

**Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs**

**9<sup>th</sup> Waste Stakeholder Group  
22 November 2010**

Royal Horticultural Halls & Conference Centre, London  
10.30 to 13.00

**Attendees:**

Julia Barrett	ADEPT
Jeremy Jacobs	Association for Organics Recycling
Kerry Vitalis	BIS
Graeme Vickery	BIS
Ian Hetherington	British Metals Recycling Association
Sarah Plant	British Plastics Federation
Bob Gordon	British Retail Consortium
Tracy Moffat	CIWM
Hayley Conboy	Confederation of British Industry
Peter Seggie	Confederation of Paper Industries
Jane Thornback	Construction Products Association
Pat Brown	Consumer Federation
Alice Baverstock	Defra Sustainable Consumption and Production Programme
Mark Plummer	Dept. Communities and Local Government
MonaLisa Chukwuma	Dept. Communities and Local Government
Nick Price	Dept. Communities and Local Government
Sarah Downs - North West Development Agency	Eeda
Gareth Stace	EEF
Jonathan Davies	Environmental Industries Commission
Jacob Hayler	Environmental Services Association
David Bellamy	Food and Drink Federation
Julian Kirby	Friends of the Earth
Helen Middleton	Furniture Re-use Network
Julie Hill	Green Alliance
Peter Witherington	Home Builders Federation
Joy Blizzard	LARAC
Steve Burdis	LGA & NAWDO
John Woodruff	NAWDO
Dick Searle	Packaging Federation
Marian Ajadi	ReAlliance
Marian Barber	ReAlliance
David Greenfield	Regional Improvement and Efficiency Partnerships (RIEPs)

Melvin Caton  
Alan Wheeler  
Claudia Kuss-Tenzer  
Jean Sheppard  
Patrick Mahon  
Keith James  
David Wilson

Seeda  
Textile Recycling Association  
Waste Watch  
Women's Institute  
WRAP  
WRAP  
Strategic Advisor to WREP

**Defra**

Neil Thornton  
Diana Linskey (Chair)  
Roy Hathaway  
Karen Lepper  
Clare Hawley  
Andy Gregory  
Adam Crook  
Fay Skevington  
Laurence Smith  
Gary Lovett

SRO Waste Programme  
Dep SRO, Waste Programme  
Dep SRO, Waste Programme  
Dep SRO, Waste Programme  
Dep SRO, Waste Programme  
Team Leader, Waste Review  
Policy Advisor, Waste Review  
Defra, House Hold waste incentives  
Programme Support, Waste Programme  
Programme Support, Waste Programme

## 1. Chair's Welcome and Introductions

- 1.1 Diana Linskey welcomed the attendees to the 9<sup>th</sup> Waste Stakeholder Group meeting.

## 2. Defra Business Plan and Spending Review

- 2.1 Neil Thornton gave a presentation on Defra's Business Plan for 2011 – 2015. Neil informed WSG that the Government recognises that Defra not only drives on the Environment but also on places, people and communities. Neil ran through the actions from the Business Plan which will drive the 'zero waste' agenda. The presentation also contained information on waste related actions from Other Government Departments' business plans. *[see paper SRP presentation waste SHs 22.11.10]*
- 2.2 Neil touched on the recent decision to [withdraw the provisional allocation of PFI credits from seven projects](#). On the spending round more generally, the view was that while it was tough, it was not an impossible spending round and we all need to be more efficient (i.e. a joint 'we' including Local Authorities etc).
- 2.3 There was a question from the floor around how the Green Economy roadmap fits with the results of the Waste Review. Neil informed WSG that the Waste Review is one of the earliest reviews for the new government and will therefore need to be fit clearly with the Green Economy Roadmap.
- 2.4 There was a question from the floor on Responsibility Deals and when they will have 'flesh on the bones' and how exactly they will work. Neil informed WSG that the Review will be looking at the RD's and which areas to focus on. There is current discussion whether to have an umbrella approach to RD's. WSG members are invited to contact [Roy Hathaway](#) for further discussion and input on RD's.
- 2.5 There was a question on the Impact Indicators around House Hold recycling rates and how C&I waste is integrated? Neil informed WSG that this is sample data and that Defra is determined to enhance Local Authority and Municipal waste.
- 2.6 There was discussion around Landfill Tax and whether there was a possibility of postponing paying Landfill Tax? Neil informed WSG members that as part of the spending round HMT took all pressures on local authority budgets into account. While taxation was an issue for the Treasury, he could not foresee a situation in which landfill tax would be postponed. There was also discussion around the push for Anaerobic Digestion when Composting is cheaper. There was a view that LA's are unlikely to go with the more expensive AD option. Neil informed WSG that this AD question will be addressed in the Review of Waste Policies.

## 3. Review of Waste Policies

- 3.1 Andy Gregory presented a slideshow on the progress of the Review. Andy informed WSG that there had been over 300 responses to the

Call for Evidence form a wide range of sources. These include Local Authorities, Business and individuals. The presentation also outlined the key messages which had been received from both LA's and Business along with the key messages around Civil Society. [see paper *Waste Review - WSG November 2011*]

- 3.2 There was a view from the floor that there is a lot of focus on carrier bags and packaging but that the Review should have a wider scope and greater ambition. Andy Gregory responded that there is recognition that these are iconic, politically sensitive issues but that Ministers and officials are conscious of the wider context on packaging as a relatively small waste-stream overall.
- 3.3 It was noted from the floor that quality was missing from the '*balance to be struck*' diagram from Waste Review update. Andy Gregory assured WSG that the review team was aware of this area and that there is a live debate taking place about targets. It was felt Ministers need to be clear on the impact of policies on recycling and prevention. It was also noted that Ministers have expressed doubt about the inclusion of targets which can be distortive if not properly targeted.
- 3.4 There was a question from the floor on where business and local enterprise sit with in Civil Society. Andy Gregory responded that these areas can't be pigeon holed and that they fall into both Civil Society and Big Society. There was some concern that there may CS and BS may have a negative impact on business and local enterprise and that further information needs to be made available and spread to alleviate these fears. Diana Linskey agreed that there needs to be clear lines of Communication to make people understand what happens to waste.
- 3.5 Andy Gregory informed WSG that all views and questions from today's meeting will be fed into the Review.

#### **4. Review of Waste Policies – Round table discussion on key issues**

4.1 The six tables were asked to consider the following questions before reporting back to the larger group:

- How do we see our level of ambition at different stages of the hierarchy?
- How should we articulate that ambition?
- How can businesses, civil society, local authorities and individual's best be encouraged to take action to prevent waste and reuse items?
- What is the role for voluntary agreement(s) - how and in what circumstances are they most effective?
- Does the proposed approach to regulation sound right?
- How should we be incentivising a move up the hierarchy?
- Does this localism story sound right?
- Should we be encouraging more local solutions? If so, how?
- How do we encourage sensible (accountable) decision making at a local level (on everything from collections to infrastructure)?
- What should be our approach to food waste?
- What are the key barriers to more effective waste management (in your area) and how can we overcome them?
- How does the current economic and financial climate play into this agenda?

4.2 Results from roundtable discussion:

<p><b>How do we see our level of ambition at different stages of the hierarchy?</b></p>	<p><b>How should we articulate that ambition?</b></p>	<p><b>How can businesses, civil society, local authorities and individual's best be encouraged to take action to prevent waste and reuse items?</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ambition – ensure infrastructure is included in our ambition.</li> <li>• There needs to be greater ambition to move up the hierarchy, to use resources more effectively.</li> <li>• Moving up the waste hierarchy should be a priority</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Materials standardisation – less types of plastic to make it easier to recycle – although this could stifle innovation</li> <li>• Move away from a throw away / consumerism society</li> <li>• Recognise there are economic as well as environmental benefits to be had in waste.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encouragement – incentivise</li> <li>• There needs to be clarification on the wording 'incentives'. It can mean encouraging people but can also have a financial connotation.</li> <li>• Local Authority re-use and recycle credits with mechanisms for a 2 tier statutory default. More funding of the Third Sector</li> <li>• Local Authorities influence / incentivise behaviours and raise awareness.</li> <li>• Decision making – there should be more local involvement</li> <li>• There is a need to get all involved, local people, business etc.</li> <li>• Unintended consequences of policy decisions need to be considered, What do local people and businesses want? This needs to be considered</li> <li>• PRN system is opaque – where does the money go?</li> <li>• Young people – we need to make it cool to recycle. eBay versus jumble sales, why is one cool but the other not?</li> </ul>
<p><b>What is the role for voluntary agreement(s) - how and in what circumstances are they most effective?</b></p>	<p><b>Does the proposed approach to regulation sound right?</b></p>	<p><b>How should we be incentivising a move up the hierarchy?</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responsibility deals – there needs to be a</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who pays for infrastructure? Create a pull</li> </ul>

<p>greater understanding along with care over the language used to describe RD's.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How much are Responsibility Deals driven by the consumer, industry or Big Society? This needs to be bottomed out.</li> <li>• Responsibility Deals – what are the incentives to join? RD's are tools which need to be suited to the appropriate situation – Right way, Right time</li> <li>• Greater product design responsibility, for example encouraging better design for WEEE</li> <li>• Direct deals between Local Authorities and Reprocessors</li> </ul>		<p>for recycle</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus on the right materials</li> <li>• Standardisation of quality.</li> <li>• Discussion on whether financial incentives actually work – some evidence suggests incentives have to be prohibitively high in order to work</li> <li>• There are various ways of improving the standard of waste materials, such as products, eco-design, collection, sorting.</li> <li>• Incentives – varied such as business direct to consumer or business to business.</li> <li>• not against landfill bans if appropriate.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Does this localism story sound right?</b></p>	<p><b>Should we be encouraging more local solutions? If so, how?</b></p>	<p><b>How do we encourage sensible (accountable) decision making at a local level (on everything from collections to infrastructure)?</b></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Localism – strong support for local authority decision making. Facilitating local discussion, sometimes these are not necessarily small enough for local communities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Efficiencies – data gathering can be beneficial.</li> <li>• Discussion around the use of expensive literature to get messages across when cheaper, easier methods of communication maybe available (leaflets etc)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Civil Society – involve people when it makes sense, encourage people to get involved. It was thought this will happen over a long period of time.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
<p><b>What should be our approach to food waste?</b></p>	<p><b>What are the key barriers to more effective waste management (in your area) and how can we overcome them?</b></p>	<p><b>How does the current economic and financial climate play into this agenda?</b></p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was wider discussion in the room around incentives and behaviour change with some people of the view that it is difficult to change people's view on waste/ Andy Gregory informed the room that the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All costs are rising; need to find efficiencies depending on the situation.</li> <li>• If something doesn't have a value it's difficult to put in schemes.</li> </ul>

	<p>Review team will be working with Defra's new Centre of Excellence team who hold expertise on behaviours. There was agreement that we need to make people more physically aware of waste and what can reduce waste.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The need to be smarter about how we measure waste prevention.</li><li>• Awareness of 'bad press' towards waste, Marketing is seen as an area which can be cut so there is a need to be a more joined up with messages on waste and how we all want the same thing, i.e. a reduction in waste.</li></ul>	
--	---	--

5. Results from roundtable discussions: Following input from each group there was discussion on a 'wish list' for the Spring 2011 Waste Stakeholder Group meeting. There was agreement that it will be an opportunity to checkpoint the Review.
6. Following discussion on how the Review will be implemented, Diana Linskey informed WSG that a clear implementation plan will be produced after the Review is released. Defra colleagues will be speaking to people interested in specific areas between now and then. Andy Gregory encouraged WSG members to let him know of any thoughts or upcoming events which may be of use for the Review.
7. Diana Linskey thanked everyone for their input and invited them to stay for lunch and further networking.

**Close**