Because the bins are in easy reach for the passenger and quite big, they limit passenger comfort.

This is a classic problem for product designers: the product needs to be there and handy when in use, and not there when not in use (think of foldaway beds, inflatable mattresses, etc.). This need for the bin to "disappear" led other designers to come up with inventive placings of the bin, bins made of flexible material (to expand as they are filled), or the replacement of the bin by a chute (thus separating the functionalities of access and storage). This particular designer effectively chose to open the questioning by addressing the idea of what constitutes "rubbish," and explores putting newspapers separately. The themes he identifies that make this initial idea of separate bins valuable are the sense of being *environmentally friendly* (as a passenger, and as part of the image of the railway company) and that of *generosity*—leaving newspapers for the use of other passengers is a positive thing to do in a public space. The dominant frame in this episode is the separation of the newspapers from the other rubbish. This leads to the generation of a clear design brief: create a bin that is compact but has two separate compartments, one of which is designed in such a way that people will put only newspapers in it. In the evaluation of his initial design, he realizes that there is a second paradox in this problem situation:

Because the bins are in easy reach for the passenger, they are distributed throughout the cabin.

Because the bins are distributed throughout the cabin, they are hard to empty and clean.

This is where the needs of the passengers and the cleaners are at loggerheads (separate collection from multiple points makes life worse for the cleaners). In the end, this problem leads the designer to create a single, large newspaper rack at the end of the carriage, where passengers can leave their newspapers as they get off the train. This particular solution was graded highest of all twelve expert designs by a panel of independent judges. What will have struck the reader is that the designer seems to go more or less upside down and back to front through the design process. The process doesn't start with a problem definition, and the designer doesn't seem to have a structured way toward reaching a solution. And it also seems much messier than the clean, linear nine-step model of frame creation that was introduced in chapter 4. But if we take the initial idea as what it is—a frame idea that works as a "primary