FICHE 03 / 10

From Awareness to Action: Designing Behavioral Sustainability Systems

Campaigns create intention. Systems create habits. Here's how to build the latter.

IN THIS FICHE

- Why awareness campaigns fail
- The science of habits and routines
- Behavioral incentives and feedback loops
- The GTI framework
- Measuring sustained behavior change
- Compliance vs internalization
- Field design principles
- What auditors actually want

#CircularEconomy · #EPR · #EmergingMarkets · #FMCG · #WasteManagement

EPR Managers | Sustainability Teams | FMCG Distributors | PRO Directors

Clément Chabot — Founder, Play for Earth
A Play for Earth initiative · Nairobi, Kenya · 2026

KEY INSIGHTS

1. **Behavior change requires system design, not content production.** Awareness campaigns address knowledge gaps. The actual gap in most sustainability contexts is friction, proximity, and routine.[1,2]
2. **Compliance and internalization are not the same thing — and ESG auditors are starting to demand the difference.** A behaviour that stops when the incentive is removed was never embedded. Measuring participation without measuring persistence produces data that cannot survive audit.[3,4]
3. **Attaching new behaviors to existing routines is faster, cheaper, and more durable than building new ones.** The route visit, the refill moment, the delivery drop-off — these are the anchors.[5]

1. WHY AWARENESS CAMPAIGNS RARELY CHANGE BEHAVIOR

The dominant assumption in sustainability programme design is that people do not act sustainably because they lack information or motivation. Fix the knowledge gap and the behavior will follow. Decades of behavioral science have shown this assumption to be wrong.

Knowledge and behavior are weakly correlated. People sort waste incorrectly not because they do not know how, but because the path of least resistance wins. Sorting correctly requires more effort, more time, or a nearby bin that may not exist. The decision is made in a fraction of a second, not as a considered choice.

Awareness campaigns change attitudes, sometimes. They change behavior rarely, and almost never durably. Meta-analytic evidence on environmental awareness campaigns consistently finds effect sizes below 3 percent for actual behavioral change — a ceiling that holds across contexts, cultures, and campaign designs.[1,2]

< 3%	66 days	3–5×
Average behavior change achieved by awareness campaigns alone	Average time to form a new habit through repetition in context	Higher retention when the action is rewarded immediately after it is performed

> *"Don’t ask people to add sustainability to their day. Embed it in what they already do."*

2. THE SCIENCE OF HABITS AND ROUTINES

Habits form through repetition in a consistent context. A cue triggers a routine; a reward reinforces it. The behavioral design challenge for sustainability is not to create new motivation from scratch — it is to attach new behaviors to existing routines that already carry automatic cues.

Lally et al. (2010) found that new behaviors take an average of 66 days to become automatic, with wide variation depending on complexity and context. Simple behaviors attached to strong existing routines automate faster. Complex behaviors introduced as entirely new routines take much longer, and many never automate at all.[5]

For field sustainability systems, this means finding existing routines that can carry a new action: the route visit, the dispensing moment, the morning shop opening, the delivery drop-off. The behavior change happens at the margin of something the person already does automatically — not as a new standalone activity.

In practice, this distinction separates programmes that sustain beyond the incentive period from those that collapse when the incentive is removed. A behavior attached to an existing routine persists because the cue that triggers the routine also now triggers the new action. A behavior maintained only by incentive has no cue left once the reward disappears.

3. BEHAVIORAL INCENTIVES AND FEEDBACK LOOPS

Three incentive mechanisms drive durable behavior change in field settings. Each addresses a different segment of the motivation distribution — and together, they produce the coverage needed for system-level behavior change.

INCENTIVE TYPE	MECHANISM	WHO IT ACTIVATES
Immediate economic reward	Points, cash, airtime — tied directly to the verified action, not to outcomes months later. The reward must arrive within the same interaction window.	Extrinsically motivated participants. Most effective at activation and early habit formation.
Progress visibility	A streak counter, a rank, a completion bar. Participants need to see their trajectory. Feedback loops are as important as the reward itself.	Achievement-oriented participants. Sustains engagement after initial activation.
Social recognition	Public leaderboards, team rankings, peer visibility. Taps competitive and affiliative drives that outlast individual economic incentives.	Community-oriented participants. Creates norm-setting effects at territory level.

The design principle: the reward must be proportionate to the friction of the action. Sorting packaging is low friction — a small reward suffices. Committing to a weekly verified collection schedule is high friction — the reward must reflect that. Mismatching reward to friction is one of the most common failure modes in sustainability gamification.

4. THE GTI FRAMEWORK: FROM COMPLIANCE TO INTERNALIZATION

The Green Transformation Index (GTI) formalizes the journey from occasional to internalized sustainability behavior across five stages. It is not a satisfaction score or a participation metric — it is an operational signal that tells distribution and ESG teams whether behavioral change is being sustained.

GTI STAGE	PROFILE	WHAT HAPPENS TO INCENTIVE?	ESG DATA QUALITY

1 Inactive	No action. Packaging enters general waste.	No incentive to remove.	None.
2 Aware	Occasional, inconsistent sorting. Behavior stops without incentive.	Incentive required to trigger action.	Low — insufficient for audit.
3 Compliant	Sorts reliably when rep is present. Behavior drops between visits.	Incentive and presence of rep remain key drivers.	Usable — coverage gaps persist.
4 Engaged	Sorts proactively between visits. Behavior persists without rep.	Incentive can taper; behavior increasingly self-sustaining.	Strong — continuous verification.
5 Internalized	Sorting embedded in shop routine. Behavior persists after incentive is removed.	Incentive removable with minimal behavior loss.	Highest — durable ESG asset.

The GTI formula weights five behavioral dimensions: action frequency (0.25), streak consistency (0.20), sorting accuracy (0.25), network engagement (0.15), and depth of routine integration (0.15). A retailer at Stage 3 with consistent frequency but zero inter-visit activity scores differently from a retailer at Stage 3 with occasional inter-visit sorting — and the ESG implications of that difference are real.[6]

The critical distinction is between compliance and internalization. A programme that measures participation but not GTI stage cannot claim durable impact. GTI stage progression is what EPR regulators and ESG investors are beginning to require as evidence that recovery behavior will persist after the programme ends.

5. MEASURING SUSTAINED BEHAVIOR CHANGE

Most sustainability programmes measure inputs (number of participants enrolled) or outputs (kilograms recovered in a reporting period). Very few measure behavioral persistence — what happens to the action when the incentive is withdrawn, when the rep stops visiting, when the programme moves to a new territory.[6]

This measurement gap has direct consequences for ESG credibility. An EPR programme that reports 40 percent recovery rates during active incentive periods but cannot demonstrate what recovery rates look like six months after the programme ends has not demonstrated sustainability — it has demonstrated payment.[6]

GTI stage tracking addresses this gap directly. A territory where 30 to 40 percent of participants have reached GTI Stage 3+ is approaching a behavioral norm threshold — the point at which the majority behavior shifts and new entrants encounter sorting as the default practice rather than an exceptional programme. Once that threshold is crossed, self-sustaining recovery dynamics emerge that no longer require continuous incentive investment to maintain.[6,7]

MEASUREMENT PRINCIPLE

The right question is not “How many participants are enrolled?” but “What percentage of participants continue the behavior when the incentive is not present?” GTI stage tracking answers the second question. Participation metrics answer the first. Only the second question is defensible to auditors, investors, and EPR regulators.

6. DESIGNING FOR INTERNALIZATION FROM DAY ONE

The most common design error in field sustainability systems is sequencing: build the incentive programme first, then figure out internalization later. By the time the programme reaches scale, the behavioral architecture is already set around the incentive structure and cannot easily be rebuilt.

Programmes designed for internalization from day one look different from the start. They identify the existing routines that will carry the new behavior. They build feedback loops that operate independently of the incentive. They track GTI progression from the first week, not as a retrospective metric but as a live operational signal.

Three design principles that hold across field settings in emerging markets:

- **Attach, don't add:** the new action must slot into a physical touchpoint that already exists — a photo at a delivery stop, a barcode scan at a refill, a confirmation click at a route check-in. If it requires a separate moment, a separate system, or a separate motivation, it will not automate.[1]
- **Immediate feedback, not delayed rewards:** the feedback loop must close in the same interaction. A counter that updates in real time activates different psychology than a monthly report. Streak visibility outperforms cumulative points for behavior maintenance.
- **Social norm before individual incentive:** territory-level leaderboards and team rankings create social pressure that outlasts individual economic motivation. Once a majority behavior establishes, individual incentives become secondary.[1,8]

7. TWO OBJECTIONS — AND WHY THEY MISS THE POINT

Two objections come up consistently in field programme design — and both miss the same point.

"Our reps don't have time to add behavioral tracking to their routes."	*"We need recovery volumes, not behavior scores. GTI is an abstraction."*
The design constraint is the core principle. If it requires a separate moment, it will fail at scale. Play for Earth embeds behavioral tracking into the existing visit workflow: one photo per retail stop, taken during the stock audit that already happens. Under 30 seconds. No separate system. The incentive for the rep is real: territory GTI scores are tied to distribution partner performance metrics. Reps with higher-GTI territories earn better placement, access to priority routes, and territory incentive payments that compound over time.[5]	GTI stage data generates recovery volumes as a by-product — because Stage 4+ participants produce consistent, high-frequency recovery events that are individually verified. A territory at 40 percent Stage 3+ generates more auditable recovery data per route visit than a territory at 90 percent Stage 2 with three times the participant count. The abstraction criticism applies to GTI as a score. It does not apply to the underlying event data that GTI is calculated from. Every GTI data point is a verified physical action.[6]

8. GOVERNANCE AND INTEGRATION

GTI data integrates with existing distributor SFA and route-management systems via standard API or flat-file export. No core system replacement required. GTI stage calculations run automatically from verified event records — the same photos, GPS logs, and timestamps that generate EPR compliance data.

Governance follows the same three-layer model as Behavioral Recovery Data: field agents generate events; territory managers review and approve; sustainability and EPR teams receive aggregated GTI progression dashboards. External auditors can access the full event trail that underlies every GTI score — designed to meet ISAE 3000 assurance standards.[3,4]

> *"Compliance is what participants do when the incentive is present. Internalization is what they do when it is not. GTI measures the difference."*

CORE INSIGHTS	RECOMMENDATIONS	QUESTIONS TO ASK
✓ Awareness campaigns target knowledge; the real gap is friction and routine. ✓ GTI distinguishes compliance from internalization — only internalization survives audit. ✓ A behavioral norm shift at 30–40% Stage 3+ creates self-sustaining recovery.	→ Audit existing field routines before designing any behavior-change programme. → Build immediate feedback loops — delayed rewards do not create habits. → Measure GTI stage progression, not just participation or tonnage rates. → Design for internalization from day one — not as a retrofit.	? Can you identify three existing routines in your field network where a sustainability action could be attached? ? What happens to your sustainability behaviors when the incentive programme ends? ? Do you currently distinguish between compliant and internalized behaviors in your ESG data? ? What is your Stage 3+ adoption rate in your highest-performing territory?

SOURCES AND REFERENCES

[1] Dolan P. et al. (2010). MINDSPACE: Influencing behaviour through public policy. Cabinet Office / Institute for Government.

[2] Thaler R. & Sunstein C. (2008). Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth and Happiness. Yale University Press.

[3] European Commission (2022). CSRD – ESRS E1. ec.europa.eu

[4] IFRS Foundation (2023). IFRS S1/S2 Climate Disclosure Standards. ifrs.org

[5] Lally P. et al. (2010). How are habits formed? Modelling habit formation in the real world. European Journal of Social Psychology, 40, 998–1009.

[6] Play for Earth (2026). Green Transformation Index methodology. Internal framework documentation.

[7] World Bank (2022). What a Waste 2.0: A Global Snapshot of Solid Waste Management. Urban Development Series. openknowledge.worldbank.org

[8] Cialdini R. (1984). Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion. HarperCollins.

Suggested citation: Chabot, C. (2026). From Awareness to Action: Designing Behavioral Sustainability Systems. Play for Earth Insight Series, Fiche 03/10. playforearth.org

COMING NEXT: FICHE 04/10

Gamification for Sustainability: Turning Good Habits into Engagement — Points and leaderboards are tactics. Real gamification redesigns motivation architecture. The next fiche maps how to design engagement systems that produce ESG-grade data as a by-product.