Systematic Survey of Local Authority Plans for Waste and Recycling Services in England

A survey of senior Local Authority Waste Managers in England to understand planned changes to recycling and waste services, and drivers and barriers to change.

Project code: RCY005
Survey date: June - December 2014
Publication date: March 2016
WRAP’s vision is a world in which resources are used sustainably.

Our mission is to accelerate the move to a sustainable resource-efficient economy through re-inventing how we design, produce and sell products; re-thinking how we use and consume products; and re-defining what is possible through re-use and recycling.

Find out more at [www.wrap.org.uk](http://www.wrap.org.uk)

Written by: WRAP

While we have tried to make sure this report is accurate, we cannot accept responsibility or be held legally responsible for any loss or damage arising out of or in connection with this information being inaccurate, incomplete or misleading. This material is copyrighted. You can copy it free of charge as long as the material is accurate and not used in a misleading context. You must identify the source of the material and acknowledge our copyright. You must not use material to endorse or suggest we have endorsed a commercial product or service. For more details please see our terms and conditions on our website at [www.wrap.org](http://www.wrap.org)
Executive summary

In 2014, WRAP conducted telephone and face to face surveys of 119 Local Authority (LA) Waste Managers in England with the aim of understanding more about the changes planned for recycling and waste management services and the drivers for these changes. The survey also aimed to identify the barriers local authorities were facing locally in increasing recycling.

Forty three per cent of English local authorities were surveyed, of which 45% were Waste Collection Authorities and 37% Unitary Authorities. The number interviewed is close to a nationally representative profile. The findings of the survey fit into five broad areas.

1 Future plans for Local Authority Services
Fifty nine per cent of LA waste managers reported that some changes to the services in their authority were planned over the next five years. The majority of changes centred around additions of lightweight materials to the dry recycling service. Common themes showed a consideration of further reductions in residual waste capacity either by lower frequency services or reduced container capacity and whether to charge for garden waste services. Therefore, there is limited evidence to indicate that significant increases in recycling tonnage will come from changes that are currently planned or committed to, with positive increases often negated by other service changes. However, further pressure on budgets is likely to result in changes to services even if the nature of that change is not yet identified or planned.

2 Drivers for change
The most frequently mentioned driver identified through the survey is the need to make financial savings and address budget pressures. Responses included introducing a new service to divert more materials from landfill and hence make a saving on landfill costs and amending existing services in some way in order to reduce costs and save money.

Approximately, one third of scheme changes are the result of multiple drivers although the majority of those identified included finance. Where finance was said to be a driver, it was acknowledged that environmental, social or political benefits would be experienced as well as cost saving. Whilst local priorities were mentioned, neither national policy initiatives nor national targets were cited as key drivers for change.

3 Plans for engagement and monitoring of existing services
The general mood of the majority of Waste Managers was that communications and monitoring of services are the first areas likely to be cut given budget pressures. This may lead to reduced capture, increased contamination or both and consequently poorer performing recycling services. The survey found that Waste Managers are under pressure to do more with less and would prefer to reduce or stop communications rather than a service.

Large scale communications campaigns appear to be declining with increasing focus on targeted communications. To reduce spend, Waste Managers are moving away from
traditional communications such as distribution of printed materials and are now focusing on ‘free’ channels such as websites and social media.

4 Barriers to increasing recycling and overcoming these barriers
Finance was the most commonly mentioned barrier to increasing recycling activities. Finance related barriers were also cited by Waste Managers as significantly impacting the ability to make changes which would result in increasing recycling.

Barriers relating to collection contracts or due to a lack of co-operation within waste partnerships were raised by many but generally were seen as less important since it was felt these could be more easily overcome, especially with time.

5 Further support
A number of opportunities to help increase recycling were suggested unprompted by the Waste Managers interviewed. In some cases this was direct support from WRAP, others suggested support from central government.

The suggestions relating to WRAP were wide ranging such as provision of operational advice; communications to inspire the public, including a national campaign; provision of money saving ideas; support to help increase skills/cababilities in the marketing of recyclable materials and in the procurement of services; and advice on collecting glass (in the context of the separate collection requirements and TEEP).

It was suggested that support from central government could include capital grants; funding for specific consultancy requirements, staff and communications; policy/legislation on packaging producers providing materials that are widely recycled; vision and clarity on long term aims including for more standardised services and ways of working; introduction of statutory targets to incentivise food waste collections; speeding up planning decisions for waste infrastructure; and interventions to help stabilise material prices.
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1.0 Background

The objective of this research was to survey local authority Waste Managers in England to gain insight into what service changes local authorities may have in the pipeline, what is driving those changes and to identify opportunities for supporting increasing recycling rates.

A nationally representative sample was sought and an analysis of the characteristics of the authorities we spoke to shows this was largely achieved. Within the sample, WRAP has also identified a sub-sample of authorities considered to have the greatest opportunity and/or potential to contribute to the achievement of the national recycling target in 2020.

This report provides an overview of the key findings from this research with an emphasis on the national picture. A total of 119 surveys were carried out, representing 139 local authorities, including responses from joint collection authorities and waste partnership. The survey accounts for the responses of senior Waste Managers from 43% of all English local authorities.

2.0 Research Questions

The key questions the research looked to answer were:

1. What service changes are local authorities planning to make to their waste/recycling services in the next five years and the likelihood of the change happening?

2. What is driving the changes to waste and recycling services by local authorities?

3. What barriers do Local authorities see to increasing recycling in their respective localities?

4. What plans do local authorities have for engagement with householders on recycling and for monitoring of existing services?

The research questions were designed to help understand what factors are driving changes in service provision, how these factors relate to each other and what factors Local Authority Waste Managers see as constraining their ability to increase recycling rates. Details of specific service change plans were asked about in order to help WRAP project potential changes in recycling rates and to identify where and how local authorities might best be supported with their future plans.

For the purpose of the report, respondents will be referred to as Local Authority Waste Managers (LA Waste Managers), however job titles and positions of the respondent varied between directors, heads of service and senior managers with varying job titles.
3.0 Methodology

The surveys were conducted by telephone or face-to-face between June and October 2014, by the appointed contractors or WRAP Recycling and Collections Advisers, and lasted approximately 25 minutes. Interviewers were briefed in the design of the questionnaire and given guidance from WRAP’s Research and Evaluation team on how the questions should be asked.

There was minimal use of prompting with the interviews being conducted in a discussion format and interviewers coding responses according to set answer lists, adding additional categories where needed to ensure all feedback was captured. A copy of the questionnaire used by the interviewers to guide the discussion can be found in Appendix C.

Respondents were assured of anonymity in providing their responses where it was requested, to help ensure an open and honest discussion. The vast majority of interviews were conducted via telephone (104 interviews), rather than face-to-face (15 interviews).

Interviewers were instructed to speak with senior Local Authority representatives at Head of Service or Director level. The seniority of staff engaged with was important in order to instil confidence that the responses obtained were from those with experience of decision making in the Council, who would understand the likelihood of service changes and have a good understanding of local key drivers and barriers influencing any service change. Interviewers were selected due to their significant experience in service delivery and experience of engaging with senior Local Authority staff in order to build rapport and recover the required information from each session.

Two distinct sets of local authorities were identified. One set targeted local authorities that in theory could make a greater contribution to recycling rates nationally because:

- They had an above average number of households;
- Their collection contracts were due to be renewed in the next 2 years;
- They were in the bottom quartile for dry recycling performance and therefore appeared to have the most potential to increase capture of recyclables or organic waste.

This provided a sub-sample that offers specific insights about the issues facing these authorities and Waste Managers in particular.

A wider criterion was applied to the second set such that, taken as a whole, findings from the sample would be close to a nationally representative profile as outlined below.
4.0 Profile of local authorities covered by the survey

To assess how representative the achieved sample is, Table 1 compares the sample authorities against the total nationally for a number of area and service characteristics, with the overall sample coverage of 43% nationally. For most categories the percentage coverage is close to 43% meaning there can be confidence that the overall representivity is high.

Table 1: Profile of local authorities covered by the survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authority Type</th>
<th>Number of LA Waste Managers Interviewed</th>
<th>Total number in England</th>
<th>Percentage of sample LAs compared to the national picture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitary</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection Service Provider</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSO</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Management Company</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rurality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recycling Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Performance &lt;30%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Performing</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Performance &gt;50%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Garden waste provision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charged garden waste</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free garden waste</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No garden waste</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Waste Provision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate food waste</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food with garden waste</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekly Residual Waste Commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCLG Weekly Collection Support Recipient</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The local authorities interviewed were split into North and South groups for purely logistical reasons. 81 of a total of 189 local authorities in the North were interviewed and 58 of a total of 137 in the South. The classification for North and South along with regional locations can be seen in Table 2.

### Table 2: Profile of local authorities by region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of LAs completed survey</th>
<th>Total number of LAs in region</th>
<th>Percentage of LAs interviewed by region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis showed no apparent trends by north / south so this classification is not assessed further in the results nor is presented separately in the charts.
5.0 Future plans for Local Authority Services

Summary

59% of local authority Waste Managers interviewed were planning to make at least one service change in the next five years. However the type of change suggested, the number of services affected and the likelihood of full roll out show the commitment to significant service changes in the coming years is minimal. Therefore, there is no evidence that significant increases in recycling tonnage will come from services changes that are currently planned. However, the situation is complex; Waste Managers we spoke to recognised that continuing pressures on budgets would likely drive some change even if the nature of any change was uncertain at the present time.

The service changes most frequently cited included:
- Adding a new material to a dry recycling service – generally plastics or other low weight materials
- Introducing a charge for the garden waste collection service
- Considering introducing a food waste collection service or amending an existing service
- Changes to refuse capacity and/or collection frequency

There is a degree of uncertainty as to whether the changes will be rolled out, and if so how and when. Where service changes were discussed, very few were being implemented at the time of the survey with the majority still considering options. For example, 15 Waste Managers mentioned food waste collections, two stated their authorities were introducing food waste collections whereas in the other 13 authorities this option was being considered.

5.1 Planned service changes in the next 5 years

To get an understanding of planned service changes, respondents were asked about the service changes they were planning to make in the next five years (2015-2020). Respondents were asked to discuss only service changes that were beyond an ideas stage and had been discussed in a strategy document or as part of local service plans. In some instances the planned changes were well progressed in their development and in others the details were to be defined following a review. The likelihood of those planned changes coming to fruition is considered in section 5.1.5.

Key waste statistics for for the local authorities taking part in the survey were assessed. There are no apparent trends between waste arisings, recycling tonnage and recycling rate for the local authorities making changes compared to those local authorities not making any changes.
The percentage of local authorities planning to make changes to services in their areas, as reported by those interviewed, is illustrated in Figure 1. Thirty-five per cent are planning changes relating to the dry recycling service, 22% to garden services, 21% to food waste collection services and 20% to the refuse service. In some cases LA Waste Managers reported that changes were planned to more than one service; as shown by the ‘any service change’ bar 59% (70/119) will make at least one service change.

**Figure 1**: The percentage of local authorities planning a service change by service area

Of the 70/119 (59%) Waste Managers stating that they were looking at making a change, the majority are planning changes that will only affect one service. This can be seen in Table 3.
Table 3: Number of planned service changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of planned services changes</th>
<th>Number of local authorities interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further details of the planned changes by service area can be seen in Figure 2. The most common service change cited was adding material/s to a dry recycling collection with 27 Waste Managers stating they will be doing so. Charging for garden waste and changes to food waste collections were other common changes proposed by LA Waste Managers.

Other changes recorded by LA Waste Managers included seven amending bulky waste collections with more emphasis on re-use / recycling and five were developing commercial waste services or integrating this service with the domestic service. Full service, efficiency or vehicle reviews had been commissioned by 17 LA Waste Managers to help inform service changes.

Figure 2: Planned Service Changes
Other planned changes mentioned during the interviews with the LA Waste Managers included:

- Contract to be awarded for recycling street sweepings
- Contract to be awarded for glass collections from bring sites
- Enforcement activity to address contamination in the dry recycling stream
- Selling commercial waste service
- Potential closures of HWRCs (Household Waste Recycling Centres)
- Residual bin capacity - graded charging
- Small scale trials of WEEE collections, hard plastics, cartons and 3-weekly residual collections

Based on the responses from the LA Waste Managers the current level of planned changes to recycling services could have a very limited impact on the recycling rate nationally. This is because the overall tonnage gains expected from these new services (e.g. adding plastics) at a national level would be small, and reductions in tonnages recycled can be anticipated from measures such as more local authorities introducing garden waste charges, or stopping services. In addition, a few LA Waste Managers reported they were planning on implementing changes in the near future. This is discussed further in 5.1.5 Likelihood of planned changes to come to fruition.

The reasons provided by LA Waste Managers for having no planned changes to services on the horizon are discussed further in Section 8.0 Barriers to increasing recycling.

5.1.1 Common changes overall in dry service change

Among the LA Waste Managers who told us they were considering changes in the coming years, changes to the dry recycling service were the most common. The details of these changes can be seen in Figure 3.

Figure 3: Dry recycling service changes being considered over the next five years
Adding a dry material to a current service was the most common service change within the changes to the dry recycling service. The types of materials to be added are detailed in Figure 4. There were a number of other common themes in relation to dry materials which included reviewing current recycling systems by looking into different service profiles/options, container capacity and collection frequency.

Amending the service profile was discussed by 18 LA Waste Managers. The changes included four rolling out fortnightly collections of co-mingled dry recycling, amending collection methods and containers, running trials and extending the bring sites available. The majority however, were considering their options through service/efficiency reviews of the dry recycling service which included various options from weekly collections to co-mingled dry recycling.

“We're looking to explore options to increase the efficiency of the current service. Paper is currently collected as a separate pass and the Authority feels that the cost of delivering this service is not out-weighed by the income received. They want to look at a number of options including a fully co-mingled approach.”

Change to frequency was being implemented by two local authorities, with a further seven considering this as an option.

“We would like to explore options around making recycling weekly to increase recycling rates”

However, one LA Waste Manager reported reducing recycling collection frequency, with a further three considering this.

“Currently the authority is looking to possibly move paper back to every other week as a cost saving exercise. It will be a disincentive to recycle so may not be pursued.”

Increasing container capacity for dry recycling is being rolled out in six authorities, with a further two considering this as an option.

Stopping dry recycling services was being considered by three local authorities. Two LA Waste Managers related this to removing material (glass and textiles) from a current service, whilst another LA Waste Manager reported considering removing recycling collections from hard to reach areas.

“Considering removing recycling [services] completely in hard to reach areas due to high operational costs of implementing [reducing] contamination process there and lack of yield from these areas.”

Adding a material to the dry recycling service was the most common planned change to services. The materials most likely to be added are plastic (packaging) pots, tubs and trays (PTTs) as can be seen in Figure 4. In some cases this will be introduced as part of a full service change when a new dry recycling scheme is introduced, whilst others plan to
add materials to the current service. Other popular materials to be added are (beverage /food) cartons, WEEE and textiles. The low number of changes to dry recycling services, along with light weighting of materials, suggests that the net tonnage and hence the overall impact on the national recycling rate will be low. However, as discussed later, there is significant uncertainty whether some of these proposed changes will go ahead.

**Figure 4: Dry Material to be added to kerbside dry recycling schemes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plastic pots, tubs</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartons</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEEE</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardboard</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batteries</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerosols</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal pots and pans</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.2 **Common themes for garden waste collection service changes**

For garden waste collection services, the most common change is to introduce charging for garden waste collections. 19 LA Waste Managers were looking to implement this change. All the changes being planned or considered for garden waste services can be seen in Figure 5.
Figure 5: Garden waste service changes over the next five years

Where implementing a charge for garden waste collections was cited by Waste Managers, 13 authorities were considering implementing a charge, three were in the process of implementing a charge and three were looking at amending the current chargeable service.

“A mixed service is currently offered, however they would like to explore options around charging for garden waste or suspending the service to help fund other service improvements”

Changes to collection frequency included three authorities reducing frequency by introducing a winter suspension of collections and two authorities increasing to weekly to enable food waste to be collected.

“Garden waste will still be collected fortnightly but the service will only be provided 40 weeks of the year (rather than 52 weeks).”

In total five LA Waste Managers reported planning to remove food from garden waste collections. This was to enable a charge for garden waste to be implemented. In some instances, the food waste is being removed so a cheaper treatment route could be used for the garden waste.
“Removing food as a result of charging for garden waste - no interest in separate food waste.”

Although some LA Waste Managers were looking to remove food from garden waste collections, two authorities were planning to introduce food waste to the garden waste collection, whilst another is removing cardboard from the garden waste collection.

5.1.3 Common themes with food waste service changes

Planned changes relating to food waste services can be seen in Figure 6. Planning or considering introducing a food waste service was stated by 15, amending or stopping the food waste service completely was stated by 11 and the discussion on liner provision was stated by nine.

**Figure 6:** Planned and considered food recycling service changes over the next five years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count of respondents</th>
<th>FOOD Introduce liners</th>
<th>FOOD Introduce collection</th>
<th>FOOD Stop or amend a service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considering liners</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introductory roll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote carrier bags</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introducing liners</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considering to stop</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopping collections</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separating food from garden</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of those stating they would introduce separate food waste collections, 13 were in the stages of considering if a food waste service could be introduced and only two are actually implementing the change.

Some LA Waste Managers discussed making amendments to a current food service. This included two looking at extending the service to more households, four were changing
the way food waste is to be collected by separating it from garden waste and one was looking at amending the service to improve participation.

Stopping the food waste collection service was being considered by two local authorities, whilst a further two local authorities already had decided to stop food waste collections completely.

“Food waste service being removed due to lack of incentive and due to fiscal constraints.”

Provision of liners was discussed by nine LA Waste Managers as a planned change. Three of which were looking to introduce liners free of charge, two were going to promote the use of carrier bags as an alternative to supplying liners, two were planning to provide an introductory roll of liners on the start of their service and two were considering providing liners if the costs stacked up. In total 63 of 119 authorities provide a food waste collection.

“Encourage use of plastic carrier bags as liners for caddies”

In one instance the LA Waste Manager was unable to introduce liners due to the requirements of the treatment facility.

“Might consider providing liners if those running the IVC plant could be convinced that liners do not affect the processing negatively”

5.1.4 Common themes for refuse collection services changes

Changes to refuse collection services either by changing container capacity or changing collection frequency was referenced by 32 LA Waste Managers. Details of the changes can be seen in Figure 7.
Fortnightly collection was the most commonly cited option for reducing frequency and this is being considered by five LA Waste Managers with a further two planning to implement this service change.

However, often these changes are planned to go hand in hand with another service change.

“If a good business case for introducing food waste could be made, we might consider going fortnightly residual.”

Three weekly collections is being given serious consideration by four authorities and at an advanced stage with one, with the LA Waste Manager stating a three weekly collection was being implemented.

“We're watching with interest those authorities that have proposed a move to 3 weekly residual waste collections.”
Only one LA Waste Manager is looking at increasing refuse collection frequency. However, this frequency increase would only be in high density housing areas with specific problems and will not be extended to cover all other households.

Changing residual bin capacity is another change being considered and reported by Waste Managers as an option which would help improve recycling performance. Nine LA Waste Managers are currently considering reducing residual capacity, whilst three authorities will be introducing smaller bins to households.

“Effective residual capacity is one of the few options we have to drive [recycling] capacity up further.....possibility of addressing this to push up recycling rates further.”

“We would like to explore options around reducing residual waste capacity. 140l may be too much of a jump but 180l may be tolerable to politicians.”

LA Waste Managers are also looking at other ways to reduce capacity. One authority is issuing smaller bins when replacements are needed whilst another is limiting capacity by moving from an unlimited sack collection to wheeled bins. Only one authority was looking at increasing capacity but only for some households, such as larger families.

5.1.5 Likelihood of planned changes being introduced

To understand the likelihood of planned changes being introduced, respondents were asked to state how certain they felt that plans that had been discussed would go ahead. Where a response was coded definite interviewers were able to establish that a decision had been made at Committee (or the appropriate) level. Uncertain implies that plans are still at discussion stage within the relevant Department.

Figure 8 illustrates there is a degree of uncertainty around planned changes being implemented. Small changes to a service such as adding a material to the dry recycling collection are more likely to happen as these generally will not require major changes to contracts nor incur significant cost. Conversely, adding a new service or major service changes, such as introducing a food waste collection, amendments to refuse collections and introducing charging for garden waste have a lower level of certainty of being introduced.
Respondents were also asked:

- How the changes would be rolled out
- The timescales for when the changes would be implemented
- The expected impact on tonnage collected

These questions were considered to be helpful in understanding the impact on national recycling performance over time. A summary of the responses to these questions can be found in Appendix A.
6.0 Drivers

Summary

The most frequently mentioned driver for service changes cited by LA Waste Managers relates to finance. Whether this is introducing a new service to make savings through increasing diversion of waste from landfill or amending services in the same way to save money, it is evident that pressures on local authority budgets are driving changes. Environmental and local priorities are discussed as drivers, although usually alongside a financial driver.

Approximately, one third of planned service changes are influenced by multiple drivers and most of these include finance. Whilst local priorities were mentioned national policy and targets were not cited as key drivers.

To gain insight into the motivations for service change, respondents were asked to outline the specific drivers for each planned service change. These drivers were split into three categories; financial, environmental and local priorities. Local priorities were both social, such as making recycling easier for residents, and political such as priority given to increasing recycling compared to priorities for other services and the presence of locally set recycling targets. The results can be seen in Figure 9.

Figure 9: Local Authority drivers for making service changes

- REFUSE Change containment
- REFUSE Change frequency
- FOOD Stop or amend a service
- FOOD Introduce food collection
- FOOD Introduce liners
- GARDEN Change collection frequency
- GARDEN Add/ remove material
- GARDEN Charging for garden waste
- DRY Stop a service
- DRY Increase capacity
- DRY Change collection frequency
- DRY Change current profile
- DRY Add a material/s

Count of respondents
6.1 Drivers for change

Finance was the most frequently stated driver (85 of 183 drivers mentioned) by LA Waste Managers as a reason for service changes, however for a third of service changes, multiple drivers have influenced the action of the individual authorities.

Financial
Where finance was said to be a driver, this focussed on pressure from within local authorities to achieve cost savings.

"The service has to achieve a saving of £....million in the next five years"

Reducing the total cost of residual waste disposal was frequently noted in combination with increasing income from the sale of recyclates to help improve financial standing.

Environmental
Environmental drivers influenced a number of service changes and was the second most common driver as reported by 55 LA Waste Managers.

Local Priorities
Local priorities can lead to both social and political drivers. Social drivers include making recycling ‘easier’, more consistent and inclusive for householders, making recycling ‘cheaper’ for residents and responding directly to ‘demand for change’ from householders.

In total, social drivers were mentioned by 18 LA Waste Managers.

“There is a mood to standardise the service if possible, to make it easier for the public.”

“There is a demand from the public for a separate food waste collection, plus people miss the cardboard now that it is not included in the [garden waste] collection."

“There are clear social benefits from providing a free bulky collection service to those in need.”

Political drivers were referenced by 18 LA Waste Managers in the form of working towards the 2020 recycling target (of 50% nationally) or locally set recycling targets.

“We want to go up to a recycling rate of 60-79% which is the reason for the trials.”

There were also a couple of mentions of wishing to keep up with the recycling performance of other local authorities, thereby improving their standing in the rankings.

“We want to increase our position in the recycling table”.

Reference to legal obligations were made by only two LA Waste Managers referring to ‘TEEP’.
In addition to those above, the following drivers were also mentioned:

- Contract renewal e.g. a new contract offered broader scope to include textiles (3)
- Infrastructure e.g. change in vehicles made service change possible (1)
- Technical problems e.g. MRF demanding contamination by textiles to be reduced, the use of MBT (Mechanical Biological Treatment) prompting a re-use scheme to divert WEEE from the system so as to mitigate against experiencing the associated risks of WEEE entering the MBT process (3)

6.2 Multiple drivers

34 of the individual planned service changes stated by the LA Waste Managers were influenced by more than one driver. Finance was almost always a driver along with the environment or local priorities as shown in Figure 4.

Table 4: Number of service changes influenced by multiple drivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Number of service changes influenced by more than one driver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Environment</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Local Priorities</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Environment and Local Priorities</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment &amp; Local Priorities</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst multiple drivers were often mentioned they were not often seen as having equal weighting. For example, where finance was said to be a driver, it was acknowledged that environmental, social or political impacts would be experienced as well as a monetary cost saving.

"There is a real need to drive down the cost of the collection service, and one way to do this is to reduce the fleet...Clearly there are environmental benefits attached to this,...in terms of increasing recycling collection ...(and)..reducing vehicle movements".

There were a couple of examples however, where drivers were viewed equally:

“Finance is a significant driver ... and spend will be made where environmentally and socially there is the greatest benefit.”

"Although the motivation is largely financial it's also about giving the householder more choice [by introducing a kerbside collection of WEEE]. Householders like it and it's not really an additional cost"
7.0 Plans for communications and monitoring of services

Summary

The general mood of the majority of LA Waste Managers interviewed is that communications and monitoring are the first areas likely to be cut as a result of budget pressures. Consequently this may give rise to decreases in recycling performance through reduced capture, increased contamination or both. LA Waste Managers under pressure to do more with less would choose to loose / reduce communications rather than a service.

There is large scale communications campaigns taking place and more focus on targeted communications and monitoring. To save money local authorities appear to be moving away from traditional communications such as distributing printed materials and are now...

To understand local authority plans for communications and monitoring, respondents were asked if their authorities were carrying out communications and would maintain this activity; carrying out and planned to expand their communications activity; planned to introduce communications; or carrying out communications but planned to stop a number of communications and engagement activities.

7.1 Communications

The communications tools LA Waste Managers referenced in relation to waste and recycling services can be seen in Figure 10. As illustrated the most popular include webpages, social media and calendars. Although provision of liners free of charge for food waste caddies is not a communications tool as such it was included as liners do encourage people to recycle their food waste and liners can be printed with instructional information. Four LA Waste Managers stated that their authorities' provided no waste and recycling communications to householders at all.
7.2 Monitoring

Monitoring includes compositional analysis, participation monitoring and other surveys. These were less common than communication activities.
Less monitoring of how residents are using their waste and recycling services may mean that LA Waste Managers are not fully informed as to which collections are working well or poorly and where. Having local intelligence on whether there is low capture of recyclables, rejection of material or inefficient services is important in managing the costs of the overall service.

A total of eight different trials were being run in six local authority areas at the time the interviews were conducted. In most cases it was stated that the outcome would determine whether the service change being considered would be extended to more households. The low current numbers of trials seemed to indicate that the prevalence of individual research and evaluation is declining.

The cost and resource requirements needed to deliver and monitor statistically robust sized trials could be considered a barrier to further research. Specifically, there was a call by 2 LA Waste Managers for this work to be undertaken at a national level where it could be appropriately resourced and managed. When LA Waste Managers were asked how they planned to roll out service changes, most stated that these would be introduced without the need for any trials and that they would refer to national good practice for guidance.

Further details of the trends and current thinking of local authorities in relating to communications and engagement activities and monitoring can be found in Appendix B.
8.0 Barriers to increasing recycling

Summary

As well as a driver for service changes, finance related barriers were mentioned in relation to recycling and in making changes which will result in increasing recycling.

Barriers relating to collection contracts or due to a lack of co-operation within waste partnerships were raised but generally seen as less important issues by LA Waste Managers as it was felt these could be more easily overcome, especially with time.

8.1 Key barriers mentioned

To understand the barriers that LA Waste Managers are facing when it comes to increasing recycling, respondents were asked to state these unprompted. There was no limit to the number of barriers that could be mentioned by respondents. For each barrier raised the respondent was then asked to assign an “importance score” (from extremely important to less important). Where a barrier is flagged as “less important” this implies that the barrier possibly could be overcome. Each barrier raised was assigned to category (developed prior to the interviews) by the interview. Any barriers that did not fit into these categories were also recorded. The LA Waste Managers were also asked to provide any suggestions as to how the barriers to increasing recycling could be overcome.

Figure 12 illustrates the barriers raised by LA Waste Managers that may prevent their authority from increasing recycling.

Figure 12: Barriers to increasing recycling as identified by LA Waste Managers
Operating Costs
Operating costs (or revenue expenditure) was seen as the most important barrier with 46 LA Waste Managers, stating it extremely important. 61 stated it was of some importance (46 extremely important, 8 very important and 7 important). The number of LA Waste Managers seeing this barrier as extremely important was significantly higher than the next most mentioned barrier seen to be extremely important which was ‘set up’ expenditure (capital costs).

LA Waste Managers felt that limited budget for operating costs has meant that they have had to compromise the quality and extent of the recycling services they can offer householders.

"It's about balancing the books, giving the best service for the money available. Everyone wants the best but it's about what you can afford".

In the worst case, LA Waste Managers mentioned having to stop recycling services due to a lack of budget. Cuts tended to be in food waste or garden waste collections, thus enabling the continuation of a ‘core’ waste collection service. LA Waste Managers consistently were mindful of the need to reduce costs.

"With budgets continuing to be cut, priority is not about increasing recycling but is about making sure the core service is delivered. To get big gains need fundamental changes in the service, but do not have the finance or staff resources to do this".

Solutions for overcoming the barrier of set up and asset (capital) expenditure were also mentioned frequently for managing operating (revenue) expenditure. A careful review of where cost savings could be made was a common approach mentioned. This included a review of human resources deployed, both the number of staff and hours required, as well as more innovative approaches such as compressed working where the same hours are worked each week but over fewer days.

"Compressed workforce working week in 4 days whilst ensuring the trucks work 5 days has mean that the fleet can be cut by 1/5."

Generating income by charging householders for garden waste collections to offset running costs were in the pipeline at 19 local authorities, but it was acknowledged that this opt-in approach was likely to reduce recycling tonnages.

"A charge is being applied to the garden waste collection service, even though this is thought to have a negative effect on the recycling rate."

Further cost cutting exercises were discussed by 9 LA Waste Managers, which included looking at major scheme changes e.g. stopping food waste collections completely and reducing the frequency of collections. Re-letting of contracts or taking collections in-house were also being considered. One LA Waste Manager said they had plans to run
trials of different service options to get a clearer idea on the relative costs and the revenue each would return from the sale of recyclables.

Other charging suggestions from those interviewed included accepting and charging for trade waste at HWRCs and an ability to charge for waste collection services in accordance with how much is put out at the kerbside (as is done in other countries). Finally, in addition to requests for funding from central government, a couple of LA Waste Managers called for reduced gate fees and increased income from the sale of recyclate in order to offset revenue costs.

Capital Costs (set up and asset expenditure e.g. vehicles, infrastructure, containers)
Lack of capital to set up a service was seen by 25 LA Waste Managers as an extremely important barrier and 43 stating it was of some importance (25 extremely important, three very important and 15 important).

Changes to services that require investment in new equipment were found to be problematic and LA Waste Managers had to pull together a strong business case to justify such investment. Set up costs was cited as being a barrier to food waste collections by many.

“... a business case had to be made for a specialised narrow access vehicle ...Therefore unlikely any significant changes such as food waste introduction possible.”

“Possibly add food waste but has to be done in a cost neutral way.”

The cost as well as any physical constraints to adapting existing facilities such as household waste recycling centres (HWRC) to accommodate additional recycling or improved facilities - were seen as a barrier to improving recycling performance; at times contributing to apathy and frustration amongst householders.

“The recycling facility was configured how the LA wanted it a few years ago - difficult to change that now and very expensive to reconfigure to add [recycling] capacity”.

“There are complaints about food waste going into the residual waste as the old vehicles have small food pods and once they are filled, the rest of the food has to go into the residual [waste compartment]. This may act as a barrier to those who see it.”

Developing a sound business case was the most commonly suggested solution to releasing budget for set up expenditure. WRAP’s assistance with developing business cases in support of investment in recycling services was mentioned on occasion.

“A strong business case demonstrating financial benefits of increased recycling rates...such an understanding would bolster the case for increased recycling.”
Capital grants from central government were mentioned by a few LA Waste Managers, whilst others felt that partnership working with other local authorities would be effective in reducing costs and increasing recycling.

**Lack of Staff Resources**

Lack of internal resources to enable change to happen was seen by 24 LA Waste Managers as an extremely important barrier with 49 stating it to be of some importance (24 extremely important, 14 very important and 11 important).

It was reported that waste and recycling education officers were the first positions to be cut, as they were considered lower priority than posts relating directly to the delivery of services. This was seen as a loss in terms of reduced capacity to communicate directly to householders.

“Depleting number of staff means that some activities are not being undertaken now, specifically regarding communications and education. Priority is on focused engagement within the budget available.”

“[losing their specialist Education Officer] has clearly affected our ability to do outreach work”

“Education team has been scrapped. Often not the money to actually distribute leaflets etc.”

Other roles that had been cut were staff who conducted participation monitoring and who assisted residents at HWRCs. LA Managers felt that whilst they had to make these cuts there were likely to be repercussions in terms of cost and quality of materials collected as residents could not be helped to the same level as previously.

There were several comments about a hiring freeze in terms of not replacing staff when they leave. One authority Manager spoke of quite a different situation, whereby future plans were such that jobs were being prioritised over provision of some collection services.

“Services are likely to be cut to enable some staff jobs to be saved. Food waste operatives would be redeployed into other workforce.”

Re-deployment of staff to areas where there is most need, external funding to keep staff on, and communications support from WRAP, were all suggestions for overcoming of a lack of internal staff resource.

One example of a request for financial support to maintain apprenticeships:

“We have two apprentices who might have to finish due to funding issues – they have been carrying out a lot of door-knocking and general communication activities - funding to maintain these posts would be helpful.”
**Cost of communications**

Cost of communications was identified by 19 LA Waste Managers as an extremely important barrier and 45 stated it was of some importance (19 extremely important, 10 very important, 16 important).

Communications budgets for waste and recycling had been cut completely in four authorities, whilst another four were relying on the waste partnership or county communication budgets as their only way to fund communications.

Although communications budgets were still in place for many, 15 LA Waste Managers stated their communications budgets were very limited due to severe cuts over the past few years. This was felt to be a major barrier to keeping householders motivated to participate in recycling. Lack of communications budget was not only seen as preventing progress in recycling - when introducing a service change - but also in maintaining current recycling levels.

“You need to spend on communications just to stand still on the recycling effort”.

LA Waste Managers have started to think of alternative media, such as online and mobile communications which require less staff time and budget to deliver. Of those surveyed, 96 LA Waste Managers were regularly using and updating webpages, 80 using social media in some form, and 16 moving calendars on-line. Advice was requested by a couple of LA Waste Managers on alternative methods of communications to standard leafleting - which had become cost prohibitive.

“We are looking into the use of a mobile app regarding collection dates”.

“More use is being made of other methods such as twitter or Facebook feeds to get the message out”.

Four LA Waste Managers reported that communications activities were part of their collection contract, and so did not see the costs of communications as a financial barrier to recycling.

“All communications are done by Veolia as part of their contract”.

One LA Waste Manager reported that whilst the communications was currently not part of the collection contract with their waste contractor they were looking to take forward WRAP’s advice to do this in order to:

“Protect it [communications] for the future.”

Another cost saving option was to utilise waste partnerships, in terms of sharing resources and information.
Several requests for funding to support communications were made including one request for WRAP to carry out research with householders to inform an authority’s communications planning for a new service. There were also calls for a national campaign from 4 LA Waste Managers.

“It was helpful when WRAP did the national advertising campaigns – that needs to happen again to push it [recycling] up the people’s agenda again.”

**Infrastructure issues (bulking, haulage, treatment or disposal infrastructure e.g. location, space limitations, cost, lack of provision)**

Infrastructure issues were stated by 23 LA Waste Managers as a barrier of some importance (10 extremely important, 5 very important and 8 important). The majority of these barriers related to lack of treatment infrastructure close to the local authorities.

One LA Waste Manager cited that the lack of local treatment facilities meant they were unable to introduce a food waste service.

“Would like to introduce separate food collection but there are no local facilities.”

Another LA Waste Manager complained about the limited types of plastics that can be recycled in their waste disposal authority area which was a barrier to them expanding their plastics recycling scheme and therefore improving recycling performance. In the main the relatively low proportion of LA Managers citing infrastructure barriers suggested that there where there were issues they primarily related to some specific regional gaps in provision.

**Lack of incentive from Waste Disposal Authority (WDA)**

Lack of incentives from WDAs was often seen as a barrier with - almost 1/3 of LA Waste Managers mentioning it. Of those that did state it as a barrier, 10 stated it was extremely important, four stated it was very important, 8 stated it was important and 23 stated it was less important.

The responses relating to a lack of incentive from WDAs focussed on the absence of a cost saving or sufficient cost differential between recycling and refuse, including specific mentions of organic waste. The lack of recycling credits (a credit paid from the waste disposal authority to the waste collection authority for each tonne recycled and thus avoided from residual disposal), a lack of increase in the value of credits and a general mood of uncertainty were also voiced. The lack of full cost sharing of avoided disposal costs was a particular issue where savings were needed to support a collection authority’s operating costs; this was seen to dis-incentivise increases in recycling / collections or communications activity.
Suggestions for overcoming the lack of sharing of avoided disposal costs between WDAs and local collection authorities were limited, but the few suggestions made did call for radical change.

An improvement to the structure of the food waste collection with a move to a ‘per tonne’ payment from a ‘flat rate’ system was seen to be a helpful change made by one WDA. Another LA Waste Manager stated that being offered a percentage of material sales income from the WDA had incentivised them.

**Waste Partnership issues**

Waste Partnerships vary in structure; some have been established legally as joint waste disposal authorities but others have been agreed locally as strategic bodies to assist joint working including procurement of services and facilities, enabling economies of scale on contracts and delivery of communications.

Lack of strategic direction within waste partnerships was cited as a barrier by approximately a quarter of the LA Waste Managers. Of those that stated it as a barrier, 26 stated it was of less importance compared to others, 3 stated it was extremely important, 1 stated very important and 1 stated important.

Some partnerships were felt to be tokenistic as they lacked targets and had financial limitations. Rather than a barrier to enabling specific activities the common issue raised was the perception of a lack of funding support from the Partnership or Disposal Authority, particularly at a time when they were under financial pressure. One LA Waste Manager went on to say that despite being part of a waste partnership, due to lack of funding for their work, they had become ineffective in bringing about real change.

“*The County has removed the funding from them [the partnership] so they have influence but no teeth which is an irritant*”

Another LA Waste Manager felt the lack of support from the Waste Disposal Authority made it difficult to introduce new services.

“*Would like to consider food but feel limited by the WDA who are not offering a treatment route for food*”.

Some partnerships had or were planning to look at delivering collections together. However different frequencies and collection methods made this a difficult task. Other authorities said that partnerships they were involved with were constructive in improving recycling, through providing communications support.

Only one LA Waste Manager made a suggestion for how waste partnerships could better help foster improved recycling. This centred on a need for a general improvement in the relationships between the local authorities involved so that costs and benefits could be shared.
“insist that relationships, contracts and payments are investigated and an equitable way forward, with all stakeholders involved, is agreed and actioned”.

Need to make savings by reducing spend on recycling
The need to make savings by reducing spend on recycling was stated by 12 LA Waste Managers as extremely important and 30 stated it as of some importance (12 extremely important, 10 very important, 8 important) to increasing recycling.

Pressure to make savings was a common theme throughout the interviews with LA Waste Managers and one which it was felt would compromise recycling performance - both in terms of tonnage and quality of materials collected.

“When recycling is going down (tonnage/participation), it is not helpful to have to make savings on the service”

“This is another reason for looking at extending co-mingled but is not politically acceptable at the moment [increases contamination]”

Consultancy support had been sourced by a few LA Waste Managers to provide them with guidance on ways to save money on recycling services, which included modelling of options.

Suggestions by LA Waste Managers of changes they could implement to deliver savings or generate additional income included:

- Income
  - charging for garden waste collections
  - charging for charities to dispose of waste
- Savings
  - smarter letting of contracts and fostering competitive bidding
  - moving to alternative weekly collections- estimated savings of £400k by one Local Authority
  - cutting food waste from a food and garden collection service – estimated savings of £0.5million by one Local Authority
  - route optimisation

Collection Contracts e.g. contract term/ inability to vary
Collection contracts were seen by many LA Waste Managers as much less of a barrier to improving performance. Of the 39 LA Waste Managers raising collection contracts as a barrier the majority stated it was less important than other barriers, (30 stating it was less important, 6 stated it was extremely importance and 3 stated it was very important).

In the main the reason for stressing lower importance relates to the opportunity to vary the contract or change terms when the contract is next be renewed.
Collection contracts with inflexible terms were seen as a barrier to expanding or in some cases improving recycling services. One LA Waste Manager mentioned that the authority was tied into a 14.5 year collection contract with no break clauses, suggesting the need in some cases for advice to LA Waste Managers on the specification and design of service contracts to allow for change / flexibility should circumstances require this.

Others stated that long term residual waste treatment contracts for MBT or energy from waste had restricted the ability to implement food collections there was a need for the food waste tonnages to underpin these treatment options.

“The waste partnership also want to keep tonnage (calorific value) for the waste disposal infrastructure.”

Identifying contracts with review clauses was seen as the only way to avoid collection contracts being a major barrier to recycling. These review clause contracts were already in place for many LA Waste Managers.

“There are 4 years left on the contract. There will be the opportunity to review the service in a couple of years’ time, prior to letting the contract again, and things may change as a result”.

Many LA Waste Managers interviewed operated an in-house collection service which meant they did not experience this barrier to any degree.

Absence of targets

Absence of targets for recycling was recognised by some LA Waste Managers as a barrier, with 13 stating it was extremely important, 3 stating very important, 6 stating important and 17 stating it was a barrier but less important.

Both national and local targets were seen as a key driver to increasing recycling as they provided a focus to work towards, and therefore the lack of targets meant a lack of focus.

“We need targets to focus other members on introducing new initiatives and to further explore the food waste collection business case.”

“Targets would refocus members – although they are generally supportive – they are unlikely to restrict bin size soon unless there is a push to improve recycling rates further”.

“We require targets so that county-wide focus is established and recycling moves up priority list for authorities.”

“Recycling targets applied locally would focus politicians to achieve longer than the political life-span between elections.”
One LA Waste Manager referenced recycling targets in the other UK nations, suggesting that England could set more ambitious targets.

“Scotland and Wales are setting ambitious targets and in Wales they [some councils] are consulting on 3 weekly or monthly residual collections with 70% and above targets, whereas Defra is silent and leaving it to local authorities with no guidance and therefore giving the feeling it is not bothered”.

Establishing new statutory recycling targets was raised as the only policy option to overcome the barrier of a lack of local authority specific targets and raise the profile of recycling.

One LA Waste Manager suggested there could be a financial penalty for not meeting local targets, in order to encourage a greater effort to improve recycling performance.

“Fines and targets would help money to be put into developing recycling. With no statutory targets it is the service that is cut where possible”.

Another LA Waste Manager suggested establishing statutory targets would incentivise the introduction of food waste collections. However, others raised barriers relating to the capital and revenue cost, funding new recycling collections is not necessarily a feasible option.

8.2 Additional barriers mentioned

During the interviews with LA Waste Managers a number of barriers raised were recorded as ‘other’ in the survey form. Respondents were not asked to give these barriers an ‘importance score’. These can be grouped into the following themes:

- Policy (National, 26 and Local, 4)
- Householder attitudes and behaviour (21)
- Demography (21)
- Housing type (17)
- Political leadership (National) (17)
- Inconsistency of services (4)

Policy – National

National policy was mentioned under a number of guises by 26 LA Waste Managers (21%) out of the 119 interviewed. The clarity of policy was brought into question by 11 LA Waste Managers, whilst others covered disagreement with how appropriate certain policies and targets are and raised the lack of a policy to enforce recycling. TEEP (as short hand for the Separate Collection requirements) was seen by 8 LA Waste Managers as a barrier to recycling, insofar as it is felt to be unachievable and therefore a barrier to progress for many Authorities.
"back off the implementation of TEEP as it is unrealistic to expect high participation and acceptability to householders on the one hand and low cost on the other if co-mingling is ... unacceptable"

Whilst there are no statutory targets for local authorities the national 50% target, was viewed as influencing the setting of local targets in some areas. The flexibility to adapt recycling targets to local circumstances was specifically raised by 2 LA Managers. An inner city LA Waste Manager felt it was unfair for them to have the same target as out-of-town authorities which have a significantly larger proportion of garden waste to help boost tonnages. Similarly, another authority was unhappy about the cost of introducing particular services in order to meet similar level targets in their region:

“The only way to make a step change is to bring in food waste collection but this is not financially viable for us.”

Finally, a sense of frustration was voiced by two LA Waste Managers over what they saw as a lack empowerment on the part of local authorities to enforce recycling by householders.

“Recycling is an opt-in scheme"

Four LA Waste Managers suggested that Government should set policy and legislation that would lead to producers of packaging using materials that are widely recycled.

“The packaging industry should be held to account for more”.

Policy – Local
Local level policy was seen as less of a barrier compared to national policy, with 4 LA Waste Managers discussing this.

A collection policy experienced by a couple of LA Waste Managers to ‘clear all waste’ from the streets was something that was felt to be contradictory to striving towards increased recycling and encouraging householders to recycle correctly.

“We're not allowed to leave bins behind even if heavily contaminated so the householders are used to having their recycling bins emptied regardless and crews take all side waste”

Fly-tipping policy was also seen as an issue:

“Fly-tipping is cleared up - no incentive to use services properly.”
**Householder attitudes and behaviour**

Householders not being interested in recycling or accepting of service changes were named as barriers, since both have a knock on effect on participation rates and correct use of waste and recycling services. This was raised by 21 of the LA Waste Managers.

**Demography**

Where there were high levels of transient populations, such as in university towns, inner city areas or where seasonal work is common, this was seen as a barrier to increasing participation in recycling. It was the view of 21 LA Waste Managers that where there was a high turnover of householders this contributed to higher contamination of recyclables and incorrect use of services.

Language (i.e. where English is not the first language) was also noted as a barrier to effective recycling in some areas of local authorities.

“Leaflets are printed in 6 different languages but there is a feeling that the language barrier is not always overcome”.

**Housing type**

High density housing stock (particularly terraced housing) and flats were also cited by 17 LA Waste Managers as barriers to recycling. Specifically for terraced housing limited front of property space to store receptacles was raised as a key barrier. In the case of flats, communicating with householders about recycling was acknowledged to be difficult with front doors often inaccessible.

“Door knockers cannot access [flatted] properties as they can’t get past the porter or concierge and the porters/conciegers do not want to talk about or promote recycling.”

Demography and housing type were often mentioned as going hand-in-hand, with hard-to-reach groups often also living in more difficult to service housing stock and flats.

**Political leadership – National**

Political leadership at a national level was discussed specifically by 17 LA Waste Managers (14%) as a barrier to increasing recycling. Of these 17, 9 LA Waste Managers (7%) stated their concerns over a lack of Government leadership. A perceived conflict between the goals of public service delivery and high recycling rates (which fall under different Government departmental remits) leading to a lack of clarity on overall waste policy was raised by a further 8 LA Waste Managers. Among those who raised this issue, there was a perception of “media frenzy” which may have contributed to an ‘anti-recycling’ and ‘anti-Local Authority’ sentiment amongst householders who they felt had been encouraged to expect a weekly residual collection service. The majority of the 17 LA Waste Managers expressed concern that the Government is no longer demonstrating its support for recycling.
“We have heard this [reference to campaign on weekly residual waste collections] on the doorstep as reasons for households not recycling.”

A separate concern related to unfair media attention which reported that materials collected for recycling are not in fact being recycled. LA Waste Managers believed issues like this could benefit from a national response by central government (including Defra) rather than individual Authorities continually having to respond to these issues.

“The media makes the Government look like it doesn’t know what it’s doing. People believe that the waste goes in a hole in the ground in India.”

The 17 LA Waste Managers that specifically raised political leadership as a barrier to recycling sought a clear vision (from Government) on the long term vision for recycling in England and how local authorities can realistically work towards this. This was particularly in the face of what were considered to be very challenging targets proposed by the EU (NB: these were in the news at the time of the interviews but the Circular Economy package is now being re-considered).

“The EU target will be 70% - government needs to step up to the mark and give guidance and leadership on how it is to be achieved as most LAs don’t have the faintest idea.”

There was also a suggestion that there was room for more joining up with planning authorities, including DCLG, to speed up the determination of planning applications for waste infrastructure projects.

**Inconsistency of services**

Several LA Waste Managers voiced concerns about inconsistency in service provision between local authorities leading to contamination of the recycling stream or recycling tonnages not reaching their potential.

“Lack of consistency of approach across all authorities leads to disappointment and reduced participation when householders move from an area where they could recycle a material and then find they cannot when they move. This applies to methods as well. There should be a development opportunity to provide the ability for householders to recycle all materials in the same way”.

One London borough interviewed suggested that streamlining of services could be done at a local/regional level e.g. London-wide or county-wide rather than considering a national overhaul in order to reduce the impact of inconsistency of services as a barrier to increased recycling.
9.0    Further Support

A number of areas where local authorities would benefit from additional support were suggested unprompted by the interviewed Waste Managers. In some cases this was support from WRAP, others suggested support from central government.

It was suggested that WRAP could provide support in relation to the following, however it should be noted that WRAP does currently offer support in some of these areas:

- Separate food waste collections at the kerbside and building the business case for services
- Technical advice on how to reduce operating costs to free up budget to enhance the local service offerings
- Develop and dissemination of case studies or lessons learnt specifically regarding refuse collection frequency and whether it drives up recycling and/or quality
- Assistance in building a business case to release budget for capital expenditure
- Advice on communications and getting the right messages out there to inspire the public to become fully engaged in recycling
- Advise on effective alternative communications methods to leafleting
- A national communication campaign
- Training support for local authority officers in relation to marketing and procurement skills to help them to make the best deals
- Guidance on ways to save money on recycling collection services
- Advice on collecting glass as part of a kerbside service in the context to TEEP
- General research and evidence particularly from pilots which help demonstrate the practicalities of implementation.

It was suggested that support from central government could include:

- Capital grants to cover start-up costs (to help initiate new services)
- Funding support for staff
- Funding for communications
- Establishing statutory targets to incentivise the introduction of food waste collections
- Funding to help with consultancy costs to model options to generate savings whilst increasing recycling
- Support for interventions to stabilise material prices to limit fluctuations
- Introduce legal requirements on producers of packaging to use materials that are widely recycled e.g. stop the production of black plastic
- Provide a clear vision and develop long term policy objectives for recycling in England and how local authorities can realistically work towards this
- Speeding up decisions on planning applications for waste infrastructure projects
- Consider the suitability of a one-size-fits-all waste and recycling service across England
10.0 Gaps, key limitations and areas that could benefit from further research

This research considered responses from 119 LA Waste Managers covering 139 local authorities, which through a comparison of key characteristics has been shown to be broadly representative of local authorities in England. However, as is always the case with voluntary surveys, there were a number of LA Waste Managers unable to take part in the research for a number of reasons.

In a few instances, the Head of Service (or equivalent) passed the survey to a less senior officer. The experience of these officers differed and they were less able in some cases to provide all of the information that a Head of Service might have been able to. In some other instances, local authorities were in a state of change and the interim managers in place were unable to provide an in-depth response for the local authority. Some simply stated they did not have the time to take part in the survey.

A further limitation of this research was that it was completed partly over the summer holiday months. If the time frame had been extended, the sample size of local authorities could have also been increased, although as indicated the achieved sample appears to reflect a representative set fairly well.

The focus of the survey was in the main on kerbside services. More prompting on other services such as HWRCs or bring banks might have provided further insight.

An area that may benefit from further research could include an evaluation of the support available based on the local authorities’ suggestions for ways to help address barriers.

To provide further insight into the drivers, the question could have probed further and asked respondents to rank the drivers where multiple drivers were discussed. However, it was recognised that striking the balance between survey length and eliciting quality responses from busy senior staff was difficult to achieve.

It is possible that some respondents may have withheld some information in their responses when interviewed by WRAP’s Recycling and Collections Advisers if they felt a negative attitude might affect their likelihood of receiving WRAP support in future. However, there was no difference in mood reported between those interviews conducted by WRAP and those by independent contractors.
Appendix

Appendix A: Further details of planned changes

How changes will be rolled out

LA Waste Managers were asked how the planned service changes would be implemented. Since the degree of planning for each of the service changes would vary in each Local Authority, the level of detail the LA Waste Manager was able to provide on the roll out varied. For just over a third of proposed changes implementation plans were yet to be confirmed which can be seen from Figure 13. However, where details were known, half of the LA Waste Managers were planning to implement changes in a full roll out to all households. Phasing the introduction of service changes, expanding services or running trials appear to be less common.

Figure 13: Implementation of Planned Changes
Timescale for implementation of planned changes

The timescale for the implementation of the planned changes can be seen in Figure 14. The majority of planned changes are due to be implemented in 2015/16, with 98 changes to be made. Changes in 2014/15 and 2016/17 were less common with 25 and 26 planned changes being made and even less in 2017/18 with only 4 planned.

Figure 14: Timescale for implementation of planned service changes

The most common time for changes to be rolled out is April 2015 and January 2016. Many of the changes will be introduced at the start of the new financial year. Post April 2016, only a handful of changes are planned.

Planned service change tonnage forecast

LA Waste Managers were asked to provide details of tonnage forecasts for each of the proposed service changes should it be available. In the majority of cases, this was unknown. However in some cases the increase or decrease in tonnage as a result of the service change was provided, as shown in Figure 15.
Figure 15: Impact of Proposed Service Changes Tonnage Forecast
Appendix B: Communication and engagement activities

Website pages
Website pages were the most popular tool to communicate recycling and collection services with 96 of respondents stating they are currently using them. Web pages are used mainly to provide information on collection services, including service change notices, however there are also instances of using the website to:

- Host a re-use exchange
- Display videos which explain the recycling process

The majority of Waste Managers stated webpages were ‘maintained’ and kept up to date with relevant information about the service. Only two Waste Managers stated they were actively promoting webpages.

Calendars
Calendars were being provided by 84 of the respondents authorities. The majority were providing a calendar annually, however three authorities were providing a calendar every other year to save costs. The calendar was the sole communication with householders for three authorities, whilst a further nine used calendars but only alongside other ‘free’ communications routes including websites and social media.

Providing collections calendars online was stated by 16 Waste Managers, and whilst a hard copy was available, for most one was provided on a request basis only.

“Now available on-line as a cost saving, no longer sending them out but will be sent to those who request one. It is also available in all council outlets”.

Two authorities were going to stop issuing calendars. Reasons for stopping the issuing of a calendar were either cost related or because it was seen there was no need, as the service was ‘simple’.

“Currently under consideration to stop [calendars] as a cost saving exercise as costs £50K. However there may be a service cost for not doing so”.

“Stopped this year - £26K saving but available online”.

“No calendars as scheme is weekly and very simple, with no bank holiday delivery”.

Social Media
Social media was being used by 80 of the authorities interviewed with a further two looking at introducing it as a communication tool.

Facebook and Twitter were the two most commonly mentioned social media routes for waste and recycling communications and in the majority of cases were council-wide
resources that could be tapped into. One specific example of how Twitter was being used was to notify followers of last minute service changes.

Many respondents said that their authorities planned to make increasing use of social media as a communications tool.

“Not used as effectively as it could - looking into doing more.”

“Tendency to be reactive, but this is improving.”

However there was recognition that its reach was limited:

“[Social media] Used to a degree but recognise that there is a rural and older population who may not have access to social media so there are limitations using this engagement method here”.

One Waste Manager said that Twitter and Facebook feeds had replaced leaflets.

Leafleting
69 of the respondents reporting using leaflets, with one Waste Manager looking at introducing leaflets.

Of those Waste Managers distributing leaflets, 17 did so only for what they considered to be a ‘needs must’ basis, in order to communicate a service change or to inform new householders to the area of general service information. Another reason prompting some authorities to leaflet was to reduce contamination; informing householders of the correct way to recycle.

Due to budget cuts, nine LA Waste Managers discussed delivering leaflets as part of a targeted campaign to those areas they felt needed the communication rather than to all households. The areas targeted included those with poor recycling rates and high contamination. There was also a decision by three LA Waste Managers to reduce distribution costs by making leaflets available on-line.

On two occasions, LA Waste Managers said leaflets were used as a tool to communicate with communities for whom English is not their first language. These leaflets were pictorial so as to avoid language barriers and translation costs.

One LA Waste Manager had taken the opportunity to use leafleting as a way to thank householders for their efforts which had led to increased recycling rates.

The means of distributing leaflets was not restricted to door to door drops. Methods included:
- Delivering leaflet with sacks/ recycling bags
- Insert in council magazine
Collection crews delivering leaflets to households where contamination noticed to be an issue

Information on how to recycle within the Council Tax bill

Web based leaflets which householders can download and print out:

“We're trying to get people to look online but they can request one [a leaflet] and it will be sent to them.”

Work to address contamination

Work to address contamination is being carried out by 48 LA Waste Managers with 5 looking at introducing this kind of work.

The issuing of stickers or hangers on bins to inform householders that they have contaminated their recycling or residual waste was the most popular method for dealing with contamination. For many LA Waste Manager this was the sole action they took, whilst for others a multi-staged approach was adopted.

“Reject bag, pop card through the door and refuse crew remove the bag later in the day. If it happens a second time in a 3 month period then a visit to the property is made. If it happens a third time then they get a letter - rarely comes to this.”

There was a clear division as to whether contaminated containers/bags would be collected. Some LA Waste Managers were opting to sort the contamination at the kerbside and take away the waste/recycling there and then. Others would instruct their residual waste crews to collect the contaminated recycling and other LA Waste Managers would leave the containers/bags to be dealt with by the householder with a communication describing the issue.

“Initially tagged by the crew and letter delivered and bin collected by the residual team later in the day… Politically and logistically not acceptable to leave the waste after the due day of collection.”

One LA Waste Manager decided to take a phased approach to the acceptance and rejection of contaminated containers.

“Yellow warning label administered and bin emptied, or red warning label and bin refused”.

Finally, there was one LA Waste Manager that took a more extreme approach to contamination enforcement, in the case of repeat offenders, by removing recycling bins altogether.

Providing a reactive telephone information service to householders found to have contaminated was widely used.

“Bins are tagged and when householders call customer services they get told what should be in the bin”.
“A card is put through the door and that generates a phone call, so we get to speak to the customer and explain how to use the service properly.”

Advice on recycling was also delivered at the doorstep, either by collection crew members, recycling officers or members of council enforcement teams.

However, despite what was considered to be a lot of effort going in to reducing contamination, the long term benefit of this work was not clear to some LA Waste Managers.

“[Work to reduce contamination] has brought down contamination levels to just over 10%. However the feeling is that if we stop this, contamination will just go up again.”

There were many local authorities however, where contamination was considered too low to warrant any management.

“Kerbside sort collection methodology results in good quality recyclables with very little in the way of contamination”.

Door to Door engagement
Door to door engagement is being carried out by 57 of the respondents authorities’, however 3 are looking at stopping this kind of activity, which is the highest of all those looking to stop an activity.

The most common reason for carrying out door to door engagement was in response to contamination issues (as highlighted through compositional analyses); poor participation levels (also identified through monitoring); or as part of the roll out of a new scheme or trial scheme. In most cases this activity was targeted and not carried out across the whole authority due to the resources required.

Whilst door to door engagement was viewed as a valuable tool in the main, one authority did not share this opinion:

“It [door to door engagement] has been done in the past with no real value – people have asked for bins and then not used them.”

Public Relations (PR)
57 local authorities stated they were carrying out and will continue to do PR exercises.

PR activity included the issue of press releases, carrying out interviews on local radio and writing council magazine articles or articles for free newspapers.

Provision of free liners for food waste services
Provision of liners was the lowest of all the engagement activities stated, with 19 providing liners, 2 looking to introduce them and 1 looking to stop providing liners
altogether. 63 of the LA Waste Managers surveyed provide a food waste service, therefore just under a third are providing free liners.

Where liners were being provided free of charge, this was mainly as part of the launch of a new food waste recycling scheme i.e. starter packs, and not continuous. However, some authorities were providing an unlimited supply that could be collected at local hubs such as libraries and post offices, or were delivered to the doorstep on request. One Local Authority did mention however that their ‘continual free supply model’ is not sustainable and they are currently assessing options.

One LA Waste Manager provided free liners for flats only, in an attempt to encourage participation which was much lower compared to other types of housing. Another LA Waste Manager reported that their authority had started selling ‘affordable’ liners, when their market research identified that food liners in supermarkets had increased significantly in price.

Other communications
Throughout the discussion with the LA Waste Managers, other communications tools were referred to including:

- Council Magazines (x8)
- Roadshows (x7)
- Bin information stickers (x6)
- Incentive schemes (x5, including three where a property is randomly selected each round and if they have presented their waste correctly they receive a cash/voucher prize)
- Working with schools (x4)
- Attendance at community events (x2)
- Letters to householders (x2 re: garden waste subscription service)
- Community consultations (x2)
- Partnership working with social and private landlords (x2)
- Radio advertising (x2)
- Recycling wheel (x2)
- Panels on vehicles
- Text messaging service to students
- Advertise in local paper
- Online event (to help to promote recycling)
- Bin hangers at Christmas
- Email alerts for collection reminders
- Grants for community groups in getting recycling projects off the ground
- Recycling guide
- Working with contractors/housing providers on new build estates (to ensure the communications is in place when householders move in).

Further detail of monitoring activities carried out by local authorities
**Compositional Analysis**

Compositional analysis of recycling and residual waste streams was being carried out and will be maintained by 48 LA Waste Managers, with 5 looking at introducing this.

Compositional analysis tended to be commissioned by county councils or waste partnerships. In terms of frequency, annually was most popular, followed by biennially (every 2 years) and biannually (twice a year) although some LA Waste Managers mentioned not having done this for 5 years or more. Others however, relied on feedback from MRFs to monitor their contamination levels in dry recycling.

Reasons for carrying out a compositional analysis included:

- Providing data which would identify poorly performing areas in terms of contamination which authorities could then target with communications;
- Providing data that could inform options for new service needs;
- Providing valuable data to waste contractors during the procurement of new services contracts.

**Participation monitoring**

Participation monitoring was being carried out by 36 LA Waste Managers with 7 looking to implement this type of work.

Whilst some LA Waste Managers said they had no budget to resource this, those that did carry out participation monitoring did:

- Via waste management contractors (i.e. it was part of the contract and often included a communications response to target poor participation levels);
- Using in-cab technology in collection vehicles, which flags up when bins/boxes are not presented (although this relies on the front line crews feeding back information where bins are not put out);
- On an “ad-hoc” basis e.g. in the lower performing areas or to monitor the impact of a new service. Few authorities carried out participation monitoring on a regular basis.

“No monitoring is scheduled in, it's more on an ad hoc basis because of the cost, and is often focused on specific projects”.

One LA Waste Manager was considering doing more participation monitoring in the future as they could see value in terms of informing how to effectively target specific aspects of the service:

“You could gather evidence regarding garden and food waste collections, to enable more flexibility e.g. reducing vehicles in the winter.”

**Householder Surveys**

Surveys was the least used monitoring approach with only 21 LA Waste Managers stating they were undertaking surveys, a further 4 were looking at introducing surveys.
Whilst just under one fifth of LA Waste Managers interviewed said that surveys were still taking place with their householders, this may be an underestimate as many mentioned piggy-backing on council-wide surveys.

“No formal survey - if anyone contacts the council they are asked a series of survey questions of which waste questions are included”.

“Questions are input to the Citizens Panel”.

The frequency at which surveys are conducted varied from every few years to multiple surveys a year, with some waste contractors carrying this out as part of a collection contract.

Surveys were seen as an engagement tool and a means of getting feedback to inform the future of waste and recycling services, including gathering opinion on new services.

“We want to engage with householders, to find out what they like, what might be acceptable in the future in terms of changing the system”

“We’re trying to find out what services are more important to people”

Survey methods used covered online, telephone, door to door and face to face at HWRCs.
Appendix C: Local Authority Questionnaire

Local Authority Questionnaire 2014

Objectives:
- To understand what service changes local authorities have in the pipeline in order to inform the contribution that the changes may make to the 2020 recycling target;
- To better understand local authority response to barriers to increasing household recycling; and
- To identify what support the local authority may need to increase household recycling.

Scope:
- Information gathered covers local authority collected “household” waste as defined by the Controlled Waste Regulations 2012.

Method and target interviewee:
- The contact at the LA was a senior manager, e.g. Head of Service or Director
- Questions were open and probing, with analysis predominantly qualitative.
- Interviewers, where possible, categorised the response to allow for quantitative analysis.
- Responses were entered into the form provided with as much detail as possible.
- Some categories and prompts for responses were suggested, but other responses provided were added.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of authority</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of interviewer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact/ interviewee name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Summary of existing service: | In brief, what services are currently provided (info should be taken from the portal and confirmed with the authority) |
1. **What service changes are you planning to make to your waste/recycling in the next five years (2014/15-2019/20)?**

   Notes. Include all changes that are beyond ideas stage and have been discussed in strategy/local plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorisation/prompt</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRY Add a material/s to current system</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Specify material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRY Change collection system from current profile</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Specific system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRY Change collection frequency</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Specify material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRY Increase capacity of containment</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Specify which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRY Stop a service</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Specify service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIC Change to garden waste charging</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>From what to what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIC Add/ remove material to garden, e.g. food, card</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>From what to what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIC Change collection frequency</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>From what to what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOD Introduce liners</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Specify system – whether free or not and method of distribution/access to liners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOD Introduce food collection</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Specify service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOD Stop or amend a service</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Specify service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFUSE Change frequency</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Specify frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFUSE Change containment</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>From what to what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any others</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any others</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **What service changes are you likely to make?** This question will tell us how likely it is that changes will happen and how they might be implemented. This will provide information in order to make more accurate forecasts as well as getting a clearer understanding of what the drivers are for changes.

### Notes

Cut and paste the services changes which you have said YES to above into the rows below. Add more rows if needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service change</th>
<th>On a scale of 1-4, how likely is it that the changes will go ahead?</th>
<th>Outline month/year of implementation.</th>
<th>How will changes be rolled out?</th>
<th>What are the drivers for service changes?</th>
<th>Any expected tonnage info/data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>1 = Definite – cabinet approval 2 = Fairly certain – senior management approval to take to cabinet 3 = Likely to happen - scoping the issues 4 = Uncertain – investigating options?</td>
<td>e.g. it will be rolled out to 100% of target dwellings within 6 months</td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial e.g. to save money Environmental e.g. divert waste from landfill Political Social e.g. provide a consistent service across the LA area, respond to demand</td>
<td>If available provide any forecasted tonnage data. Also include some commentary on how the figures were derived.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service change x

Service change y

Service change z

MM/YY
3. **What are the barriers to increasing recycling in your area?** This question will tell us what the barriers are to making any further service developments and what might overcome them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ask un-prompted. Categorise responses</th>
<th>Score 1-5; 1 = very important</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>What would help to overcome this barrier?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital expenditure e.g. vehicles, infrastructure, containers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue expenditure e.g. operating costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of incentive from WDA e.g. lack of recycling credits/issue with levy system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to make savings by reducing spend on recycling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulking up, haulage, treatment or disposal infrastructure issues e.g. location, space, cost, lack of provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal and treatment contracts e.g. type of contract, treatment, term, inability to vary, min tonnage etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection contracts e.g. contract term/ inability to vary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Partnership direction/ issues with etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal staff resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **What plans do you have for engagement within and monitoring of existing services?** This question will help to provide info on any expected change in current performance based on their engagement and monitoring activities. Also help to inform us what type of support might be required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prompts and categorisation of responses</th>
<th>Now (yes/no)</th>
<th>Stop</th>
<th>Maintain</th>
<th>Introduce/Expand</th>
<th>Explanatory notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compositional analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free liners for food waste</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door stepping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leafleting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website pages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other comms activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address contamination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>