – hundreds or a few thousand households. They generally achieved at least small changes in behaviour and gave out many devices that would save energy and water.

PECT also reported that doorknocking was a good way to reach those with a less active interest in environmental issues (though it did not formally profile its audience). In contrast, the fact that “aspiring
environmentalists” were over-represented in Carplus survey respondents suggests that a postal-only approach may attract only the most interested.

Having face to face contact was the principal success factor that projects cited for this model. In recruiting people to its project, NEA reported that its original idea simply to leaflet households was not sufficiently effective in generating sign-ups, so it introduced follow-up visits the day after leafleting to encourage involvement. PECT thought that the initial interview was crucial in persuading people to read or use the items in their welcome pack; and AFSL noted that face to face contact in home visits provided for a deeper level of engagement than at events. The model also appeared to work best where initial contact was followed up some time later.

Cost was the main drawback, and some questioned whether the model was cost effective. In its evaluation report, PECT discussed whether initial contact time could be reduced while still having a meaningful engagement with the householder.

Running public information campaigns and large scale events

The main lesson from the EAF on these activities was that their impact on awareness and behaviour was rarely evaluated, usually because projects did not have the means of following-up initial contact.

Some EAF projects clearly ran very well attended and respected events, where their specialist knowledge and track-record was important (e.g. RYA/BMF, SA, CG), but without further evidence it is difficult to say much more about key success factors.

8.5 Lessons on running change in organisation projects

Several of the success factors in change in organisation projects are outlined in detail in section 8.3 above, particularly in relation to working in frameworks and achieving high level support from senior managers.

It is clear that these projects – whether targeting audiences externally or their memberships internally – had some very significant advantages over other projects with respect to reaching a large audience:

- they gained access to people/ areas of activity which would not otherwise be accessible or would not have been accessible en masse (e.g. higher education procurement; people involved in boating; members of the church);
- they did not have to spend time recruiting or attracting their audience;
- in many cases there were pre-existing communication channels which these projects could tap into (e.g. members’ magazines);
- organisations’ members were often relatively homogenous with regards to their attitudes on SCP issues as well as their wider values, so it was perhaps more straightforward for these projects to design activities that would have wide appeal, and (more speculatively) that would reach beyond the most environmentally aware;
- projects were able to draw on organisations’ internal resources and therefore extend the scope and reach of the projects - e.g. NT using its staff and properties for demonstrations (though they also emphasised the need to pay people for their time and/or expenses in order to ensure that things are prioritised and get done).

As discussed earlier, working to change the behaviour of members also appeared to have a catalytic effect on the organisations themselves, so that they could be seen to be leading by example. Key success factors here were senior level support combined with a willingness to embrace new ideas and ways of working, delivered through aspects such as: designing/ re-designing internal policies; putting staff training into place; re-organising internal systems; putting better facilities in place; using internal seminars, meetings and project steering groups; influencing others within the organisation/ changing organisational culture.

For those projects working to support external organisations, having the right contacts within the organisations they were targeting – even before the projects got under way - was imperative. Building their own credibility within their target organisations, and strong relationships with key personnel were crucial to being successful (e.g. CF, EAUC). Having expert knowledge of the audience’s needs and the right skill set to deliver support helped to cement these relationships and credibility.
8.6 Lessons on running market development projects

As discussed earlier, market development projects achieved variable degrees of success, the most obviously successful being the MSC, FSC and BF (as well as the EAUC on sustainable procurement in higher education). Key success factors are examined in turn.

Good understanding of market characteristics and dynamics

This was crucial in determining how projects pitched their work to key market players. Where these factors were not fully understood, engagement was difficult. BioRegional, for example, had to revise its model after a consultation exercise with potential housing sector buyers of “One Planet Products” showed that the original model (based on bulk discounts) was flawed. Working through the whole supply chain, with both demand and supply sides seemed to be advantageous as well (e.g. MSC, FSC, BF).

Making a strong business case

Several elements contributed to project being able to present a convincing business case, including:

- Being able to demonstrate interest from final consumers to back up a CSR\(^\text{117}\) case. Both MSC and FSC undertook outreach work to do this, and the FSC commissioned surveys of UK public awareness of its logo.

- Having a strong ‘brand offer’, which favoured the certification schemes which had an established track record. MSC and FSC both ensured rigorous ‘chain of custody’ over their products, which ensured the sustainability criteria were consistently met. BabyGROE vetted all new advertisers to ensure a high level of quality assurance for its customers, as did BioRegional for product suppliers. BF also used conversion of celebrities’ cars as a way of promoting its offer.

  "FSC offers the best value. The value is demonstrated through two main areas. It’s the standard with the highest standard. It has the most demanding criteria... It’s the only scheme that’s recognised by the majority of NGOs who campaign in this area... And although consumer recognition is still very low... there’s still greater recognition of FSC than there is of any other certification scheme.”

  FSC participant

- Projects being run by credible individuals, with business nous, that are respected by the businesses they are working with;

- Reducing business costs, for example by reducing product search costs (BioRegional) or supply costs (e.g. chain of custody costs for MSC fish);

- Using ‘first mover advantage’ to motivate businesses. MSC, for example, worked at first with only one foodservice supplier which became the market leader in the supply of sustainable fish to schools. As MSC worked with others the business sought to preserve its leading position. FSC also noted that retailers preferred to work with them individually, rather than on a collective product promotion.

Identifying and accessing key ‘gatekeepers’ in supply chains

Projects seemed to enjoy more success where the number of access points in the supply chain was small. MSC found it much easier to make headway in the schools sector because purchasing decisions were governed by just one local authority buyer in each area, whereas restaurant chains had more complicated decision making structures. Those working in construction found it especially hard either to identify or access key gatekeepers.

Working to remove blockages and brokering new relationships between supply and demand sides

BF attempted to break the circle of not having either supply or demand for PPO in place by working with producers (farmers), processors (press owners) and consumers (vehicle and fleet owners). MSC began work on certifying more fisheries so as to increase the supply of fresh fish when it became clear this was a key requirement of restaurants (schools supply was based on frozen fish).

Market conditions and timing

---

\(^{117}\) Corporate social responsibility
Projects were also reliant on the right market conditions for their projects to succeed, which may be determined by external, non-market factors. Two examples were cited in this respect:

- BF suffered due to an uncertainty in whether or not Pure Plant Oil (PPO) would qualify for the 20p tax break for biofuel. This uncertainty made any long term financial commitment by users and producers highly risky.
- Conversely, MSC’s Fish & Kids project benefited from the recent debate on the quality of school food, and BabyGROE felt it had benefited from an increased awareness of environmental issues and decreasing stigma on the use of second hand goods.

“One difference in context is that the cost sector, particularly school meals, has been under enormous pressure to improve their service and to market the aspects they are doing well due to the impact of Jamie Oliver’s TV series, Jamie’s Dinners. Fish & Kids provides them with a positive and interesting story to tell parents about fish dishes which are not just healthy but also sustainable.”

MSC (final evaluation report)

8.7 Lessons on running policy landscape projects

Because so few projects have been working in the policy landscape and, in particular, because only one has been concentrating on this area, it is difficult to draw out generalities from their experience. Nevertheless certain lessons have been learnt.

Projects working in the policy landscape relied very heavily on personal contacts and on networking. Green Alliance placed a lot of importance on building relationships, ‘being at the right place at the right time’ and knowing who was influential in particular areas of policy. The ability of other EAF projects to input into policy processes was limited because they do not have these relationships, although an opportunity was provided at the Year 3 network event.

8.8 General lessons on partnerships

One of the major success stories of the EAF has been the instrumental use of partnerships. These included:

- **partnerships with local authorities** who acted as service gatekeepers (MSC), or sources of support (WWF, NT);
- **commercial partnerships** who provided access to new markets (MSC, FSC), to publicity (ACS, FSC), to advertising revenues (BabyGROE) and to technology (BF, NEA);
- **partnerships between EAF organisations** which allowed knowledge sharing and sharing of resources (e.g. WWF and SPAN, NFWI and Carplus, Common Ground and Somerset Trust, BF and RYA/ BMF, GAP and NFWI)

As a result of partnerships, many projects were able to leverage additional resources or expert advice for their projects (e.g. provision of freebies, incentives, or energy advice). Many of these relationships will remain in place in future (e.g. WWF and Surrey County Council) and represent an positive outcome in terms of the ability of EAF projects to continue to catalyse action in their communities in the long term (see also chapter 10).

8.9 General lessons on catalytic individuals

It is apparent from both the interviews with participants and the project visits that key individuals often played a very important part in how the EAF projects developed. Leading individuals were important in all project models – community action, organisations, business and policy.

Group participants often put the success of projects down to a certain individual - frequently a project intermediary, or EAF project manager - but catalytic individuals operated at all levels within the projects. GAP talked about greener members of its EcoTeams acting as catalysts for other group members, for example, while the NFWI, also using the EcoTeam example, talked about the instrumental roles of the team leaders.

The enthusiasm, commitment, knowledge and personality of an individual is often what persuaded people (and businesses) to take part. Some EAF project managers displayed significant (social) entrepreneurial
capacity, to develop new ideas and ‘sell’ them to their target audiences, as well as finding creative solutions to overcome significant obstacles. It cannot be proved, but it is almost certainly the case that the degree of success in some projects was as much to do with the individual(s) leading them as the engagement model used.

“They’ve been great, particularly the staff there have been really, really supportive. In particular Laura. I’m sure it’s her job to do so but she has been really, really supportive and very, very helpful.”

MSC participant

“Phil and Richard are there, they’re incredibly loquacious, good speakers...and I’ve seen Phil at presentations and he really sells the environment, and believes in it. It’s not just a job.”

EDEN participant

Interestingly, in addition to the inspirational project managers, some projects appear to have developed or unearthed their own catalytic individuals – or people who might be referred to as ‘environmental mavens’118. For example:

- the Soil Association talked about group members becoming seen as local experts;
- the National Trust commented that those heading up their exemplar properties were being approached by members of their communities about green issues because they were increasingly seen as the people who knew and/or who knew how to find out about environmental questions;
- the NFWI quoted examples of Eco Team participants who had gone on to be the focus for further action in their local community.

In thinking about whether it would be possible to replicate projects’ work, the great unknown is whether a similar model would work without the involvement of the same people.

8.10 General lessons on using new technology

Quite a number of projects invested in new technology, particularly in developing websites and online materials to help deliver their programmes of work (BioRegional, GAP, MSC, Peace Child, RYA/ BMF, Soil Association, Sustain, Studentforce).

Projects trying to achieve more than the basics have had trouble obtaining what they specified

Both GAP and BioRegional attempted to design complex websites which had a data processing capability. Both found it difficult to procure sites that met their specifications, and both had under-estimated the costs involved. BioRegional simplified its requirement, while GAP was successful with its third contractor. The problem seems to have been two-fold. On the one hand, having the right technical and supplier knowledge within the EAF project to ensure successful specification and procurement of what was wanted, and on the other, an assumption that this type of work could be conducted more cheaply than proved realistic.

High costs and over-runs have been an issue for several projects

GAP and BioRegional’s experiences were, in both cases, costly both in terms of money and in terms of time. Even where there were no major hitches, costs were often higher than expected: this was the case for both Peace Child and the Soil Association and in both cases they also took longer than planned.

There is an obvious risk associated with being the first to try things

Peace Child invested in a car powered by biofuel and has had ongoing problems with the technology. They are also now in a slightly difficult position because scientific evidence on biofuels has changed.

However, investment can lead to significant benefits

Despite the initial problems that GAP faced, their website is now an extremely valuable tool, and critical to delivering the Eco Team model. Similarly, both the Soil Association and Sustain see their sites as having been very valuable for their organisations (in both cases they are credited not just with providing a means of communicating to an existing client-base but also for getting new people interested in their work. In fact, the Soil Association directly attributes the rise in its membership to the “Why organic?” site, which is more directly focused on communicating with the general public than the association’s own).

---

Not all projects found websites to be an effective engagement tool however: several projects commented that investing time in face-to-face contact and one-on-one support had delivered more significant results than referring people to on-line resources.

8.11 Key ingredients of a successful EAF project

Bringing together all observations about what worked, we have distilled some common characteristics of a successful EAF project. Success is defined here according to two dimensions: **effectively engaging** the target audience to think about sustainable consumption as well as providing the knowledge/tools to make changes, and **achieving actual changes** in behaviour as a result.

The key features which emerged were:

- Good knowledge of the target audience, its interests and its starting point with respect to environmental issues – whether the target audience is communities, organisations or businesses;
- Facilitating activities that will empower participants to act – rather than just resulting in awareness raising or information delivery on their own;
- Ability to be credible and trusted in the target community;
- Face-to-face contact with project participants (and intermediaries);
- Repeat contact with participants – at least a follow-up and more enduring contact if possible;
- Where feasible, some element of hand-holding to help participants implement change;
- A means of creating focus, structure or a framework for the project activity;
- Where feasible, measurement of project impacts to make them tangible and immediate to participants;
- Some element of participant accountability – either through regular contact, peer monitoring or more formal measures;
- Feedback, reward, celebration;
- Project accountability – through evaluation;
- Inspirational/entrepreneurial leadership, including strong ‘people’ skills;
- Willingness to develop and work in partnerships.

In addition to the above, where a project is being run in a larger organisation, a key feature would be getting buy-in at the top, either inside projects’ own organisations or when working with external organisations.
9 Operation of the Fund

Projects gave extensive feedback about the implementation of EAF during the project visits and in the year 3 e-survey. Since their experience may hold valuable lessons for the specifications and day-to-day management of similar funds, we have summarised the main areas of feedback under the following headings:

1. Support from Defra
2. The ‘rules’ of the fund
3. The projects’ experience of the evaluation process
4. Networking - the annual workshops

9.1 Support from Defra

Overall, the projects were extremely complimentary about the level of support offered to them by the Defra team, especially in the earlier stages of funding, and they felt the team to be extremely approachable and helpful.

"Defra have been fantastic"
NEA, 3rd year visit

Very few had any complaint, but where they did mention room for improvement this seemed to be focused in three areas:

1. Some projects felt that the level of support offered to them at the beginning of EAF was not sustained across the three years – particularly when there were changes in the case managers allocated to them. This was a particular issue when projects were in need of support during changes to their work plans (e.g. AfSL).

2. Certain projects felt that Defra could have done more to provide them with wider government contacts. Some felt they needed links to other parts of Defra or other Departments (e.g. to the DCSF for those working with young people, to DfT for those working on transport, etc...). Some also wanted help to find match funding through signposting to potential sources.

3. Certain projects felt they had had too little interaction with Defra. Some would have liked more individual feedback on the quality of their work and on the suitability of the reports they submitted (e.g. YHA). A few others would have liked an occasional check-up (e.g. Sponge). There was certainly a sense from a few that they needed a little more reassurance that they were doing the right thing, particularly where they were new to sustainability or behaviour change.

"We would have liked more feedback from DEFRA about their level of satisfaction with our work."
RYA/ BMF, 3rd year visit

The lessons to take away from this for future funds are two-fold:

1. Approaches aiming to change whole lifestyles - the cross-cutting nature of sustainability means that projects taking a whole lifestyles approach may need access to advice from several government departments, via the primary funder.

2. Innovation - funds that encourage innovation may need to perform a ‘critical friend’ role (or find someone who will) to reassure projects they are on the right track, and staying within the objectives of the fund.

9.2 The ‘rules’ of the fund

The application process

National Trust felt that in terms of the initial request for funds, a two-step application process might have been better. After outlining an initial idea, the projects could then have worked collaboratively with Defra on how it might be achieved.
Although not widely mentioned, the annual process of re-applying for funds was praised by the Soil Association as a useful tool for re-assessing where the project had got to and what there was still to achieve.

The length, size and nature of the fund - advantages

Projects were extremely appreciative that the EAF provided funding over a three year timescale. The main advantages were felt to be:

**Stability** – which had enabled them to use approaches which simply would not have been feasible had the funding been for a shorter period (e.g. WWF's work on community action and learning).

**Freedom and flexibility** – projects could set the agenda and decide where they needed to concentrate their efforts instead of having to do many isolated pieces of work (which is often the nature of short-term funding allocations) or continually mould themselves to suit different funding criteria (e.g. Envision, Green Alliance, London Sustainability Exchange).

**Bigger ambition** – others (e.g. EDEN) commented that the EAF grant was much larger than their usual grants, which enabled them to take on more ambitious activities, of longer duration, and which may have more of a behaviour change impact than low cost one-off events. The flip side of having a larger grant for some small organisations was their difficulty in finding match funding; some simply did not have the grant chasing knowledge, or project track record to find match funding easily (e.g. AfSL, BF).

**Risk taking** – the EAF enabled some projects to undertake activities that may have been judged too new or too risky (in terms of guaranteeable outcomes) by their parent organisations (e.g. NT, YHA, WWF). For some, the EAF has given them the chance to prove the worth of their approach to wider internal or external stakeholders (see Chapter 10).

The length of the fund - disadvantages

While they generally praised the EAF, many of those working with community-level groups noted that three years was not as generous amount of time as it may seem, because of the length of time it takes to build the capacity and confidence of the groups.

Some (e.g. WWF) commented that behaviour change impacts were only starting to come through at the end of the EAF period, but people were now equipped to carry on changing their own and others’ behaviour well beyond the EAF as a result of the early capacity building. EAUC made similar comments with respect to changing procurement practices in higher education, where building institutional and individual capacity was felt to be an essential first step in embedding longer term change.

“Building the capacity of the communities to establish and run their own pro-environmental projects takes a long time. Some groups that looked like they were struggling after just two years have recently exploded into a profusion of projects and activities.”

EDEN

Only one organisation (Studentforce) felt that three years was perhaps more than they would have wished to spend on their project. They had struggled with match funding and had perhaps felt locked into a model that did not reflect changing organisational priorities.

The time taken to build up momentum in the projects is reflected in the e-survey data over the three years. 11 projects said they were behind schedule in Year 1 and 10 in Year 2. Two important lessons for the structure of funding emerge from observing those running or supporting community action groups during the EAF:

**Building the capacity of community groups takes time** – in the models where community groups are supported to set their own environmental agendas and work plans, the early set-up period can be lengthy and resource intensive.

**The need to change tack early on** – can cause delays to early project outputs but organisations which facilitate community groups may need to change direction early on to respond to the idiosyncrasies of the groups’ needs and their readiness to change behaviour.
One project suggested that funding for organisations that support community action groups could perhaps be tapered to reflect these features, with the largest portion allocated in Year 1. This idea was not tested with the other EAF recipients so cannot be generalised.

**Match Funding**

Finding match funding was identified as a major problem by many of the EAF projects, and often as distraction to the work they had planned to carry out.

"Match funding is a nightmare"

Common Ground

Some of the key issues identified by projects were:

**Diversion of staff resources** - in some cases, problems with match funding led to project staff being unpaid for the work that they did, or even project staff covering match funding from their own pockets in order to keep the project afloat.

**The project being unattractive to potential funders** - match funding seems to have been a particular problem for organisations or projects without any obvious private sector remit (i.e. those which could not provide what might otherwise be seen as good business or sponsorship opportunities).

**Narrower criteria of other funders** - some said that the cross-cutting nature of their project could be off-putting to some potential match funders with narrower remits. For some, joining up energy, water and waste excluded some funding sources (NEA); as did training with environmental action (CSBT). Envision also commented that projects sometimes risked falling between two stools: for example, funding pots for young people didn’t necessarily cover the environment; and environmental pots may not prioritise working in schools.

Having said this, a handful of organisations did comment that having been forced to find match funding had helped them foster relationships with new partners.

The following table illustrates some of the issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of projects’ experiences with match funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACS</strong> reported that match funding was the limiting factor in how much they applied for and claimed that people had gone unpaid for their work on the “Choose2Reuse” project as a result of the difficulty of finding match funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BF</strong> found match funding very stressful. They had spent a lot of project time looking for additional funds, and one of the directors ultimately took on extra consultancy work as a means of generating the income. They felt this had very much diverted attention away from the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In <strong>AFSL</strong>, the project leader covered half the match funding himself in order for the project to continue its work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carplus</strong> felt that match funding had been a difficult area for them and had restricted what they were able to do. They only had the funds to introduce one alternative fuel vehicle for example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSBT</strong> said that match funding had, for them, meant the involvement of the Learning and Skills Council who had very different objectives and different targets from those of the EAF project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EAUC</strong> reported particular problems surrounding the use of in-kind donations for match funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Alliance</strong> credited the match-funding specification with having encouraged them to build partnerships with commercial organisations but also felt it had forced them to operate in areas that were of interest to match funders rather than those they felt most required their attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LSx</strong> found it difficult to find match funding but also recognised that because of it, they now had an ongoing relationship with Thames Water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Studentforce</strong>, like many others, found it difficult to find match funding for their project and had to use the funds of the organisation itself in order to match Defra’s. This led to EAF being extremely draining on the organisation as a whole.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The flexibility of EAF

The most common source of praise about the EAF as a funding vehicle was the flexibility that it offered. This enabled many of the projects to adjust their work plans in the face of changing circumstances, and, consequently, enabled them to achieve more than they would otherwise have done (some of the many examples are given in the table below). Projects also felt they had been given room to experiment, even if that meant making mistakes or being uncertain that any particular activity would have an impact. In this way, the EAF most certainly encouraged creativity and innovation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustain</strong></td>
<td>Commented that it was the EAF’s flexibility which had allowed them to feed into the Olympics’ sustainable food plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEA</strong></td>
<td>Said that the flexibility had enabled them to switch to Electrisave devices instead of smart meters as it became clear that the latter would be extremely difficult to procure (thus enabling a practical solution to what would otherwise have been a major stumbling block);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MSC</strong></td>
<td>Expressed appreciation for the freedom that was given to them to do what they felt necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Alliance</strong></td>
<td>Spoke of the freedom it had given them to “drop everything” and focus all their efforts on the waste chapters of the Conservative party Quality of Life review while it was under development (thus ensuring that the organisation had a lasting impact on the ongoing debate around how the UK should deal with waste).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GAP</strong></td>
<td>Experienced many delays in developing their website system for capturing participants’ data but were given the time to find the right solution, which they did on the third attempt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 | Examples of projects benefiting from the flexibility of the EAF

Questions were raised by both the evaluators (in Year 2) and at least one project as to whether the funding had, in fact, been too flexible and risked projects not achieving their objectives. On the basis of the evidence collated in Year 3 this does not seem to have been the case for the vast majority of projects, and was a minority view amongst the projects themselves.

Flexibility was undoubtedly beneficial to what the EAF projects were able to achieve. The questions for future funding revolve more around how flexibility should be managed rather than if it should be allowed – perhaps for example, through an outcome-driven approach rather than a rigid task specification approach.

**Reporting requirements**

The evaluation of the EAF 2003-5 by CAG\(^{119}\) had highlighted an important problem with project reporting, where projects had generally reported on what they had done (processes and outputs) but had provided weak evidence of what they had achieved (project outcomes).

Defra responded in the EAF 2005-8 by making output and outcome reporting an explicit part of the reporting requirements.\(^{120}\) Many projects struggled with this, as was identified in both the Year 1 and Year 2 interim evaluation reports. They remained frustrated in their Year 3 interviews, the three main complaints being that:

- Defra had not been clear at the set-up stage about the reporting it expected and projects had not allocated enough time in their bids to meet the reporting requirements.

> "The requirements for reporting should have been clearer from the outset. Reporting procedures could have been simpler and more streamlined." 
> BabyGROE

- The reporting specifications were too onerous, particularly the initial quarterly reporting.

---


\(^{120}\) In year 1 Defra provided an example template for the quarterly progress reports.
They did not realise the extent of the evaluation requirement when they put their project plans together, which led to difficulties in adequately resourcing the evaluation component (e.g. AFSL, EDEN, SPAN; WWT).

There were also more specific complaints, for example that standard forms were not suitable for all organisations (e.g. CF because it was a small organisation working with a very specific audience, CSV because they had, in part, used their grant for core funding).

The Year 1 evaluation identified projects’ frustration with reporting and Defra responded by simplifying the reporting criteria, by changing from quarterly to half-yearly reports and by providing exemplar reports for projects to learn from. The evaluation also flagged a risk that the regular reports would produce little data on project outcomes (mainly due to a mismatch in the understanding of what was meant by demonstrating and reporting outcomes). Defra countered this by asking projects to meet an additional requirement: the production of an explicit evaluation plan which would then form the basis of their final project report. Alongside this, projects were offered free call-off support from an independent evaluation consultant (Kathryn Rathouse) – an offer which 29 took up. The Year 2 evaluation repeated warnings that projects were not sufficiently focused on demonstrating outcomes and made further recommendations on how this could be done. In response, Defra provided further support to some projects to help them complete their evaluation analysis and Year 3 reports.

Overall, there is little doubt that projects gained a lot from the evaluation process and found the evaluation support provided to be very useful (see section 9.3). Having said this, the fact that Defra had to provide so much additional support in this area shows that many projects were inexperienced at outcome evaluation and found the process time consuming and, on occasion, stressful. On the whole, they did not have the knowledge121 or resources to conduct a rigorous evaluation of behaviour change outcomes, and had not expected to do so.

9.3 The projects’ experience of the evaluation process

Difficulties in doing the evaluation

As already highlighted, it is clear that projects did not find evaluation easy. At the end of Year 3, 21 projects reported they had found it either very or fairly difficult122. This was highlighted by feedback given during the project visits where the main issues raised were:

**The time-consuming nature of evaluation** – e.g. CF, MSC, WWT. In the year 3 e-survey over half of the projects (17 of 30 answering the question) reported that evaluation had diverted resources from other aspects of their project.

**Measurement getting in the way of ‘doing’** - which was voiced especially by the community action projects who sometimes thought that evaluation led to bureaucratisation and could be off-putting to their participants – e.g. EDEN, WWF, WWT.

“It is worth considering that when building a relationship with the community groups to enable them to make beneficial changes to their lives and to the environment, that repeated ‘evaluations’ and questionnaires risks altering this relationship - so this ‘research’ has to be handled sensitively.”

EDEN

**The difficulty of obtaining accurate baseline data** – e.g. BioRegional. At the end of Year 1, almost a third of the projects had not undertaken a baseline assessment. Some projects found both baseline and follow-up assessments difficult because they did not have direct or on-going contact with the final target audience (e.g. through events or where they provided arms-length support to community action groups).

**The difficulty of evaluating the outcomes of certain types of activities or impacts** (e.g. workshops and networking activities; capacity building and cascading impacts on local communities) - CF, CSV, Envision, GAP, SPAN, Sponge, Studentforce, Sustain. This feature applied especially to capturing and

121 In the end of Year 1 survey, only 1 in 5 projects reported that they had a significant amount of skill in monitoring and evaluation.

122 Figures taken from responses to the Year 3 e-survey (n=30 answering the question). Only 8 felt evaluation had been fairly easy and 1 that it had been very easy.
valuing the **social impacts** of EAF projects’ work (which is a wider issue anyway regarding third sector projects\(^2\)).

"We know it's happened, but we don't know what bit of our work has enabled it to happen"

Somerset Trust

**The issue of attribution** - given changes to the wider societal context with environmental issues rising up the agenda anyway – e.g. Studentforce.

**The difficulty of estimating the CO\(_2\) savings which resulted from the work carried out** – e.g. BioRegional.

**Having the skills to analyse the data collected** – for example:

"Doing the evaluation work was fairly easy but to get the right detail out of the responses was a time consuming and specialist job which probably would have been better outsourced."

PECT

**Differentiating between fund evaluators and project evaluation support**: One drawback of the approach taken was the fact that projects sometimes failed to differentiate between the work they were doing with Kathryn Rathouse to evaluate their own project, and the help Brook Lyndhurst was asking them for to contribute to the evaluation of the programme overall. At least a few felt there was duplication, which may have added to their sense of burden about reporting requirements.

**Benefits of doing the evaluation**

While they had generally found evaluation difficult, only two projects reported that it had been a waste of time (in the Year 3 e-survey). The main benefits of evaluation identified by projects (in the surveys and visit interviews) were:

**It provides evidence that can be used to demonstrate the value of their project** – either to others within their own organisation and/or externally to potential funders (e.g. EDEN). BabyGROE reported that the evaluation had helped them attract advertisers and NGO support.

"we've never been very good at measuring what we do and it's made us address the evaluation issue and put it on the agenda."

Anonymous

**It provided insight that they would use to develop the approaches used in their existing project and in future work** – that it helped them learn what worked (CSV), identify other things they needed to do (MSC to certify fresh as well as frozen fish), and to understand what they had achieved (STSD, YHA).

**It provoked them to take stock** – some (e.g. ACS) said that the annual Brook Lyndhurst visit had prompted them to take-stock and think more strategically. National Trust, Soil Association, Somerset Trust and others felt it made their organisations think very carefully about how to conduct evaluation and how to embed it within the organisations;

---

\(^2\) See, for example, the work on measuring social value in Defra’s waste and resources evidence programme.
Evaluation support

Reaction to the evaluation support provided by Kathryn Rathouse was overwhelmingly positive. 26 of the 30 projects who commented on evaluation in the Year 3 e-survey said it was useful (16 of them saying "very useful"). Two-thirds (20 of 30) thought the evaluation handbook devised by Kathryn had also been useful\(^\text{124}\). Similarly positive comment was made during project visits (GAP, MSC, WWF, Peace Child and others). The only criticism was that support was not in place sooner (e.g. Peace Child).

"I would like to personally commend Kathryn Rathouse and Brooke Lyndhurst [sic] for the professionalism, support and indeed much appreciated praise and enthusiasm for the project over it's term [sic]. Working disparately with partners from other organisations as part of the EAF was at times challenging and having independent, impartial support and guidance particularly from Kathryn Rathouse was invaluable"

Peace Child

"Thank you for all your support. It’s been most useful to have Brook Lyndhurst contribute to our evaluations and include us in the overall EAF evaluation. We look forward to your final results."

EDEN

"Discussions with Defra’s consultants have been useful."

Common Ground

In delivering the support, Kathryn Rathouse stressed the importance of person-to-person contact with the projects. She used the example of the evaluation handbook not being used extensively and, in particular, projects coming to her with questions that the handbook covered because they more readily turned to a person than to written material.

As evaluators of the fund overall we certainly feel that the evaluation support allowed many projects to go much further, and produce more robust data, than they might otherwise have done.

Taking together the projects’ observations on reporting and evaluation, there are three key lessons here for future funds supporting community-led behaviour change programmes:

Community organisations may need hands-on evaluation support - since they are more used to ‘doing’ than ‘measuring’ they may need help to produce high quality evidence of what they have achieved. The evaluation component needs to be transparent in the funding they are given, and ideally should be backed up with access to expert evaluation advice.

Commitment to evaluation needs to be built in at the beginning of the project - though some flexibility about the detail may be required to accommodate changes in work plans as projects learn more about their audiences. Again, having access to expert support, at the start-up stage and as the project progresses, may help.

Clarity from the funder about objectives – it was evident throughout the evaluation that Defra and the projects did not always interpret the EAF objectives in the same way, particularly “building capability and commitment of communities to change consumption patterns” or “move from awareness into action” so that some were uncertain about what the desired outcomes were. The fact that Defra itself became clearer about its own pro-environmental behaviour objectives while the EAF was running added to the feeling held by some projects that the goalposts kept moving.

9.4 Networking – the annual workshops

Feedback on these events was very positive. Sponge for example, commented that the events had enabled them to extend the reach of the project and MSC said had been able to form links with Sustain which they have continued to exploit.

“We've really benefited from the DEFRA-led and WWF-led networking events focusing on behaviour change but need to see this momentum and networking continuing”

Studentforce

The events also proved to be a very useful research tool for evaluation purposes, enabling group debate on issues that had been raised in individual project visits, and the evaluators being able to test emerging hypotheses about which behaviour change approaches work.

Projects frequently called for more networking of this kind and some (e.g. WWF) ran their own events independently. Following recommendations about the desire for networking in the Year 2 evaluation report, Defra set up a simple electronic network where projects could post questions to each other or share advice. Very few projects used this and it was not a success. We suspect that the projects meant that they wanted more facilitated networking (either electronically or face to face).
10 Legacy of the EAF

This chapter considers what will survive beyond the EAF 2005-8, in terms of:

1. The internal legacy for EAF projects
2. The external legacy
3. What the projects will do next
4. How learning from the EAF will be shared
5. The replicability and scalability of engagement models developed in the EAF

10.1 Internal legacy - impact of the EAF on the projects

The discussion in chapter 7 has already examined outcomes with respect to the impact of the EAF on the development of community capacity to drive sustainable consumption. The future of the EAF projects is clearly an important part of whether the capacity built during the EAF will be sustained into the future.

Financial stability and organisational capacity

For some newly established organisations or organisations which were struggling financially prior to receiving funding, the EAF has helped consolidate their position and even given them the possibility to expand their operations, for example:

- BabyGROE is now a financially viable operation;
- BF is in a position to win a number of large commercial contracts.

This increase in organisational capacity and viability was also felt by those who were expanding into new areas. For example, Envision was able to expand its work out of London to Birmingham thanks in part to EAF funding.

Other projects commented that being associated with the EAF (and Defra) has given them greater credibility in their communities and with funders. The evaluations completed as part of the EAF process will also be used by projects to demonstrate their credentials to future funders (see chapter 9).

More anecdotally, the visit interviews revealed how far some of the projects have developed during the three years, especially in relation to their knowledge about behaviour change and how to measure it. Lack of knowledge about behaviour change techniques was identified as a key weakness at the end of Year 1 but we are confident that many of the projects are now in a place where they could act as references points to others seeking to develop similar approaches. This might be externally with new ‘client’ organisations (e.g. ACS, GAP) or internally where EAF project teams will continue to operate inside organisations.

Against this positive picture, it is probable that some of the EAF projects will not be able to attract future funding on the scale of that provided by the EAF and that some of the capacity built by the EAF will be lost. Some projects, for example, were concerned about community action groups they would no longer be able to support.

Staff & volunteers

The same risk applies to staff employed in EAF projects. At the time of the Year 3 e-survey, around only half of the staff in post were assured of a future with the project (though most were still looking for additional funding). Similarly projects in aggregate were intending to scale back the number of volunteers they work with, though the overall total remains high at a round 1,000 continuing to be engaged by the EAF projects. It is debatable, if staff and volunteers move on, whether this capacity is in fact lost or whether it contributes to knowledge transfer elsewhere. This is something that cannot be assessed in the evaluation.

It would be worth Defra considering, in any case, whether and how EAF project managers could remain part of a stakeholder network linked to Defra behaviour change work. All too often in previous third sector programmes, project managers have moved on, become untraceable, and their expertise has been lost to the evidence base.
Partnerships and networking

For many organisations, both new and not-so-new, being part of the fund has led to large numbers of contacts and links with other organisations and with the communities within which they operate (see section 7.3 and 7.8). These new partnerships and links are likely to endure beyond the EAF, providing an important contribution to the development of local level capacity to drive sustainable consumption forward. Some notable examples mentioned by projects include:

- EDEN spoke of the wealth of local knowledge and contacts that it had acquired in Cumbria;
- CF stressed that the relationship the Church now had with NGOs and others interested in environmental sustainability would be ongoing;
- National Trust spoke of its increased links with Defra;
- Sustain has extended its contacts throughout the London region in this area of sustainable food;
- WWF now has links with several local councils;
- Both LSx and NEA formed of partnerships in delivering their programmes which will be retained (e.g. with Thames Water and EDF).

Mainstreaming pro-environmental behaviour change within organisations

In some organisations, running an environmental behaviour change project has prompted change in the working practices of the organisation itself as well as changes in the attitudes of key staff, both at the top of the organisation and those responsible for day to day operations. In a number of cases, delivering public-facing activities threw their own practices into focus and encouraged them to do more to 'walk the talk' (e.g. NT, YHA). Some projects (e.g. EAUC, MSC, FSC, CF) have had the same catalytic effect on the external organisations they have worked with. There is a high probability these will be lasting effects because many of the changes are 'locked in' to how the organisations operate.

The same lock-in potential applies to investment made in organisations’ long-term assets. For example, DCHA now has a housing stock which is more energy efficient than it was three years ago; National Trust properties have more energy and water saving facilities; the community buildings that Eden worked with now have insulation and recycling. There are many other similar examples.

Proven worth of behaviour change engagement models

One of the key benefits accruing to projects was the chance to experiment and fine-tune their engagement approaches and, where it was needed, build credibility within the parent organisation as a result.

SPAN, the Somerset Trust, the Soil Association, WWF and WWT all spoke of their organisations’ changing approaches to working with communities and community-level groups – in fact, WWF said that the EAF had “completely changed the way [the WWF] approached behaviour change”, leading to a better understanding of sustainable living and a new focus on community group advocacy, as opposed to using champions or targeting individual behaviours. More generally, others (e.g. GAP, Envision, ASC) reported how the EAF funding had allowed them to refine their model to make them more effective and capable of further roll-out.

“This has been an extremely useful project and has provided a platform for developing WWF’s work on behaviour change across sectors within our new sustainable consumption programme”

WWF

In some cases, the EAF experience has convinced either the project themselves or their parent organisation that the model is worth continuing with and will either look for new funding, or support the project from internal resources. For example:

- The Soil Association, Somerset Trust, WWF and WWT will each be continuing to support the community-level groups that they have been supporting through EAF, either by themselves or with the help of new sources of funding.
- The Big Green Blue will continue its programme of work with the boating community because it is now seen by RYA/ BMF as too valuable to lose.
- EAUC may well offer a continuing service with funding from the Learning and Skills Council.
Learning more about audiences that will enhance engagement

In similar vein, projects have learned more about how to engage with particular audiences and this will be built into the way in which they run behaviour change projects in future (e.g. the Soil Association will revise how it approaches membership engagement as a result of the EAF experience). Some of the projects located in membership organisations especially have learned a great deal about what works in their own particular context which they can continue to build on in further engagement with their membership (e.g. NFWI, RYA/BMF). Many projects reported that their project evaluation (as well as questioning during the programme evaluation) was a useful stimulus which encouraged them to reflect on what makes their model successful and adapt it accordingly (see section 9.3).

New systems, products and toolkits

Chapter 7 noted that an important part of the capacity building impact of the EAF was the development of a wide variety of written publications, fliers, web sites and toolkits. Some projects will be using these to continue to develop their engagement work (e.g. GAP’s Eco Team database, various web sites, training packages developed for specific organisations or sectors) and some may be available for more general use (e.g. Studentforce’s community check toolkit, Sponge’s home-buyers guide).

It is not clear whether or how the projects will disseminate these tools, however, and there is a significant risk that many will be lost from wider access. Others (e.g. where significant investment has occurred) will be treated as proprietary by the projects and will not be available for wider use. These are issues to which Defra should give further thought, including whether a repository of EAF materials is desirable or possible to make this capacity available to future community led projects (e.g. survey questionnaire libraries, pamphlets, leaflets and fliers, toolkits, etc).

10.2 External legacy

The wider legacy beyond the projects themselves is clearly also of importance. The impact of their work on building community capacity for the future was covered in section 7.3. Here we are concerned with two other aspects of their wider impact: influencing policy; and expanding markets for sustainable products.

Contribution to policy debates

Quite a number of groups contributed to the development of debate in key policy areas. Examples where impact or influence is likely to be sustained include:

- Green Alliance fed into the Conservative Party’s Quality of Life review and has contributed to other topical policy debates (e.g. on waste management and the concept of Zero Waste).
- NEA is working on the energy demand reduction pilot (with Defra, DTI and Ofgem)
- SPAN has been asked to contribute to the model which will be used in the Big Lottery Local Food Fund125
- Sustain was actively involved in the development of the London Mayor’s strategy for sustainable food which is currently being implemented.

Expanded markets for sustainable products and ‘eco-brands’

A lasting impact of the EAF is likely to be seen in product markets in which some of the projects worked, where there is a high probability that some of the changes that were catalysed in supply chains will be locked-in for at least the medium term. This applies especially to the MSC project which resulted in 2,000 schools providing MSC fish in school meals, but also the FSC which helped thousands more companies to become FSC certified and, potentially to BFO if its haulage fleet conversions to PPO are successful. BabyGROE also deserves a mention for expanding parental access to sustainable baby products and developing a financially self-supporting magazine to continue that promotion.

Unknown impacts of publications for widespread distribution

CG, Green Alliance, Sponge, CF and others have all published works which have the potential to influence large numbers of people but there is no guarantee this will be the case. There is very little evaluation

125 A £50 million programme that will distribute grants to a variety of food-related projects to help make locally grown food accessible and affordable to local communities.
10.3 What will the projects do next?

A key question is whether the EAF has generated sufficient momentum for all the learning and capacity-building gains identified above to be secured into the future. In March/April 2008, EAF projects were asked about their future plans, in the evaluation visits and the e-survey.

Continuation

The extent to which projects intend to continue with or further develop their projects is shown in Figure 16. The picture is generally positive:

- at least 22 will keep going - 18 of them as stand-alone projects with 4 others to be mainstreamed within their wider organisations;
- only 2 will not continue in their present form;
- 8 were not certain of their future at the time of the survey;
- of those with firm plans to continue, 6 are to be scaled up to reach new or larger audiences (people, businesses or organisations);
- just 2 were to be scaled down.

In the visit interviews, those who were intending to continue commonly said they would try to do similar things, but perhaps with larger or different audiences, using the knowledge they had gained during their EAF funding to refine their model. The evaluation suggests that many are now in a much stronger position to be able to do this because of what they have learned over the last three years. Some specific examples are given in section 10.1 above.

![Future plans for the EAF projects](image)

**Figure 16 | Future plans for EAF projects**

Source: Year 3 e-survey

Confidence about future funding

During the project visits many managers expressed concern about future funding, particularly as no-one knew at that time whether there would a successor to the EAF. A widely shared sentiment was that, without an EAF, it was difficult to see where funding for ‘environmental’ projects in the third sector would come, particularly from a fund that did not ‘straitjacket’ projects into narrow boxes (e.g. energy efficiency, or...
water, or skills – as discussed in Chapter 9). Some thought it would be difficult to find funding to continue cross-cutting sustainable lifestyles work since many funds have a much narrower focus.

It seems that most projects have some idea as to where their funding will come from, however. As shown in Figure 20, half of the projects had either secured funding (12 projects) or were confident they would (5)\textsuperscript{126}. Only three projects were not very confident they would secure funding. Even so, there is a real risk that some of the good projects developed in the EAF will not continue because they cannot find funding. The YHA, for example, flagged in its evaluation report that it does not have funds to continue its Environmental Activity Leader work; and the MSC said that it does not have resources to continue to support its work in schools catering, even though there is certainly scope for further roll-out with other local authorities.

**Sources of future funding**

Of those who had secured funding the most frequently quoted source was from within their organisations (10 projects) followed by grants from other funding programmes or charitable endowments (9).

A small number expect to generate income from partnerships developed during the EAF, either with local authorities (7 projects) and/or businesses (4). Examples include the Association of Charity Shops, which has agreed to run a similar re-use project with local authorities in Yorkshire, and GAP which will run more EcoTeams with businesses (notably with Sky TV).

Similarly, a few will exploit products (2 projects) or services (6) developed during the EAF, including paid consultancy. This group includes BabyGROE, which expected to become self-supporting from its advertising revenue.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{sources_of_funding.png}
\caption{Sources of funding for project continuation}
\end{figure}

Whether or not they had secured funding though, most (24 of the 28 who answered the question) said they would be considering grants from other funding programmes or endowments, either as new funding or in addition to funds they had already secured.

The fact that almost a third of EAF projects have secured further funding from within their organisations is proof of how much internal support they managed to attract. Similarly, the seven who had already secured income from partnerships with local authorities are further evidence that formation of strong partnerships was a success of the Defra funding.

\textsuperscript{126} 30 out of the 34 projects answered the funding question
10.4 Will learning from the EAF be shared?

The potential benefits of the lessons learned in the EAF clearly go well beyond the participating projects. Disseminating to the wider community sector, research and policy audiences is an important facet of securing the EAF legacy. This will need to involve the projects themselves and Defra.

In the March 2008 e-survey, the main means by which projects were planning to ensure that others learnt from their experiences were by:

- publishing their evaluation report (22 projects),
- providing materials developed during EAF to other projects free of charge (20), for example on their websites; and
- holding dissemination events and seminars (15).

Learning developed by projects - evaluation reports and toolkits

The projects’ own evaluation reports are one of the most valuable resources created by the EAF. They provide a much more intimate account of the approaches, successes and failures of individual projects than can be given in this evaluation report.

It seems unfortunate, therefore, that a third of the projects may not publish their work. Poor traceability and access to evaluation reports was reported as a key barrier to the development of best practice in an earlier Brook Lyndhurst study for Defra. Defra is urged to consider how it will ensure that the whole suite of EAF evaluation reports is easily traceable and accessible to other stakeholders.

The Year 2 evaluation report also encouraged Defra to consider how toolkits and other engagement tools developed during the EAF could be used beyond the project that developed them, either freely or through avenues such as licensing.

Networking events

In the March visits and at the final celebration/networking event in May 2008, many EAF projects also called for further networking events to be held. The three annual events held during the EAF showed that there was strong interest in these events, that projects were often battling the same issues and could learn from each other, that a few found new partners to work with, and that it could be an effective forum for feedback to policy makers.

Having hosted these events, and engaged a wider stakeholder group in the final event, Defra is in a good position to take this dissemination work forward. A future event(s) could perhaps bring together the lessons and the people from its Climate Challenge Fund and Every Action Counts, an idea which was well received at the May 2008 event.

Mentoring

Some projects (e.g. ACS) floated the idea that project managers from this round of the EAF would be in a good position to mentor similar kinds of projects (preferably for a fee to cover costs), and the idea was debated at the Year 2 networking event. The evaluation has documented a growing expertise in behaviour change methods which supports the idea that peer mentoring could reduce the risk of new projects re-inventing engagement models that are flawed, or heading down unnecessary blind alleys.

10.5 How replicable and scalable are the engagement models developed in the EAF?

Beyond what happens to EAF projects themselves lie the important questions of whether the types of models tested during this round of the EAF can be scaled up to cover a greater proportion of the UK population or replicated in other communities.

---

128 See analysis in the Year 2 report and the demonstration of knowledge and capability contained in many projects’ evaluation reports.
As was indicated above, some scale-up will occur as a result of the continuing activities of some EAF projects, if they can find the funds for further roll out, or where they have secured mainstream support in their own organisations. Others (e.g. NFWI, WWT) are using the EAF project legacy as a springboard for launching new environmental programmes. On the downside, some projects have a worry that third sector funding for environmental projects tends (in their view) to favour the testing of new ideas rather than supporting proven models to extend their reach and impact, which could make roll-out difficult. Some projects also expressed concern about the future of some of their local community action groups once money was no longer available to provide them with facilitation support. These are issues which Defra may wish to consider in relation to its future third sector funding.

In assessing the potential for models tested in the EAF to have wider applicability, five aspects have been taken into account which draw on the analysis of outcomes and success factors:

- **Opportunities** – in terms of reach, access to target audiences and behaviour change drivers
- **Ability to bring about behaviour change** – to deliver measurable outcomes on headline behaviours
- **Facilitating conditions** – factors that may need to be in place for replicability to work
- **Barriers/limitations** – aspects which may undermine replicability
- **Funding risks** – issues that relate specifically to the benefits that funders could expect to derive from funding a given model

Table 2 runs through each of the engagement models described in the project typology, assessed against these five headings. There are, of course, no guarantees of success in replicating engagement models and the analysis should be seen as a best estimate of what could work, given the evidence gathered in the EAF evaluation. Questions remain about two further aspects in addition to those shown in the table: whether the key role that certain individuals have played in some projects could be repeated by different individuals elsewhere; whether projects that have depended on deep knowledge of local issues would work as well in other geographical settings.

The analysis suggests that there are many and various opportunities for replicating some of what EAF projects did. In deciding which models are worthy of further support, Defra (or other funders) would need to be clear about the overarching objectives of the funding – in particular whether it is required to bring about rapid and large-scale measurable behaviour change among the UK public, whether its target is to build the long-term capacity of communities to devise and run their own environmental projects, or both. It is clear that not all of the EAF projects or models delivered both and choices may need to be made about which models to support, depending on strategic objectives.

If the objective is simply to deliver rapid behaviour change on a scalable basis then the following options seem worthy of consideration (but needing further evidence in some cases):

- Choice editing or supply chain brokerage;
- Door-knocking advice or audit, supported by help to source products and devices (this approach is well established in the waste sector as a cost effective outreach method but more evidence is needed of its effectiveness with respect to energy and other behaviours). This model fits with EST’s Green Homes model which will generate more learning;
- Supporting influential individuals/teams of people to perform a challenge and hand-holding function for public institutions, large membership organisations or similar to catalyse significant institutional behaviour change;
- EcoTeams or similar where they can be run on a large scale through other organisations (perhaps pitched towards Defra’s Concerned Consumers segment);
- Working with/through schools (but subject to further collation of evidence on educational versus behavioural outcomes of previous projects, and taking into account the Generation Green initiative by British Gas);
- Further work with social housing landlords to enable them to embed pro-environmental practice in the way they operate;
- Projects geared to helping managers of community buildings (e.g. village halls, community centres, sports venues) take significant action to reduce energy and water use, and increase recycling.

On a per capita reach basis, all of the above may be more expensive than mass media campaigns and have to be balanced against the behavioural gains that could be expected to accrue from that channel.
More complicated is an assessment of the optimum role of community action groups, and groups that provide facilitation support to them, in a landscape in which there is an urgent search for ways to reduce CO₂ emissions by 80%. What is clear from the EAF experience is that the widespread replication of facilitated community action groups would require substantial investment, continuing financial support, and may take a long time to produce tangible results (though not in all cases). Equally clear is that facilitation support, offered on an area-wide basis (e.g. a county) by effective and entrepreneurial organisations, may enhance the effectiveness and potentially the longevity of grass roots action.

An unresolved question here is the extent to which community action groups can be influenced or directed to deliver against specific behavioural outcomes, without losing the features that make them attractive to community volunteers - independence, a sense of ownership, freedom to invent their own initiatives, and to work at their own pace. A further question is the extent to which prescriptive outcome targets would squeeze out some of the more creative initiatives launched by community groups, or prevent them from responding to very specific local needs/opportunities that might not be spotted by ‘outsiders’ or official bodies. A final question is what value should be attached to the complementary nature of community level action in supporting and embedding more ‘top down’ initiatives (e.g. Act on CO₂)? These are all questions for Defra (and others) to consider further in relation to the role of third sector organisations in the delivery of sustainability and carbon reduction objectives.

---

129 Used here to mean driven, creative and solution-oriented rather than income/profit generating
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Ability to bring about behaviour change</th>
<th>Facilitating Conditions</th>
<th>Barriers/limitations</th>
<th>Funding risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Facilitating community action groups | • The facilitated group model could be run anywhere a ‘parent’ organisation/network could offer overarching support  
• Benefits include enhancing the effectiveness of grass roots action, and increasing the survival chances of very local groups.  
• May therefore build long-term capacity of communities to propel themselves on sustainable consumption, though attrition of groups is inevitable  
• May be possible to deliver via volunteer outreach facilitators deployed by a ‘parent’ voluntary organisation which drives an engagement programme manages | • Unpredictable – depends on what groups decide to do and how effectively they can deliver activities  
• Change is most likely in small, everyday behaviours though some groups bring about much bigger changes | • Communities with common social identity/strong social bonds  
• Skilled and competent facilitators with knowledge of sustainability and ‘people skills’  
• High quality training for facilitators backed up with advice and support if they need it  
• Long term relationships with groups, or a long-standing presence in the local community so that grass roots groups know where to go for help  
• Specialist knowledge of the local area and its community issues  
• Independence from | • Cost per group supported – arising from the amount of person-time required for effective facilitation and hand-holding  
• May attract mainly ‘green thinking’ people in local communities (though can push them to go further than they would otherwise) | • Behavioural outcomes cannot be directed or predicted (at least in the models used in the EAF)  
• ‘Parent’ organisations may not be effective facilitators, trainers or programme managers  
• It is probable that not all groups supported will survive or deliver activities of significance  
• Scalability – EAF projects each supported between 4 and 60 action groups, amounting to a few thousand people in total. Without evidence on the scale of spill-over impacts in their wider communities it is not possible to say what their potential is to reach large numbers of the public |

130 But this may not have to be the case necessarily. For example, NESTA’s Big Green Challenge prize competition for community groups has set a challenging outcome target of a 60% reduction in CO₂ in the communities engaged by projects that are competing for a share of the £1 million prize. Projects have developed their own, very different, community engagement approaches for delivering the carbon saving outcome. The lessons learned will add to the evidence on how community led projects can contribute to pro-environmental behaviour change.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>facilitators, provides training, hand-holding support and accountability for outcomes.</strong></th>
<th><strong>'official' institutions/government (to support the voluntary ethos that attracts people to grass roots action)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EcoTeams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Semi-facilitated model can be run with a wide range of organisations</td>
<td>• Outcome focused model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Scale-up possible depending on take-up from potential GAP ‘customers’ (e.g. businesses, organisations, local authorities)</td>
<td>• Proven impact on key headline behaviours in the short term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funding can be leveraged by recovering (some) costs from organisations hosting EcoTeams</td>
<td>• Workbook approach, group activities &amp; personal monitoring provide structure, motivation and momentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Less/low success with those not already pre-disposed to environmental action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Less success in influencing ‘difficult’ behaviours (including switch to green tariff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does not provide long-term support to teams to continue to act as catalysts for change in their communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with schools</td>
<td>• Some indication that changes endure at individual level, but more evidence is desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Could provide access to large audiences</td>
<td>• Spill-over from individual team members to catalysing wider, and long-term, community action is unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possibilities for mainstreaming environmental action</td>
<td>• Teams may not continue beyond the initial engagement period to act as a focus of community action in the long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• External organisations can be catalysts of change, take away a 'hassle' factor from teachers, and provide expert ‘how to' knowledge</td>
<td>• Where focused on pupils, evidence indicates impact is mainly educational plus small change in everyday behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parents groups in schools can also function effectively as</td>
<td>• Where focused on schools operate (e.g. energy use, food procurement) projects can deliver significant environmental gains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Active support from teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Building activities into lessons/homework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hands-on support from external organisation to deliver the programme, maintain momentum, and reduce time required from teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Partnership with a local authority can help deliver a comprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hands-on support can be expensive (i.e. probably outside normal school budgets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The ability of children to influence parents' behaviour may be limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Models may need to be adapted to work in ‘challenging’ schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Projects mentioned that sustainability is still too peripheral an objective for many schools which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Outcomes vary significantly depending on which models are used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Many different models of working with schools have been trialled (EAF and elsewhere). Developing a common evidence base would be valuable – in terms of what has worked, in relation to what objectives, and whether impacts are sustained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Working with faith communities | • Can provide access to large audiences  
  • Privileged access to some communities that may be less easy to reach or to convince through ‘official’ channels  
  • Environmental messages can be tailored to have meaning in the context of people’s underlying beliefs, so engage people who aren’t otherwise thinking about environmental action  
  • The institutional framework can act as a focus for activity and lock-in changes for the long term through mainstreaming (depending on the model used)  
  • External facilitator can act as a ‘change agent’ | • Little evidence available from EAF projects  
  • More likely where work is mainstreamed inside the normal working of the faith community, including the environmental management of the community’s buildings | • Long-term relationships – either with leaders in the organisational structure, or individuals in local congregations  
  • Hands-on support and advice  
  • Good understanding of how the faith community functions  
  • Credibility as an expert on sustainability issues | • Being able to secure ongoing contact with individuals in the target audience  
  • Cost of providing ongoing facilitation support | • Limited ability to drive specific behavioural outcomes  
  • Difficulty in proving what specific environmental impacts can be attributed to the engagement activity  
  • Capacity building outcomes may be more significant than immediate behavioural outcomes |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Working with low income communities | • Empower and enable low income households to take  
  • Significant environmental gains where choice editing  
  • Housing associations – dedicated sustainability  
  • Cost – some sustainable options (e.g. organic food) are light touch engagement is unlikely to deliver change in |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doorstep support, advice &amp; gadgets</th>
<th>control over their own quality of life (e.g. through energy saving)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Contribute to social inclusion and community cohesion by providing a focus for local activity and events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve quality of life and environmental performance simultaneously where choice editing can be used (e.g. a housing association installing insulation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>can be used (e.g. housing associations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Otherwise limited - gains in voluntary environmental action by some people, focusing on small everyday habits (e.g. recycling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Giving out 'gadgets' (e.g. light bulbs) can avoid the need for voluntary action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access to large audience in given geographical areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Model could be replicated almost anywhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can access people who might not otherwise get involved in 'community action' on the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Advice can be tailored to individual household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Providing gadgets or free samples can overcome behavioural barriers – effort of finding product, fear about its performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Moderate to significant environmental savings where gadgets are provided free of charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Small changes in everyday behaviours among a proportion of those contacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact of smart meters could not be determined with the evidence provided to the EAF evaluation; further results are awaited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>officer with a remit to challenge and influence the organisation's own activity, and provide outreach to residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Engagement with/ hands-on support to tenants’ associations and other influential individuals on housing estates (e.g. locally recruited ambassadors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Involvement of residents in discussion of choices that can be made to remove unsustainable options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Face to face contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Being able to offer practical help or freebies enables the project to 'get through the door' initially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Practical advice on what can be done, backed up where possible by feedback on an individual's baseline performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Follow-up contact, as a reminder and to measure outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Partnership with business and others to provide products or services that can be offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cost per household, depending on depth and frequency of contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Choice editing that improves quality of life for some but not all can be seen as inequitable and damage other work on social inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>difficult for low income households to justify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cost - of having a dedicated staff member for sustainability; of high quality outreach to tenants’ groups and residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Possibility of institutional barriers in some housing associations – staff attitudes, management practice and procurement policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Approach appears promising but the scale and longevity of impact is uncertain. More evidence is needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does not build wider community capacity or action on sustainable consumption, except where other activities are run alongside (e.g. community networking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public education campaigns &amp; large-scale public events</td>
<td>Potential for large scale reach (the only model in EAF capable of reaching tens of thousands/ millions of people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privileged access to large audiences that might not otherwise be reachable en masse</td>
<td>Securing support and sanction from the organisation’s leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage in terms of avoided search and recruitment costs to reach a large audience</td>
<td>Impact on the behaviour of members can vary, depending on the approach used, the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage in terms</td>
<td>Significant environmental gains where change is mainstreamed in the organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Potential for lock-in of positive environmental impact where gadgets are given out (e.g. cistern devices) | Specialist knowledge of audience (its interests and barriers to action), so that messages and language can be tailored appropriately |
| Potential for large-scale reach (the only model in EAF capable of reaching tens of thousands/ millions of people) | Clear and simple call to action (e.g. buy product x; do action y) rather than general ‘feel good’ or aspirational messages |
| Potential for large-scale communications tailored to very specific audience needs where run through channels within membership organisations (e.g. RYA/BMF) or specialist intermediaries (e.g. BabyGROE, Sponge) | Difficult to evaluate impact on attitudes or behaviour |
| Can bring attention of a wider audience to other grass roots activity through national/annual festivals | Difficult to follow-up people contacted in this way to establish impact – too small in scope to register on national population surveys; often too large to follow-up all contacts individually |
| Largely unknown, though there were some indications that very focused campaigns can persuade a moderate proportion to change. | Not always being able to demonstrate a definite outcome in order to justify funding (though some EAF projects found ways of doing this).

- This may put such approaches at risk of not being funded, but there are some hints that they can work where they are especially focused, or as part of a package that supports other grass roots activity.
- Mitigating these risks would involve a very clear exposition of expected outcomes and clearer evaluation plans in bids for funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changing organisations</th>
<th>Not being able to obtain support from the ‘top’ of the organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not all organisations will have an ethos or membership identity which is welcoming to environmental action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Limited opportunity to be prescriptive about behavioural
| Market development projects | of the additional resources available in the host organisation to expedite engagement  
- Existing identity of the audience with the organisation, its ethos and activities, which may make it easier to find messages that have common appeal or reach beyond the immediate ‘greens’  
- Possibility of securing lock-in of environmental gains through introduction of new working practices, training etc. | amount of ‘top-down’ direction, and depth of on-going engagement | the usual management of the organisation (this applies equally to organisations changing themselves and projects helping external organisations to change).  
- ‘Inside knowledge’ of how the organisation thinks and works  
- Credibility with the target audience, including on-going relationships with key individuals  
- Ability/ authority to influence working practices  
- Capacity of a small, dedicated team to cope with all of the demands of a large organisation  
- Vulnerability to wider changes in organisational policy/structure which could affect project activities  
- Outcomes - change agendas have to fit with the interests of memberships and organisations’ leadership. |
| Expand the market share of sustainable products in some markets through brokering new supply chain behaviour  
- Demonstrate a business case in new markets or ones where there are significant demand-side barriers or failures (through research, advocacy or practical demonstration)  
- Choice editing can lock-in consumption changes and by-pass the need for voluntary increase in purchase of sustainable products by supply chain buyers can be significant  
- May have less impact on choices made by final consumers, except where new supply chain behaviour edits choices, or where consumers with a latent interest can be isolated and targeted directly (e.g. parents looking for ‘green’ babycare products)  
- A market with a small number of supply-side ‘gatekeepers’  
- Face to face contact and on-going relationships with the gatekeepers  
- Understanding of the cost (and other) drivers of buyers; and the internal and market constraints operating on them  
- A convincing product offer (e.g. eco-brand, proven sales, hand-holding support)  
- Breaking into complex supply chains  
- Being unable to identify or access supply chain gatekeepers  
- Shifting sentiment in the wider world (e.g. on biofuels)  
- Possibility that there is a limited number of third sector organisations with the clout and capability of delivering successful market development programmes  
- Uncertainty about which sectors, markets or products are suited to this kind of approach |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy landscape projects</th>
<th>consumer action</th>
<th>Ability to confer legitimacy on the buyer through independent accreditation of products’ environmental claims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to confer legitimacy on the buyer through independent accreditation of products’ environmental claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect, via influence on government policy and targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Credibility among stakeholders, which needs to be supported by evidence of expert knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Networking desire and capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Do not always capture the ‘on the ground’ experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small or very local projects may find it hard to feed into policy debates, because they may lack resources or ability to respond rapidly to consultations, or lack awareness of the debates that are happening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Difficult to direct outcomes because independence from government is key to the success of such projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overlapping work programmes of third sector organisations, learned institutions and other stakeholder networks – what criteria need to be used to define who merits/qualifies for funding?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 20 | Scope for scale-up and replication of EAF engagement models |
11 Conclusions and recommendations

This section draws together analysis from the three-year evaluation to arrive at conclusions about the EAF programme and recommendations for moving forward. It covers:

- Headline conclusions (11.1);
- Operational conclusions (11.2);
- Evaluation and evidence (11.3);
- Achievements of the EAF programme (11.4);
- Behaviour change outcomes (11.5);
- Wider outcomes (11.6);
- Value for money and additionality (11.7);
- What makes a good third sector-led behaviour change project? (11.8);
- The barriers to engagement (11.9);
- What this means for the future (11.10); and
- Recommendations (11.11).

11.1 Headline conclusions

It is clear that the EAF has influenced more sustainable patterns of consumption in communities and had measurable impacts in changing behaviour; it encouraged participation, enhanced activity and pushed people a little bit further in respect to both behaviour change and wider community action. Moreover, some EAF projects could be scaled up and there are many and various opportunities for replicating some of what EAF projects did.

Third sector funding programmes can be useful because they encourage voluntary change but must be supported by wider measures. They cannot be relied upon to deliver the more difficult goals on their own.

11.2 Operational conclusions

Timescales and flexibility
By providing funding over three years and offering a high level of flexibility (e.g. allowing projects to change work plans when circumstances changed), projects felt more financially stable and had room to experiment and change direction. As a result they were able to undertake riskier activities and achieve more than they otherwise might have done. This timeframe also enabled projects to get up to speed on specialist knowledge/methods, build capacity (particularly where they set up community groups) and witness behaviour change impacts (which take time to materialise).

Support offered by Defra
Projects greatly appreciated the level of support offered by Defra, especially in the earlier stages of funding. In particular, the evaluation support provided by Defra was highly valued. By conducting evaluations, projects obtained evidence to demonstrate their value (both internally and to funders and stakeholders externally) and offered them insight to develop approaches. The evaluation support also provided the evaluators with better data than would otherwise have been the case. The facilitated networking opportunities were very useful to projects (to extend their reach or form new partnerships) and to evaluators (to test emerging hypotheses).

Many projects did, though, find reporting and evaluation a burden, and some had insufficient resources or skill to meet Defra’s reporting requirements. It was accentuated by changes in the reporting requirements as the evaluators came on board and as Defra consolidated its thinking on pro-environmental behaviour goals. The key lesson here was the importance of building evaluation in before projects launch their activities.
Match funding
Whilst the need for match funding forced projects to foster relationships with new partners (often to mutual advantage), it was often difficult to find and secure. Moreover, match funders often required changes to work plans in order to accommodate their needs which were sometimes unrelated to the EAF project (thereby reducing the resources that could be deployed on EAF work).

11.3 Evaluation and evidence

Project level
The fact that almost all of the projects were able to produce an evaluation of their impact was a significant achievement of the EAF. It was feared by some community action projects that measurement gets in the way of ‘doing’ but successful projects showed that this was not necessarily the case (nor did having targets inhibit innovation). Successful approaches at the project level were those where monitoring and follow-up was included as part of the work plan (these projects were more likely to produce outcome data and show behaviour change).

There were though, certain inherent difficulties involved with community projects proving what they had achieved. A key pitfall appeared to be that projects consistently confused outputs (i.e. what they had done) and outcomes (i.e. what they had achieved as a result of their activity) in their reports to Defra. Moreover, the quarterly (and then six-monthly) reports were sometimes found to be inconsistent (e.g. on the time-periods covered and what activities were included in which time period) and incomplete (e.g. lists of activities without any indication of how many people had participated in them).

Projects more commonly measured their outcomes using ‘softer’ data (qualitative or self-reported, e.g. surveys) than ‘harder’ measurements of actual changes in consumption behaviour (e.g. purchases, meter readings). This was often because projects did not have contact with their participants in an environment where behaviour change could be measured or because the ‘hard’ data were commercially sensitive. It was noticeably more difficult for community action projects to provide ‘hard’ data than transport projects or those working on internal change within their organisations.

Moreover, evaluation can be a burden (in particular, on smaller organisations); it is difficult with limited resources (time, knowledge and money) to undertake extensive research into behaviour change outcomes. Indeed, samples were generally small and self-selecting (i.e. often those that were more engaged and/or unrepresentative of all project participants). It was often difficult to gauge where the data had come from, which methods had been used to arrive at impact calculations and interpretation of data was sometimes questionable. (Additionally, some projects were better than others at explaining what they had done and ‘talking up’ their projects).

Programme level
The programme level evaluation was implemented at the beginning of the EAF fund and it gauged insights from a wide range of different sources. This triangulation of data was vital to achieve a better understanding of projects (notably the face-to-face interviews and project reports). The large quantity of qualitative material enabled the evaluators to avoid relying on poor quality quantitative data.

Standard survey questions were used and allowed cross comparison where projects were likely to produce data that was not easily comparable. However, there were limitations in their use because community led projects tended to be so different in their skill levels, resources and access to audiences.

11.4 Achievements of the EAF programme
Although some achievements may be attributed to more than one source, projects delivered a very large number and range of outputs. At least 78,000 participants were involved in EAF projects (i.e. that undertook a specific activity rather than simply reading a magazine or attending an event). Involvement varied from supporting 190 community action groups (many new) and 6,000 volunteers to running workshops and training courses.

It is impossible to estimate the total reach (i.e. the number of people ‘engaged’) as some projects were unable to ascertain how many magazines had been read or gauge exact contact figures from...
intermediaries, and so on. Moreover, these figures do not take into account the quality or depth of contact. (If all forms of contact are considered, the reach of the EAF amounted to millions of people).

Projects engaged with a broad range of people, including some who were not very environmentally aware/active. However, in many cases, project participants were greener or more active in their communities than the UK population as a whole. (Intermediaries, e.g. community champions, appeared to be even more green than participants).

11.5 Behaviour change outcomes

By the end of the three years of EAF funding, participants were doing more than they were before and they were doing so in greater proportions than the general public. Nevertheless, it is obvious that certain behaviours proved a lot easier to change than others.

Key behavioural areas in which projects achieved behaviour change were recycling (encouraging either small to moderate increases in existing behaviours) and energy and water saving (the adoption of many small, low impact behaviours). Indeed, many projects observed they had successfully built on wider shifts in public attitudes towards the environment and achieved impacts where the audience was more ready to change. There were a few bigger changes in certain areas, e.g. establishing supply chains in new products and ‘locking in’ new sustainable behaviours into organisations.

However, it is clear that participation in EAF pushed people further (particularly where they worked in groups). Many of the community action group projects, as well as some of the doorstep projects, appealed to people who were already interested in taking action, but who may have needed a push to get started or to go further.

There were few successes in areas which would have required major lifestyle changes, such as micro-generation, flying and car use - but this also reflects the fact that fewer projects focused on these. Sustainable food behaviours were seen as complex. There is a great deal of enthusiasm for taking action on food but messages surrounding sustainable food were reported to be confusing (e.g. the contradictory messages pushed to consumers about buying organic and local although both have different carbon implications).

11.6 Wider outcomes

Projects had an important impact on building personal capacity of participants through building confidence and commitment, improving knowledge on sustainability issues (general and specific) and sometimes through training and signposting participants to sustainable products.

Qualitative evidence suggests that the EAF programme also built community capacity developing many community action groups and activists (not least the staff and volunteers working on projects, many of whom represent an important community resource). Moreover, many resources have been created which can further impact change, e.g. toolkits and knowledge on how to deliver workshops and evaluations; it is essential to ensure this investment in resources and capacity building is built on.

However, the fact that changes were in ‘easier’ actions rather than tackling more of the ‘difficult’ behaviours highlights the limits to voluntary change in the current wider social and infrastructural context. For example, offering participants lifestyle information ‘in the round’ through doorstep projects may work to initially engage their interest but could just as easily let them off the hook by allowing them to choose the easiest options. Funding programmes like the EAF can support what is going on in the wider world but must be seen as just one part of an overall package.

Spill-over effects

Little solid evidence was found to illustrate the presence of spill-over effects (i.e. one behaviour acting as a catalyst for another or encouraging the same new behaviour in a different domain, e.g. school to home). Evidence of the existence of spill-over effects is largely anecdotal. Few projects set out to measure these and since many projects were targeting several aspects of lifestyles simultaneously, spill-over effects were difficult to report.

Sustained change

It is difficult to ascertain whether behaviour changes will be sustained given that many outcomes were only just tangible by year three. Longevity will depend on the continuing motivation of the individuals engaged
by EAF projects but, where projects have worked to change organisational practice or supply chain relationships, there is a good chance that the changes they brought about will be locked in for the medium to long term (though this is not entirely without risk of reversion). A few projects were able to ‘lock-in’ behaviours through choice editing (which can achieve large-scale change in consumption quickly), but it is not conclusive as to whether this is empowering or disempowering for participants.

11.7 Value for money and additionality

There was no correlation between the size of an organisation and what it achieved (nor between the funding received and what it achieved). The bulk of very active projects were awarded mid size grants and some clearly punched above their funding weight. A few made large savings for their organisations internally with the smallest grants.

Value for money cannot be assessed on a consistent basis but there are examples of projects that provide ‘good value’. Successful market development projects delivered considerable project outcomes (for the grant received) by being very focused in their activity. Projects that engaged people through door-knocking, advice and gadgets/services and through EcoTeams\textsuperscript{132} appear to be an effective way of reaching large numbers of people for short duration engagement. Some projects could measure change only for tens or hundreds of people but this is not necessarily proof that large scale impact did not happen, just that the full extent of the impact remains unknown. Moreover, many offered wider community benefits that go beyond Defra’s headline behaviour goals or generated learning in addition to the activity they supported on the ground.

Displacement

Evidence suggests that very little displacement occurred (i.e. one activity did not stop another activity happening instead) and most of the projects were doing things that would not otherwise have happened, either in their own organisations or in the wider community by other means. Moreover, the scale of the individual grants in the EAF also enabled some projects to run activities on a larger scale than they could have done on their usual sources of grant funding.

Innovation

Many projects developed and delivered innovative solutions to behaviour change issues by developing new products, engagement tools, innovative partnerships or bespoke packages for specific settings. A similarly important outcome of the EAF has been the change in the way some large membership organisations and stakeholders in supply chains think and operate. Working within and through membership organisations, and some of the supply chain brokering activities in the EAF, should be seen as a distinctively innovative outcome of the EAF.

However, it cannot be concluded that the EAF brought about a ‘leap’ of innovation in social and market activity. It did so in some local areas, some markets and some organisations and has certainly been a catalyst for change in places; but the lessons learned need to be built upon for social innovation to occur on a bigger scale.

Nonetheless, the third sector has an important role to play in the ‘innovation landscape’ of social change. Community led organisations can identify and respond to opportunities that might be overlooked by mainstream services, because the openings are too small, too local, too specific, or simply inaccessible (e.g. in membership organisations, faith communities). While the third sector is not inherently more innovative, flexible or responsive than (for example) the private sector, it can be a cost effective means of achieving innovation and finding creative solutions to local sustainability opportunities. The sector is generally less encumbered by bureaucracy, systems and red-tape, which enhances its ability to adapt to meet participants needs and develop engagement packages that are fit for purpose in each case. The EAF has provided many examples of where this has been done well (and not so well too). Judging from the EAF experience, the third sector is not capable of delivering mass environmental behaviour change on its own, but it has a lot to offer in complementing other approaches.

\textsuperscript{132} The reference to EcoTeams refers to the delivery model and is not an endorsement of any delivery organisation.
### 11.8 What makes a good third sector behaviour change project?

Conclusions can be made about 'what worked' to make a good third sector behaviour change project (and how projects successfully engaged consumers in sustainable consumption). Fourteen are identified below:

**Good knowledge of target audience, its interests and starting point with respect to environmental issues, whether communities, organisations or businesses**

It was crucial for projects to understand their audiences and start from where audiences 'are at' (i.e. what makes them 'tick', which behaviours seem normal etc.) and tailor messages accordingly. A few projects failed to deliver useful support by assuming they knew what their audience wanted or pushing forward with a 'great' idea without realising it was unattractive to potential consumers. Projects working in or through large membership organisations had an advantage in that members were often relatively homogenous so it was perhaps more straightforward to design activities with wide appeal. A few projects were able to 'tap into' changes in the wider landscape and 'ride the wave' of moves to mainstream recycling and school food by removing existing barriers.

While most projects engaged participants in environmental issues head-on, others used alternative hooks to excite and engage their audiences: where personal identity is strongly associated with a local area it can be useful to focus first on locally important issues and then make links to wider environmental problems; work could be targeted to 'moments of change' in people's lives when they may be open to new messages, e.g. new mothers; cost-saving messages can persuade low income communities to use less energy; and some projects cited synergies between religion and pro-environmental behaviour as a good entry point into large faith institutions.

**Activities that will empower participants to act – rather than just awareness raising or information delivery on its own**

Awareness raising has a role to play but it is not enough; it does not necessarily translate into behaviour change. To change behaviour, people wanted to be shown how they could do things cheaply and easily (i.e. what the practical steps were). Information was most effective where it provided tips on what to do, signposting to sources of help etc. Projects achieved success where they made change convenient, for example, by introducing clothing recycling banks into workplaces, recruiting and training environmental individuals so as to not overburden teachers or providing 'goody bags' with products.

Such 'freebies' can help projects "get a foot in the door" and counteract the image of sustainable products being unavailable or unaffordable (and once installed they remove the need for participants to make any further effort to make environmental savings). The projects using these tools often achieved large reach - although where they were offered, take-up and use of freebies or gadgets varied.

**Ability to be credible and trusted in the target community**

Third sector organisations often have privileged access to, and understanding of, audiences that would probably be unavailable to an 'outside' organisation. For example, many had access to large captive audiences (their membership) and/or were heavily embedded in local communities, which conferred a 'licence to speak' and helped participants to feel they were being encouraged rather than 'told' to do something by government. It also helped community organisations not to be too closely associated with business or government in order to gain the trust of the communities and groups they were working with.

The use of volunteers (who were by and large very active and green) provided additional (and cost-effective) - access (thereby extending reach and impact) and helped participants to identify with, and trust, the messenger/message. Volunteer contributions seemed to be most effective where projects took care in recruitment and offered good training and on-going support.

**Face to face contact**

Face-to-face contact with participants was vital to build trust and confidence but also to provide some essential 'hand-holding' to overcome fears about unfamiliar behaviours. It was cited as the principal success factor for door-stepping projects (which achieved moderately high reach) even with people who had a less active interest in environmental issues. (Indeed, projects who originally dropped leaflets into households added an element of face-to-face contact afterwards in order to increase sign up rates; it was not enough just to tell people). Moreover, community groups valued personal contact more than generic forms of support such as toolkits. Cost was the main drawback to this approach.
Community action projects and participants cited group working as key to building a sense of ownership over environmental issues and personal motivation. Participants were encouraged to do more when they saw ‘people like me’ taking action. There is no evidence to say whether it was more effective to begin projects from scratch or piggy-back existing groups but it may be beneficial to ‘tap into’ organisations with existing audiences, particularly ones with an environmental ethos (e.g. eco-schools). Organisational change projects, for instance, did not have to spend time recruiting or attracting their audience and in many cases there were pre-existing communication channels which these projects could use for the benefit of the project.

However, group working is very resource intensive and it appears these approaches cannot deliver rapid results; it takes time to build consensus and take action. Additionally, the existence of ‘community’ cannot be taken for granted, and groups do not necessarily flourish even where there appear to be some tangible connection between people.

Where feasible, some element of hand-holding to help participants implement change

There was evidence to suggest that hand-holding made unfamiliar products and behaviours appear less threatening. In some cases, community action projects provided facilitation support as a means of doing this.

It appeared to be most effective to use an experienced facilitator with moderate engagement along the way. Where groups were supported at arms length there was a risk that they chose to cover issues which fell outside the SCP agenda and some evidence that they were more likely to disband. However, a heavily facilitated approach risks dependency. It was not always easy to strike the right balance between providing facilitation and allowing groups to take ownership of their projects.

Regardless of the depth of facilitation provided, all projects said it involved substantial ‘people time’ in order to ensure that the supported groups remained cohesive and active, and facilitator training and recruitment was key (these people were critical to the groups’ effectiveness but the job is highly skilled requiring knowledge of group dynamics as well as environmental issues).

By and large, facilitated, prescriptive, top-down group models (deciding what should be tackled) delivered some notable behaviour change outcomes across fairly large numbers of people in a short time whereas facilitated, bottom-up approaches (participants set their own objectives) delivered a host of small behavioural changes (and some significant ones) for smaller numbers. Evidence from EAF suggests that the latter are more likely to remain active in the long term.

Repeat contact – at least a follow-up and more enduring contact if possible

Follow-up contact made audiences feel more engaged, acted as reminders and was a means of reinforcing messages.

A means of creating focus, structure or a framework for the project activity

The use of engaging and cascading messages through ‘frameworks’ (e.g. schools, faith institutions, membership organisations) helped to reach audiences (with messages tailored to their personal values) and maintain focus and momentum. However, these did take time to establish and success was often based upon how successful projects could be at embedding themselves within these organisations.

Where feasible, measurement of impacts to make them tangible and immediate

Participants, projects and intermediaries responded positively (in terms of outcomes) when they were given visible facts on how their daily life impacted on the environment through audits, carbon footprinting and other resource use monitoring. To be successful these tools need to be robust, simple in presentation and scope, be followed up and be administered with expert knowledge.

Tangible, immediate results reinforced a sense of capability and encouraged participants to continue. In some cases, projects steered participants away from ‘difficult’ actions because the likelihood of few early results risked being de-motivating for participants (e.g. micro-generation). It was equally a contributor to why the EAF projects in aggregate achieved limited success in changing ‘difficult’ behaviours.

Some element of participant accountability – either through regular contact, peer monitoring or more formal measures

Projects found that peer-to-peer mentoring helped to keep volunteers on message and that pledges could be a useful tool if accompanied by a level of scrutiny (i.e. through follow-up contact) and were enhanced by
face-to-face contact (i.e. rather than web-based pledges). There is some limited evidence that pledges on 'small' behaviours may be sustained.

Some projects were able to 'lock in' new behaviours so they endure in the longer term through the adaptation of organisational processes (so they become routine), internal staff training and the building of self-managing capacity in community action groups (so they can manage themselves in the long term).

**Feedback, reward, celebration**

Some projects (and participants) noted that prizes or rewards could be effective in reinforcing a sense of achievement (and therefore motivation) and – crucially – did not have to be especially large. Demonstration activities were important, giving an opportunity to test out new behaviours 'for real' (learning by doing) or celebrating positive experiences (thereby increasing commitment). Feedback to individuals on their performance was also crucial in encouraging people to change behaviour in the EcoTeam model.

**Project accountability – through evaluation**

Evaluation, though occasionally painful for projects, delivered big benefits. Firstly, it showed the fund had delivered activity on the ground and had measurable impacts. Secondly, it generated learning to inform future policy. Thirdly, it provided projects with a means to fine tune approaches and document evidence of their impact.

Evaluation was effective where it was built in from the beginning and related to project objectives, thereby increasing the opportunity for measurement.

**Inspirational/entrepreneurial leadership, including strong ‘people’ skills**

Leadership (at all levels) was a crucial component of success. The enthusiasm, commitment, knowledge and personality of an individual is often what persuaded people (and businesses) to take part. Some projects developed or unearthed their own catalytic individuals. It is difficult to say if the models used in the EAF could be replicated without the involvement of the same people.

Senior level 'buy in' was essential (either inside projects’ own organisations or when working with external organisations) and could be encouraged through project steering groups involving senior staff as well as consulting with members to create a mandate for environmental action before the project was launched. Moreover, this 'buy in' allowed organisational change projects to draw on internal resources and therefore extend the scope and reach of the projects. It also appeared to have a catalytic effect on the organisations themselves, so that they could be seen to be leading by example.

**Willingness to develop useful relationships and work in partnerships**

Finding the right contacts and building strong relationships was key; many projects were able to leverage additional resources or expert advice for their projects (e.g. provision of freebies, incentives, or energy advice) through partnerships with local authorities (who act as service gatekeepers or sources of support) and commercial organisations (who provide access to new markets, publicity and technology). Many of these partnerships may continue beyond the life of the EAF.

Market development projects needed to identify and access key ‘gatekeepers’ in supply chains (particularly difficult for projects focusing on construction) and successful projects removed blockages and brokered new relationships between the supply and demand sides.

Many EAF projects shared knowledge and resources (e.g. establishing regional workshops) amongst themselves although the issue of Intellectual Property was a consideration to those developing commercial resources, e.g. toolkits etc.

**A good understanding of markets and business**

In order to run successful market development projects it was important to understand market characteristics and dynamics. Moreover, it was essential to make a strong business case (from a CSR perspective, by having a strong ‘brand offer’, being able to reduce business costs, and being run by credible individuals, respected by the businesses they are working with). It was imperative that these projects leveraged market conditions to their benefit.

Some of the best projects offered a package of measures (including several of the complementary components defined above), e.g. offering sustainability advice with specific tips and actions participants could take, providing hands-on facilitation support to carry it out, plus sometimes a financial incentive or 'reward'.
11.9 Barriers

**Individual level**
On a personal level, participants generally opted for ‘easy’ changes and small steps which were perceived as simple and painless. They avoided behaviours that appeared to be unfamiliar, inconvenient or threatening to their way of life. Some participants felt unable to act because the decision-making did not lie within their control, there were cost or infrastructural barriers to taking up new behaviours (for example, where participants did not have energy meters installed), they lacked the time to take action (busy lives and work schedules were a common cause of environmental action being crowded out) or because they lacked basic skills, e.g. cooking.

Personal action was undermined by a persistent perception of a lack of national and international action and negative news stories which make people doubt the worth of what they are doing; sustainability advice is sometimes contradictory and a stigma remains to being (visibly) involved in environmental action (despite environmental issues becoming more mainstream).

**Project level**
Certain behaviours were particularly challenging for projects. For example, projects working on transport suffered from a scarcity of public transport in rural areas, the high number of stakeholders involved in service provision, participants’ safety concerns, etc. Taking action on a larger scale is complicated, often involving multi-partner approaches (e.g. microgeneration or transport provision). Taking large-scale action around energy and insulation was reported to be so complicated and difficult that people often lost interest.

Moreover, the community based models used in the EAF needed significant time to develop the depth of relationships with participants that appear to be a key marker of successful projects; some were only starting to show results by year three.

In some cases, market development projects were only able to offer a limited choice of products, which was seen as threatening and commercially risky (by the public and businesses). Conversely, sustainable products were not always available regionally/locally (which undermines national promotions).

11.10 The future

The EAF programme has provided projects with increased financial stability and organisational capacity and has created new partnerships and links. Moreover, it has engendered an improved understanding of behaviour change models/approaches, mainstreamed pro-environmental behaviour change within organisations and resulted in expanded markets for specific sustainable products, e.g. fish and timber; all of which will help to develop local capacity and drive sustainable consumption forward beyond the EAF. There is sufficient momentum that most projects will continue.

There are risks, however, that capacity will be lost through: a lack of funding (on a similar scale to EAF) being available to environmental third sector groups engaging in behaviour change (as a result there is a risk that projects will let volunteers go, reduce the amount of community groups they support etc.); a loss of staff where project managers and intermediaries move on; and a loss of materials created, such as toolkits or even projects’ evaluation reports.

Many of the EAF projects could be scaled up (and may be) through future funding or by securing mainstream support in their own organisation and there are many and various opportunities for replicating some of what EAF projects did.

Although further research would be beneficial, if the objective is to deliver rapid behaviour change (to reduce CO₂ emissions by 80%) on a scalable basis then the following options seem worthy of consideration:

- Choice editing or supply chain brokerage;
- Door-knocking advice or audit, supported by help to source products and devices.
- Supporting influential individuals/teams of people to perform a hand-holding function to catalyse significant institutional behaviour change;
- Models similar to EcoTeams where they can be run on a large scale through other organisations;
- Working with/through schools;
Further work with social housing landlords; and

Projects geared to helping managers of community buildings take significant action to reduce energy and water use, and increase recycling.

However, if the goal is embedding long term sustainable behaviour change into communities, then the models above (as well as more 'top down' initiatives e.g. Act on CO2) could be supported by the use of facilitated community action groups. Widespread replication of such groups would require substantial investment, continuing financial support, and may take a long time to produce tangible results - though not in all cases.

An unresolved question is the extent to which community action groups can be influenced or directed to deliver against specific behavioural outcomes, without losing the features that make them attractive to community volunteers - independence, a sense of ownership, freedom to invent their own initiatives, and to work at their own pace.

A further question is the extent to which prescriptive outcome targets would squeeze out some of the more creative initiatives launched by community groups, or prevent them from responding to very specific local needs/opportunities that might not be spotted by 'outsiders' or official bodies.

11.11 Recommendations

This evaluation has highlighted a number of areas in which the experiences of EAF projects could provide lessons for future funding models for funders, practitioners and policy makers alike. These include:

- Supporting the third sector;
- The application process;
- Evaluation;
- Dissemination of EAF knowledge; and
- Research recommendations.

Supporting the third sector

Visible government action/leadership on climate change

The work of funds like the EAF needs to be supported by top-down communication and visible government action on climate change. These communications should aim to straighten out some of the inherent contradictions in less mainstream behaviours such as food (where, unlike recycling, no injunctive norms exist at a societal level). Defra's new campaign on seasonal food may be an ideal opportunity to provide leadership on this issue. Moreover, clear leadership could help counter the remaining stigma attached to being (visibly) involved in environmental action (despite environmental issues becoming more mainstream).

Tackling 'difficult' behaviours through multi-stakeholder partnerships

Multi-stakeholder projects are essential to overcoming barriers around ‘difficult’ behaviours where the landscape is more complex (transport or microgeneration etc). For example, Defra could work with partners such as energy companies through their CERT obligations to move beyond better energy management in the home.

Improved co-ordination between government departments

Better co-ordination between government departments with different remits would help support grass roots action on sustainability (e.g. linking community based environmental action programmes to policy-level strategy and implementation in schools, the food sector, or energy). For example, if environmental education was more effectively part of the school curriculum there would be less need for reliance on supportive teachers. Additionally, funders could offer coordinated access to advice from several government departments for projects aiming to change whole lifestyles 'in the round'. Such multi-partner, cross-departmental working could also mitigate against institutional barriers.

Sustained support throughout funding programmes

Any support offered to projects should be sustained throughout the duration of the funding programme not just at start-up (e.g. evaluation, IT, etc) allowing the opportunity for reassurance and feedback on both sides (and a level of flexibility). Access could also be provided to partners who may be able to help projects (e.g. offering support and guidance) to overcome any possible infrastructural and institutional barriers.
Funders could also perform a ‘critical friend’ role (or find someone who would) to reassure innovative projects they are on the right track, and staying within the fund objectives.

**Long-term funding**
By providing funding over three years, the EAF was able to achieve markedly more than shorter-term funding streams (by allowing a greater degree of flexibility) which should be considered for future behaviour change programmes (particularly where there may be delays between project activity and behaviour change).

**The applications process**

*A two-step application process*
After outlining an initial idea, projects could work collaboratively with funders in a two-step application process which would: provide an opportunity for funders to feed experience into project development; signpost applicants to useful materials and partners; and allow funders and applicants to jointly develop an appropriate evaluation plan. This would also ensure projects and funders do not utilise more resources than necessary.

**Demonstrating knowledge**
Projects must be able to demonstrate that they are capable of changing behaviour rather than simply raising awareness (i.e. doing more than just telling people to change). Funders should consider (a) how well the applicant understands their target audience and (b) how projects are proposing to engage their audiences, e.g. Is group working possible? Do they have proven access to local ‘hearts and minds’? Are results achievable and tangible? Are they using the right hooks/methods for their audience?

**Existing audiences**
Third sector projects can be successful where an audience already exists and are accessible en masse. Membership organisations, for instance, do not have to spend time recruiting or attracting their audience (and pre-existing communication channels can be tapped into). Sometimes members are relatively homogenous with regards to their attitudes on SCP issues as well as their wider values, making it easier to target audiences.

**The importance of personality**
Where successful models appear reliant on certain catalytic individuals, it may be beneficial to fund the person for the duration rather than the project, i.e. Defra might consider placing greater emphasis on the suitability of key staff.

**Local authority partnerships**
Third sector partnerships with local authorities can achieve the best of both worlds – access to service gatekeepers and a level of officiality but with local ‘buy in’.

**Workshops**
It may be beneficial to hold workshops before funding programmes begin to develop capacity within projects, e.g. how to evaluate, behaviour change basics, community development advice for environmentally-focused projects etc.

**Old ideas vs. ‘new’ innovation**
Significant scaling-up of successful projects can be achieved by funding proven models to extend their reach and impact. Old ideas/existing projects may be just as favourable as ‘new’ innovation.

**Evaluation**

**Providing long-term evaluation support**
Evaluation should be embedded at the outset (ideally with an offer of hands-on expert evaluation support) through an outcomes-driven approach rather than a rigid task specification approach (outputs). To minimise the heavy burden of evaluation, projects could be encouraged to focus in on measurable aspects of their work where robust data is more likely to be produced (projects working with un-facilitated groups may need more assistance in order to ensure an evaluation is possible). Reporting requirements should be as explicit as possible at the outset (even if the exact form is undecided).

**Key components of a successful evaluation methodology**
In designing their evaluation, projects should consider: integrating data collection into work plans; conducting baseline measurement; carrying out types of work for which impacts are easier to evaluate (e.g.
work which involved repeated contact with participants rather than one-off and which moved beyond raising awareness into the ‘doing’; working with audiences for whom behaviour change is easier to gauge (e.g. adults who pay the bills rather than schoolchildren); working towards realistic goals in the timeframe given; and having regular access to project audiences.

**Fund evaluators**

Fund evaluators should be involved for the entire fund duration, need to have direct access to the projects’ audiences (built in from the start, to reduce the risk of only being able to access self-selected participants) and must be able to triangulate from different sources of information (to establish a full picture of project activities).

**Funders must be closely involved in the evaluation process**

Funders should be involved in the development of the overall evaluation approach and have regular contact with the evaluators so that interim findings can shape internal thinking and policy. Where possible, an experienced research manager inside the funding team can be extremely useful to provide ongoing guidance and challenge to the evaluators. Additionally, it would be preferable to have someone with a research background (internally or externally) to monitor the scope and quality of information being provided to funders in reports, so that additional measures to protect data quality can be taken if and when needed.

**Dissemination of EAF knowledge**

**Networking events**

Defra is in a good position to hold further networking event(s). It would be particularly beneficial to bring together the lessons and the people from its Climate Challenge Fund, Every Action Counts and the EAF.

**Mentoring**

Enable and/or support the mentoring of newly funded projects by project managers from the EAF; such peer mentoring (preferably for a fee to cover mentors’ costs), could reduce the risk of new projects re-inventing engagement models that are flawed, or heading down unnecessary blind alleys.

**Use of evaluation reports**

Maximise access and signposting to evaluation reports and ‘best practice’ guides, possibly on the Defra EAF website or by establishing a new repository similar to ChangeLAB (under Defra’s remit). The projects’ own evaluations from the EAF provide a methodological resource to critique and build upon, and should be taken note of in Defra’s forthcoming action research projects.

**Use of toolkits**

Consider how toolkits and other engagement tools developed during the EAF could be used beyond the project that developed them, either freely or through avenues such as licensing.

**Compile a ‘stakeholder network’**

Consider a method to compile a ‘stakeholder network’ of key EAF project managers/catalytic individuals to ensure expertise is retained by Defra on behaviour change/community action work (even when these people move on).

**Research recommendations**

This evaluation has highlighted a number of possible research studies for the future, namely:

- How and why behaviours are sustained (and in what circumstances) through a longitudinal behaviour change study.
- If and how one behaviour change can act as a catalyst for another in a new activity or a new domain.
- Whether and where introducing measures that make pro-environmental behaviour automatic and unconscious (choice-editing) have any wider spill-over effects on attitudes or behaviours.
- Whether the same set of factors (as discovered in the EAF) apply for more ‘difficult’ behaviours in producing behaviour change/community action outcomes and what works for less green/active individuals.
- Collating the evidence on the impact of schools-based pro-environmental behaviour change projects where the claims appear to currently be larger than the evidence base.
- Collating the evidence on the impact of door-stepping projects (and different ways of doing this) preferably in partnership with local authorities where potential behaviour change success exists (but again, where there is little evidence).