



LINCOLNSHIRE WASTE PARTNERSHIP

21 SEPTEMBER 2011

REPORT REFERENCE: **2.2**

SUBJECT:	LOVE FOOD HATE WASTE CAMPAIGN
REPORT BY:	DOUGLAS ROBINSON
CONTACT NO:	01522 554816

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Lincolnshire Love Food Hate Waste Campaign was conducted from November 2010 – March 2011. Post campaign monitoring found that whilst the campaign did not meet the original objectives a number of successes were noted.

This report summarises the campaign and its impacts and proposes how a lower level of ongoing activity can be maintained.

DISCUSSIONS

Events summary

55 events were delivered across the County and 5600 people reached directly. To engage with the maximum amount of people a range of events was organised and delivered over a variety of different times, including evening and weekends.

Experience from other authorities suggested that campaign events and messages need to reoccur in order to gain maximum impact and behaviour change.

Monitoring and Evaluation

As part of the WRAP funding MEL Research were employed to conduct pre and post campaign monitoring to evaluate the campaign. The survey was a door knocking exercise, where residents were asked a series of multiple choice questions.

All results were based on the answers that residents gave to the questions; no waste compositional analysis was conducted.

Due to limited timescales, the post campaign monitoring was conducted before the programme of events had been completed. Although this is not best practice, this could not be avoided due to the terms and conditions, and deadlines of the funding and the end of the WRAP 3 year business plan.

The key findings of the pre and post-campaign surveys:

Overall, the proportion of Committed Food Waste Reducers (CFWRs) across Lincolnshire in the post-campaign was 17%, compared with 20% in the pre-campaign survey and 16% nationally (from the national tracker survey that was carried out in February and March 2010).

Post-campaign South Holland has the highest proportion of CFWRs at 23% increasing from 21% pre-campaign. The lowest proportion of CFWRs was found in Lincoln at 10% decreasing from 14% pre-campaign.

Post-campaign the proportion of CFWRs is above the national 12 month rolling average in the districts of South Holland (23%), North Kesteven (21%), South Kesteven (17%) and Boston (17%).

Between the pre-campaign (2010) and the post-campaign (2011) the total estimate of cumulative reduction in food waste away from landfill is 757 tonnes.

Headline results:

Overall, post-campaign 61% of respondents stated that they throw 'hardly any or no' food away, compared with 58% pre-campaign and 60% nationally, representing an increase of 3% points.

Almost two fifths (39%) stated that they are bothered a 'great deal' by throwing food away, a decrease since the pre-campaign (45%) but more than nationally (26%).

Over one third (35%) stated post-campaign that they go to a 'great deal' of effort to minimise food waste, decreasing from 40% since the pre-campaign survey and compared with 36% nationally.

Whilst recall of promotional campaigns about food waste over the last year fell in Lincolnshire to 27% from 36% pre-campaign, below the national average of 53%, recognition of specific logos increased.

Recognition of the LFHW white on green logo increased from 8% pre-campaign to 17% post-campaign and recognition of the 'Recycle for Lincolnshire' logo increased from 28% pre-campaign to 55% post-campaign.

In the post-campaign there was an increase in the proportion of respondents who remembered seeing information about food waste in council publications from 35% pre-campaign to 40% post-campaign and who had seen information on billboards and

outdoor signs (from 34% pre-campaign to 53% post-campaign).

In addition 5% of respondents remembered seeing the county council funded 'bus backs' and other respondents remembered seeing information on waste collection vehicles, demonstrating the impact of the council sponsored vehicle signs on Agripa-equipped vehicles.

Analysis of post campaign results

The post campaign research has indicated that the campaign did not meet the original objectives, although it did have a number of successes.

WRAP have provided additional background information to share with partners to help explain some of the results.

Food waste behaviour change (and behaviour change in general) is a complex area. It is also a long term goal not a 'quick fix'.

WRAP is curious about some of the results from the Lincolnshire post-campaign research, as there are some puzzling results.

Other local LFHW research has thrown up some unusual results as well – but this is usually in connection with the number of CFWRs. From past research experience WRAP has found that where CFWR figures are higher than the national average before a LFHW campaign, they are sometimes lower after the campaign. WRAP is aware of this anomaly and has developed a new matrix (explained in the Lincolnshire research document) in an attempt to report more accurately on the level of CFWRs.

It appears that the preliminary findings from the national tracker (WRAP's research into national attitudes and behaviour in connection to food waste) are showing that general awareness of LFHW has fallen slightly between autumn 2010 and now.

There are various possible reasons for the reduction in awareness nationally and in Lincolnshire (and these wouldn't have been picked up through post-campaign research). Overall awareness of food waste issues in August/September and October 2010 seems to have been high. This may be due to the BBC programme 'Great British Menu' (aired in August) and the print media coverage of food waste issues which followed. There was also a peak in visits to the WRAP LFHW website around 22 October 2010, indicating an increase in general awareness/interest in food waste issues. These coincide with the pre-campaign research in Lincolnshire (which was carried out from 27 September to 18 October) and could have influenced the pre-campaign research.

The Lincolnshire LFHW activity was a short campaign – just over six months in total including setting up contacts and employing engagement officers. It may be that the post-campaign research was carried out too soon after the campaign was completed (in fact there were still activities going on while the research was underway). This was unavoidable because of the funding deadlines and the money having to be spent before the end of March 2011, but tracking on-going changes in food waste behaviour would be helpful in Lincolnshire.

Future of Love Food Hate Waste campaign

There are different ways of how LFHW messages can continue to be promoted which is dependant on available budgets, and the willingness of the district council's to support it both in terms of financial contributions and officer time.

Low cost option:

Existing events - making information leaflets, recipe cards and other LFHW resources available at all shows/ events that Environmental Services/ district councils may be involved with and any other complementary events. The amount of events that occur might be low and the effectiveness of having these messages alongside other messages may result in dilution of all the messages being promoted.

Press releases – LCC and districts utilising the WRAP press release templates and sending them out via the normal communications channels.

Information on website – ensuring that the information on the Recycle for Lincolnshire website is regularly refreshed. Districts would also need to update their websites.

Information in council publications – A unified approach to including articles in County and district publications when space permits.

Complementary events: LFHW messages and information have already been disseminated to the Lincolnshire Food Group who are implementing programmes through the Health and Well Being fund. These programmes aim to encourage people to eat a more healthy diet and grow their own. LFHW messages could be considered to be complimentary to these programmes. It should however be noted that the main purpose of these events is to do with health and well being.

A low cost option would require less commitment from the districts, but would mean that LFHW messages were continued to be promoted although the strength of messages would be less.

Medium/ high cost option: In order to develop and delivery further specific LFHW awareness raising events district council support both in terms of financial contributions and staff time would be required. The Community Engagement officers were only available through WRAP funding and have since left the employment of the County Council. It would also require additional budget if cookery demonstration were to be undertaken.

A medium/ high cost option would require commitment from all partners to develop and delivery the programme, but would result in a greater amount of behaviour change.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The LWP is recommended to:

1. To support the low cost option as a way of continuing the Love Food Hate Waste campaign.