

# LWARB brand strategy review

## Questions & answers on the brief:

**How would you say you were currently perceived e.g. as an environmental arm of local government, a private-public body aimed at assisting a wide range of audiences or a type of advice centre/consultancy... or some mix of these?**

A mix of these, depending on who you ask. The main perception we suspect is that we are a public sector body, closely connected to the Mayor, a part of local government working closely with local authorities to help with waste and recycling issues. But we might be increasingly seen as more of a private-public body amongst businesses that we work with, as well as behaviour change campaigners and business consultancy providers to SMEs (and larger corporates – but this is very early stage work). We'd like the stakeholder analysis part of this work to give us some more robust evidence here; and the work as a whole should help us position ourselves in future as a catalyst for systemic change.

**In the first paragraph of your brief, you mention '(potentially) restructure our brand portfolio'. Can you explain what you mean by this?**

We're looking for analysis, insights and support in working out if we have the right brands, if there are too many or too few, if they're achieving the right things with the right audiences, etc. The output of that work might be a restructured brand architecture, or different brands, or both.

**In your 2018-20 Business plan you talk about three arms of LWARB – Resource London, Advance London and Circular London. However, in your brief, Advance London appears to have been 'demoted' (though is clearly related to Circular London by its branding/logo). Is there a reason for this?**

Advance London is an ERDF-funded business support programme that sits within Circular London. It has its own brand/name for purely historical reasons – one of which is that we used to have three programmes which included an investment programme (since dismantled) and the current Advance London SME support programme. As Advance London delivers against Circular London objectives, it now sits within that area and is (in brand terms) subservient to it.

**There are a range of other 'entities' (existing and future) mentioned in your briefing pack, for example LWARB Circular Solutions. Do you see your future brand architecture incorporating some or all of these?**

LWARB Circular Solutions is a working title for a new commercial entity, through which we aim to commercialise some aspects of what we do, with the goal of becoming more financially sustainable by the end of our next 5-year business plan period. This brand strategy work has been commissioned alongside a piece of commercial exploration, which is looking at what prospects we have for generating revenue for what we do now and in the future. We want the two pieces of work to connect, as our new brand strategy has to help us deliver any commercial services we offer in future.

**Though your campaigns are not part of this brief, do you think there may be a need for some form of overt endorsement by LWARB in the future?**

I can't see that currently being necessary – or helpful – with London's citizens. But happy to explore.

**With our imminent withdrawal from the EU, what is your latest thinking on how much that will impact on funding and other types of support for LWARB?**

We have a number of projects currently funded by the EU – and those will continue through to the contracted end of the project. But future funding from the EU post-Brexit depends upon agreements with the EU and UK and cannot be relied upon. We are hoping that the UK government will provide funding to replace some of what will be lost; but we'll be looking at a wide range of funding options including commercial partnerships, foundation funding etc.

**Can you tell us more about the extent of your long-term ambitions outside London?**

We have not defined those ambitions yet. We clearly have something to offer other cities, both in the UK and beyond, and this will be explored as part of the next phase of our development.

**What do you feel the balance required is in this programme of work between (i) providing a sense of unity across all your initiatives, and (ii) clarifying the naming and brand architecture? Which is more important to you or are they equally important?**

They're both very important – but the first is probably more so.

**Your brief talks about assessing 'current stakeholder perceptions to feed into brand development'. Do you have information on these already? Do you have a current view on the level of consultation that would be desirable in terms of numbers of people you would want us to contact and involve?**

We have a stakeholder survey for one of our programmes (Resource London), which will feed in to our thinking. Given timelines and budgets, the level of stakeholder consultation element of this brief is likely to be limited – but we'd like to hear from you about what you think is achievable.

**Who at LWARB would be involved in the day-to-day programme and what would their roles be?**

Ali Moore, head of communications and behaviour change, is the lead contact on this project, supported by Isabella Kima, corporate communications lead. However the whole SMT (there are 6 of us) will need to be involved at key stages, and the whole LWARB team will need to be engaged in January as part of our 'values and culture' away-day. Details of this will be made available to (as well as co-developed with) the successful bidder, who will be expected to participate in part of that day.

**What is driving the timeline for completion by 11<sup>th</sup> February?**

We are taking a final business plan back to the Board in mid-February and we would like to take a firm brand proposal with it, to show how we will position and communicate what we do with key audiences, stakeholders and customers.

**Obviously we would like to have access to as many and diverse stakeholders as we can, do you foresee any problems scheduling sessions before Christmas?**

That is definitely a possibility. We may need to be flexible around the end date for Phase 1 of the work; please put in a timeline that you feel is achievable.

**What will success look like at the culmination of this project and beyond?**

A clear brand structure, understood and signed up to by our Board and the whole LWARB team, with a powerful, unifying brand proposition that we can all deliver with passion (and without confusion).

**What types of research do you have regarding stakeholder insights - their needs and any current perceptions of your brands?**

See above – we have a stakeholder survey that we run every two years about Resource London.

**The role of co-branding - do you foresee co-branding opportunities within the focus areas to endorse good practice?**

Possibly – but this is one to explore once we have clarity around our own brand and its value.

**What is the perception of your current logo/s? For example are there any practical implementation issues or particular perceptions you want to overcome?**

They are not particularly differentiating; and our parent (LWARB) brand is a little institutionalised. The green is not well liked internally and feels predictable for a sustainability organisation. None of them seem entirely fit to support our commercialisation.

**What are the key applications (digital, non-digital, environmental) for the brand to help stimulate behavioural change, both now and in the future e.g. gamification of circular choices?**

The brands that this brief is focused on are our 'corporate' or B2B brands, and as such they don't have a wider behaviour change objective. The corporate and programme brands are to enable effective conversations and collaborations with local government, policy-makers, corporates, small businesses, financial institutions and the third sector – so key applications are website, social media, podcast, case studies, reports, media out-reach, presentations and events.

**Is there an informal verbal shortcut that people use when talking about LWARB?**

We refer to it as 'LWARB' (pronounced 'elwarb') with anyone who knows us already; and as 'the London Waste and Recycling Board' with those who don't.

**What would you say are the commonalities across all brands and why do they need to be different?**

The commonalities are around shared objectives: to make London a world-leading low carbon circular city, by reducing waste and increasing recycling. The audiences or stakeholders for our two programmes tend to vary: Resource London is our local authority support programme; and Circular London speaks mainly to business. But this will need to change as we seek to mainstream circular economy thinking and practice across London businesses and to London's citizens. It is our intention to integrate the two programmes and "desilo" the staff. Both talk to policy-makers; and both occasionally talk across a range of audiences.

**What is the appetite for blowing apart the stereotypes of sustainability and waste?**

Interesting question – we believe that traditional sustainability as practised merely prolongs an unsustainable "linear" economy. Trying to popularise and simplify the term "circular economy" is a challenge. So the appetite is probably quite big amongst employees; possibly less so amongst Board members. We would like to push the boundaries of what is possible as long as it can help us deliver our objectives.

**Can the three examples of previous brand work that is asked for in the response be in an appendix, additional to the 8 pages specified?**

Yes.

**Can you provide the full contract Ts & Cs including any requirements for insurance?**

Yes – this will be put up on our website alongside this Q&A.

**What is your inhouse design, marcomms capacity? How big is the team?**

We have no in-house design or marcomms capacity, other than for the creation of our podcast, PR and social media materials. All other creative work is contracted out. As a result the communications team is small: one corporate comms officer, and four working on consumer behaviour change, with a head of communications and behaviour change working across both corporate and consumer.

**Can you give an overview of your stakeholder groups, the number of them and are they all London or UK based?**

See various questions above and below: stakeholders are primarily London but policy-makers include Defra. We also collaborate with other cities (usually via the city administration / municipalities), both in the UK and globally.

**The brief mentions “simplify and clarify our current name”, do you anticipate this to involve going through new naming process? If so, does it apply to all the sub brands?**

Possibly, if the analysis shows that it's needed. We are open to discussion and this is why we have issued this invitation to tender: to investigate and decide on the optimum brand strategy, proposition, architecture and naming.

**Based on current architecture, would renaming LWARB affect the programme names and brands?**

Yes, almost definitely – but the way in which it would affect the programmes would depend on *why* we changed the LWARB name, and to what. We hope this process will flush that out.

**Could you detail the stakeholders who would need to be involved in the project?**

See various answers above, but they include and are not limited to: the Mayor of London; London's councils; our Board; small businesses based in London; larger corporates with offices in London; Business Improvement Districts; financial institutions and districts; waste disposal authorities; waste businesses; Defra; WRAP; third sector organisations in the sustainability space.

**What do you anticipate the stakeholder analysis to be?**

We would like your response to suggest an approach to stakeholder analysis and will co-develop it with the successful bidder.

**How would you want to take the proposal to your Board? To stakeholders first, then the Board? Or vice versa?**

Preferably we would take a range of options to stakeholders and then make a single recommendation to the Board; but we may need to take the same range of options to the Board with a recommendation informed by stakeholder feedback.

**Regarding the logo change, do you expect it to be an evolution or revolution?**

We're not sure currently – but we're willing to consider both. See question above on blowing apart stereotypes.

**Logo design itself – refreshed logo or logos – does that apply to the main brand or the programme brands too?**

The whole portfolio – parent brand and programme brands. It's all up for grabs at this stage.

**No creative work on specific channels is required - but you want a slide deck - could we use a 'new look & feel' on the deck to show how the creative direction might go?**

Yes, that would be really helpful; but we would reserve the decision-making around creative direction for the next stage of work (to be procured in the new financial year).

**Could you elaborate on who the key stakeholders are for this project (both internal and external) and the priority audiences you would like to involve.**

See various answers above.

**An understanding of the wider audiences for the project would be useful too, even if they aren't involved directly in the consultation.**

International businesses of all kinds that are engaging with circular economy and climate change; academic institutions; cities and countries around the world who participate in events and projects with us (as well as those who currently do not).

**Is the phase 1 delivery deadline hard/fixed? For example, if the end deadline was still met, would there be flexibility with the dates for phases 1 or 2?**

We recognise that timelines are extremely tight in the brief, and we are willing to be flexible. Ideally all deliverables would be ready by the deadline specified (11<sup>th</sup> February); how we get there is something we will be guided on.

**What has helped LWARB develop from a small public sector body into a circular economy change maker?**

A shift in focus over the past few years has led us to develop projects designed to accelerate the transition to a circular economy in London (e.g. our Advance London programme; our accelerator; and our work with corporates through projects such as CIRCE and Circular Fashion Fast Forward) and make investments in circular economy businesses through Circularity Capital and the Greater London Investment Fund. All of this follows from our production of the first ever city-focused Circular Economy Route Map in 2016, which has set the framework and direction for our work ever since. EU and other funding has also helped us grow in size and scope.

**Do audiences struggle with LWARB the acronym and understanding what you really do?**

Yes.

**The brief mentions you want a brand to attract partners, who would be an example of an ideal partner?**

Depending on the focus area, it could be a large corporate; a major financial institution or district; another global city; a network of change-makers; or a significant event or programme of change on a global scale to tackle climate change. We also want to attract delivery partners, who can collaborate with us to work with corporates and build our capacity and skills.

**Who would you compete against in a commercial consultancy space?**

We would compete against small, specialist consultancies who work with businesses to re-engineer their linear business models to circular ones; or who work with organisations to facilitate behaviour change, both internally and externally. We would not aim to compete with bigger consultancies as we have a small team and very specific expertise and experience.

**What are the most challenging issues facing LWARB as an organisation?**

The ability to make a significant impact with limited resources; the complexity of our stakeholder 'landscape'; and funding beyond 2025.

**In the new strategy, are any significantly new audiences likely to be targeted or any radical departures or change in what you currently do?**

This is currently being worked through in our business planning process and is hard to say at this stage, but our focus will remain very clearly on delivering the objectives outlined in previous answers – i.e. making London a low carbon circular city by reducing waste and increasing recycling. Work will continue in our three competency areas: policy development and implementation; access to finance and business support; and behaviour change. But in order to achieve all this, we will need to find new sources of revenue – potentially beyond London and the UK – to help fund our ability to meet our objectives in London.

**Who are the core audiences you want the core brand to focus on? How engaged do you feel they are with the LWARB brand and /or the programs?**

See above for stakeholders. We have two branches of our work: that which is statutorily required of us; and that which broadens our scope, increases our impact and creates the potential for revenue generation. How the brand(s) or programmes map across that is to be determined in this next phase of our development – and this brand strategy should help us clarify that.

**What plans are there to launch new initiatives?**

We are currently in a period of redefining our strategy and developing a new business plan for 2020-25. There will be new initiatives coming out of that process – t.b.c. But they will all support our core objective of making London a low carbon circular city by reducing waste and increasing recycling.

**Will the current core programs (Circular London, Resource London, etc) be staying as they are or having any significant changes to them? Are there plans to end any current programs?**

No. We will continue under the new business plan to run two programmes, currently named Circular London and Resource London. However we are creating the conditions for greater integration and cross-programme working over the coming months.

**To check, the core logo is included in this?**

Yes.

**Do you have any brand or reputation research on your core brands or programs?**

We have a bi-annual stakeholder survey for our Resource London programme, which will be completing around the time that we appoint a contractor for this piece of work.

**Is there a case to explore reverting to the full name or changing the name?**

Yes, possibly. There's a case to explore a range of naming possibilities. That's what this brief is about.

**Are your stakeholders and audiences listed by priority?**

Not necessarily. Our primary stakeholders currently are the Mayor of London and London's councils and they have equal prominence and priority. But see the answer below for a broader view.

**Which are more important for the brand review – stakeholders or audiences / customers?**

Both – our stakeholders are vital to our statutory work around local authority support, increasing recycling rates and helping to deliver the London Environment Strategy. But consumers, corporates and small businesses are vital to our ability to develop a commercial proposition and revenue-generating services – which we need in order to be financially sustainable in the longer term.

**A key objective is to “Simplify and clarify our current naming and brand architecture so that all stakeholders are clear of who, why and what we are”. Can you reveal the percentage of stakeholders who currently do not know who, why and what you are?**

I'm afraid we don't have that kind of data.

**Are there any plans to create new brands for the architecture?**

Our assumption is that we should simplify our architecture, not make it bigger or more complex. But let's see where the work takes us.

**Are there any plans to change any of the existing brand names/identities in the architecture?**

That's what we're asking for in this brief: the analysis and recommendations for both the architecture and naming/identity. So yes, potentially.

**The programme brands slide states that you now have two programmes – Resource London and Circular London. Should we therefore ignore all information on Advance London?**

No – Advance London needs to be considered too. It's a project that sits within the Circular London programme; it just has its own brand for historical reasons.

**If you could fix one thing through this brief – only one, and the most important at that – what would it be? Fixing stakeholder confusion through the hierarchy? Fixing brand recognition? Fixing brand relevance? Or consistency of message?**

Hard to say. It might be relevance – in the light of a climate emergency, we believe our work really matters; but the current branding does not reflect that purpose. It also does not reflect the need for us to act more commercially in future.

**Say you were to do nothing with the brand(s) for the next five years, ie leave everything as it is, what would be the most likely outcome, and the worst-case scenario?**

The most likely outcome is a combination of stasis and fragmentation: our objectives around waste reduction, recycling and climate change would be harder to meet as we wouldn't have something to focus and galvanise our reputation and work; and internally we would become more disjointed, with too many diverse approaches to brand and communication and a lack of a unifying brand strategy. Given that we want to change things systemically, rather than piecemeal, that seems to be a very bad outcome – as does the prospect that we would have little or no revenue generating ability.

**Do you have any existing research/insights on stakeholders that might be valuable or are we starting with a blank sheet of paper?**

We have a stakeholder survey for our Resource London programme, repeated every two years, which will be complete by the time we start this work. No other insights for stakeholders have been gathered in a systematic way.

**Do you have a stakeholder map or does one need to be created?**

One needs to be created.

**Do you have any views on the level of stakeholder engagement that might be appropriate or should we suggest within the confines of the budget?**

Please suggest within the confines of the budget. We would also be interested to see proposals which suggest an 'ideal' approach to stakeholder engagement, with associated costs – but are ultimately likely to have to stick firmly within budget.

**One of the deliverables is a 'refreshed logo(s) in a range of formats'. Could you expand on what you are envisaging here... are the parent logo and programme logos all within scope?**

Yes.

**We're assuming the scope of this work (minor tweaks or wholesale re-design) will depend on the results of Phases 1 and 2?**

Yes.

**Usually we'd consider the identity as a whole at this point as opposed to just logo – has this been omitted for budgetary reasons?**

Partly – but partly also to give us space to think just about the strategy, without being seduced by compelling creative. There will be a creative process in the new financial year, to bring the brand strategy to life.

**When you talk about architecture are you including all three levels: LWARB (parent brand), 3 sub-brands, 3 consumer campaigns. Is it likely you'll have more sub-brands or more campaigns in the future?**

No, we're **not** including the consumer campaigns. They all sit as separate entities. If it becomes clear during this process that they benefit from being associated with the parent brand, we will consider it – but this currently seems unlikely. We are however including the programme/project (sub-)brands – Circular London, Resource London and Advance London. We are very unlikely to have more sub-brands in future – the goal is, if anything, to simplify.