

# **NATIONAL WASTE STRATEGY FOR ENGLAND**

**2005 REVIEW**



The Chartered Institution  
of Wastes Management

**DEFRA / CIWM Regional Workshops to Support  
Phase 1 of the Strategy Review:**

**“Resource Efficiency and Sustainable Waste  
Management”**

**July 2005**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**
- 2.0 BACKGROUND AND PROCESS**
- 3.0 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS FROM DELEGATES**
- 4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Appendix 1: List of Workshop Delegates**

**Appendix 2: List of workshop Session Facilitators**

**Appendix 3: Briefings from Defra on 5 Topics Covered**

**Appendix 4: Feedback Summary on the 4 Workshop Events**

## **1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

1.1 Four workshops, held in January / February 2005 as part of the review of Waste Strategy 2000, drew a wide range of varied and sometimes contradictory responses from delegates. Given the issues discussed and the range of interests represented by delegates this was expected. However a number of consistent themes were raised, common to all workshops or to separate sessions or questions in individual workshops. In all cases barriers to progress were easier to identify than solutions but useful input to the process was gained.

1.2 The main issues raised include:

### **1.2.1 Economic and financial issues:**

There is too little incentive to prevent / re-use / recycle etc because waste is still too cheap to produce and have managed by others. Government was urged to introduce economic incentives / taxes to support more sustainable resource use. The early involvement of HM Treasury to develop proposals for inclusion into the strategy is clearly needed.

Investment in new infrastructure to manage wastes and resources in more sustainable ways is urgently needed. Investor confidence needs to be built in the technologies to be used and in the strategy and policy framework.

Variable / incentive based charges for household waste collection should be introduced – but mindful of the potentially harmful downsides to such a policy and of experience gained in this area in other EU member states.

More resources are needed for local authorities to develop more sustainable waste management, and more equitable means of allocation of resources.

### **1.2.2 Communications:**

The new Waste Strategy needs a complementary communications strategy. This needs central co-ordination of many organisations. Target audiences include the public, waste producers (especially SMEs) and Local Authority members and officers. This communication must be consistent and sustained over a long period for real changes to attitudes and behaviours.

The need for residual waste management capacity including Energy from Waste and “new” technologies needs to be recognised and championed by Government as soon as possible.

### **1.2.3 Structural / Institutional and Delivery Issues:**

The following should be reviewed: division of responsibilities for waste strategy development; service planning and delivery; development control planning between different tiers of local and regional government. Current arrangements are often inefficient or detrimental to delivering more sustainable waste and resources management.

Targets for waste prevention, recycling etc need to be reviewed as current arrangements are often not complementary or incentivise inappropriate actions.

Government responsibility for waste and resources management should be in one Department.

Solutions and strategies have to reflect local circumstances – one size will not fit all.

#### 1.2.4 **Policy and Legislation Issues:**

The scope of the strategy must reflect all wastes, regardless of origin. The strategy must give more emphasis to prevention, re-use and recovery, rather than concentrating only on recycling.

The definition of “Waste” and “Recovery” have very real impacts on the capacity for waste recovery / recycling and demand for recycled resources.

Planning and permitting systems for waste management facilities need to be streamlined and regulation in general made more proportionate to risks.

#### 1.2.5 **Waste Producer / Product Issues:**

Targets and strategic controls are needed for Industrial and Commercial wastes as well as Municipal wastes to reflect the broader base of the strategy. This should include statutory waste / resources planning and reporting for businesses.

More guidance and help is needed for waste producers – especially SMEs.

More support is needed for materials re-use or waste exchange between businesses and for eco-design of products and services to be more resource efficient.

## **BACKGROUND AND PROCESS**

### **2.1 Review of Waste Strategy 2000**

- 2.1.1 The National Waste Strategy for England and Wales (“WS2000”) was published in May 2000, and a national waste strategy for Wales was subsequently published in June 2002. WS 2000 was intended to be reviewed after 5 years with a full review after 10 years.

### **2.2 Defra / CIWM Workshops**

- 2.2.1 Preparations for the 5 year review began in late 2004. The first phase of Defra’s work included gaining input to the review through interviews with a broad range of stakeholders. This was supported by a series of 4 regional workshops organised through the Chartered Institution of Wastes Management and its trading subsidiary IWM Business Services Ltd:

- **Birmingham** – Friday, 28<sup>th</sup> January 2005
- **London** – Monday 31<sup>st</sup> January
- **Chorley (Lancs)** – Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> February
- **Exeter** – Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> February

- 2.2.2 The workshops were run at no charge to delegates and were advertised via the Institution’s “News-on-Line” service and website. A list of delegates is attached in Appendix 1.

- 2.2.3 Each event comprised: an introduction by Defra covering the process and objectives of the Review; five facilitated workshop sessions (each run in the morning and afternoon) with CIWM member or officer facilitators (list of facilitators attached as Appendix 2); and a plenary report back / Q&A session. Each workshop covered strategic issues identified by Defra:

- Waste Prevention / Reduction
- Recycling and Re-Use
- Energy from waste
- Role of Technologies in Advancing Sustainable Waste Management
- Joining-up Action Across Waste Streams

### **2.3 Summary Report**

- 2.3.1 Briefings prepared for facilitators / rapporteurs are attached as Appendix 3, and a summary of delegate feedback on the events themselves in Appendix 4. A summary of the comments made by delegates is given in section 3 of this report, with full copies of rapporteurs’ written notes placed on the CIWM website. The summary therefore does not reflect a CIWM position or policy, and in some cases includes positions CIWM do not agree with. Minor changes have been made to make points clearer. The objective here is to present points made by delegates.

- 2.3.2 Where possible, delegate comment has been grouped into 5 common themes:

- Economic and financial issues
- Communications
- Structural / Institutional and Delivery Issues
- Policy and Legislation Issues, and
- Waste Producer / Product Issues.

## **2.4 CIWM Position Statement**

- 2.4.1 The full CIWM position was presented separately to Defra in a report: “National Waste Strategy for England, 2005 Review, Lessons Learned Report and Position Statement”. A copy of this report is also available on the CIWM website.

### 3 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS FROM WORKSHOP DELEGATES

#### 3.2 Waste Prevention / Reduction

##### 3.1.1

***Question 1....."What is stopping us from reducing the amount of waste society produces, whether at home or in business / industry?"***

#### **Economic and Financial Issues:**

- Convenience and Cost: These are more dominant driving forces for consumer behaviour than environmental impact. The UK has a strongly embedded 'throw-away society'. The service for waste collection appears to be absolutely free – regardless of the amount collected. Affluence supports materials use and waste, thus inhibiting reduction through cost incentive or penalty. No clear message, the language is confused and who is going to say "consume less"?
- Waste Is Too Cheap: The low cost of new raw materials and of waste management discourages efficient processes, eco-product design, and conservation of materials. Landfill tax is not high enough to make alternatives economically desirable.

#### **Communications:**

- Lack of Public Engagement: Public understanding of sustainable waste / materials practices and personal responsibility is low. We fail to promote a 'prevention and minimisation' message as well as recycling. There is a general belief that recycling solves all, thus little thought is given to waste prevention. There is little or no householder 'producer responsibility' or 'Duty of Care'. Environmental information often focuses on comparatively trivial issues, such as choice of paper or plastic bag and does not explain to the public the importance of big issues such as choice of home.

#### **Structural / Institutional and Delivery Issues:**

- Local Authority Role and Funding: Local authorities can only play a very limited role in waste minimisation / reduction (restricted to promoting home composting / reuse and providing awareness-raising material).
- Local authorities pick up waste they do not reduce it, and may favour certain types of waste to meet recycling rather than reduction targets. Funding for reduction activity is needed and must be 'ring-fenced' (unlike many current Grant schemes).
- Political Barriers: Many local politicians have short-term priorities, not committing to long term issues such as waste prevention strategies.
- Waste Management Industry: – The objective of most of the industry is to manage waste - less waste could mean some people would be out of a job!

**Policy and Legislation Issues:**

- Legal Definition of “Waste”: Interpretation of what is a commercial / industrial waste can inhibit re-use (and recycling) activity due to the cost or other burdens of regulatory compliance.
- Conflicting Policies and Targets. Weight based targets have led to waste generation via the collection of green waste. Defra should look at diversion targets. Too much emphasis is placed on promoting recycling. Waste prevention is in direct conflict with the Government’s overall drive for economic growth.

**Waste Producer / Product Issues:**

- Manufacturers / Retailers: Businesses lobby Government and influence consumer choice through trends and fashion. Much packaging is not needed to protect goods or uses materials which are hard to recycle eg. polystyrene foam.

3.1.2

***Question 2....“How can we overcome those obstacles? Who needs to do what? What changes in policy are needed, if any, to encourage waste prevention?”***

**Economic and Financial Issues:**

- Build on lessons learned from other sectors, e.g. power of motivating factors (appeal of monetary reward versus environmental impact) Implement charging mechanisms:
  - Product taxes / producer responsibility, e.g. for single use products.
  - Tax [VAT] exemptions for recycled materials.
  - Demonstrate [to the public and businesses] the cost benefit of prevention versus disposal (and also recycling).
  - Variable charging [for household waste] the question is how to operate and enforce without increasing flytipping or burning of waste at home.

**Communications:**

- Persuade people that waste / resource reduction and prevention is something they want to do. This involves real cultural change and will need resources, time and leadership similar to campaigns to wear seat belts or to live / eat healthier.
- Demonstrate that the cost of disposing of a discarded item is very much less than the hidden cost of wasted resources that went into producing it, e.g. typical waste collection and disposal costs are around just £2/household/week.
- Promote sustainable resource management concept at a younger age.

Education needs investment long-term.

- Extend funding/remit for “Recycle Now” to incorporate waste prevention and minimisation.
- Wider promotion and development of ‘Eco-homes’ / sustainable housing.

**Structural / Institutional and Delivery Issues:**

- Tailor waste collection / services solutions to socio-demographic areas – one solution does not fit all!
- Reduced waste collection container capacity – do not pick up “side waste”.

**Policy and Legislation Issues:**

- Definition of waste: concerted UK lobby along with EU partners to raise voice and influence EU waste law. Levels of definition of resource needed, including: virgin material, by-product, post-consumer materials and definition of complete “recovery” of wastes.
- Residual targets – have a definition of residual waste as a basis for local authority targets rather than recycling targets.
- Producer responsibility should be increased.
- The group felt that waste prevention should not be part of the waste strategy but should be tackled at a higher policy level that would include sustainable production and consumption, transport, housing etc.

**Waste Producer / Product Issues:**

- Influence product / process design eg. light-weighting of packaging to reduce waste weight – need to change from end of pipe solutions.
- More “Environmental Stewardship”.
- Emphasise and support Corporate Social Responsibility.
- Need to look at ways of getting consumer packaging back into the chain eg. incentives to reuse containers – more multi-trip.

3.1.3

**Question 3: “What existing measures are effective and which less effective?”**

**Organisations:**

The following were identified as organisations with a valuable role to play in waste prevention / minimisation – and whose effectiveness or role needs to be increased:

- Envirowise
- National Resource and Waste Forum (NRWF)
- Defra (Research & Development Programme; Market Transformation Programme; Sustainable Development Unit; Waste Implementation Programme Local Authority Support Unit Direct Support; Policy Division Incentive Scheme Research)
- Sustainable Development Commission
- European Union (*Towards a Thematic Strategy on the Prevention and Recycling of Waste*)
- Environment Agency.

**Instruments / Activities:**

<b>EFFECTIVE</b>	<b>LESS EFFECTIVE</b>
Landfill Tax – has reduced waste weight for disposal.	Landfill tax not high enough and not rising fast / soon enough. Fly-tipping could be the negative aspect of increased tax.
PPC – looks at the whole process and what materials go in as well as come out.	
Economic instruments [eg producer responsibility] have created a reduction in weight of waste –eg. Light-weighting of packaging.	Light-weighting has increased use of plastics.
	PRNs – not effective, no real reduction in waste, can still achieve obligation through recycling only, even if no waste reduction.
Exemptions reduce regulatory burden on businesses.	Legislation – some parts are ineffective due to inconsistency and interpretation.

EFFECTIVE	LESS EFFECTIVE
Home composting – effective even though difficult to measure.	
	Penalties for illegal waste management are too low – courts should consider community service orders for offenders including street cleaning etc.
Nappy laundering.	

### 3.1.4

**Question 4.....” What changes in policy are needed, if any, to encourage waste prevention?”**

**Economic and Financial Issues:**

- DTI / Defra should work with Treasury to develop economic measures which encourage waste prevention without hindering economic growth. e.g. tax incentives for ecologically designed products (reduced toxicity, reduced packaging, products designed with end of life in mind).
- Economic incentives for recycled material e.g. reduced VAT on recycled products / materials.
- Greater use of aggregates tax.
- Direct household waste charging schemes – “how?” is the question, taking into account service admin and additional costs.
- Introduce a Waste Tax instead of landfill tax – bearing in mind the change in definition of waste.
- Virgin materials tax –global economics have shifted the UK economy from manufacturing to one led by service industries. Thus such a tax would need to be developed at a higher level e.g. EU leading to International Trade Agreements.
- Long term look at economic instruments – planned over a protracted period.
- Other taxes such as that used for plastic bags in the Republic of Ireland.
- More effective use of PRN system.

- financial incentives to encourage eco-design in products.

**Communications:**

- Communicate a message which shows personal benefits leading to social change; similar to previous campaigns for seat belts etc; for waste which concentrates on prevention / reduction not recycling.
- Invert the waste hierarchy pyramid so the greatest level of emphasis is placed on minimisation / reduction, followed by recycling / recovery and finally disposal.
- Life cycle and whole process assessment – holistic / whole environment view – consider the knock-on effect of decisions.
- Long term investment in education at all levels.
- Talk to stakeholders on impact of change of legislation / process.

**Policy and Legislation Issues:**

- Legislation is too complex for business; too many actors are involved in supply / waste chain. The problem needs to be addressed not just through fiscal measures, solutions also need to be simple and convenient to implement.
- Extend minimisation through PPC to all industries.
- Definition of waste – defined as a resource wherever (or as soon as) possible so as not to be hindered by legislation and enforcement.
- Waste minimisation introduced at the planning stage.
- Speed of applying for environmental permits and the cost to the applicant.
- Consistency of policy.
- EU benchmarking –annual international best practice review.
- Waste policy (commercial and municipal) needs to be simplified, waste diversion targets would be more effective than recycling / recovery targets.
- There should be more standards for recovered materials – like PAS 100.

**Structural / Institutional and Delivery Issues:**

- Planning – reduce building on flood plains to reduce waste produced in floods.
- Redesign local government.
- Biodegradable waste should go to land for use in increasing soil quality.

**Waste Producer / Product Issues:**

- Corporate environmental responsibility.

Statutory waste reporting by businesses –what is produced, how much is paid for disposal, what is recycled, reused and where (on site/off site).

## 3.2 **Recycling and Re-Use**

### 3.2.1

#### ***Question 1.....” What is stopping us from recycling more of the waste that households and business produce?”***

##### **Economic and Financial Issues:**

- Waste is too cheap: Difficult for waste managers to justify recycling in industry as goods are cheap, labour is expensive. Landfill tax is too low to have significant impact, but may change escalator increases.
- Immature markets for recycled materials and re-use of wastes, and reluctance to buy second hand goods in UK.
- Markets for the re-use of electrical goods are poorly developed.
- Lack of investment in new technologies and recycling/re-use facilities because of market uncertainty.
- PRN income goes to the wrong people - not used to stimulate further capacity.

##### **Communications:**

- Perception that recycled materials will contaminate products / processes
- Affluent culture and peer pressure in the UK discourages re-use.
- People care, but want recycling and re-use made easy for them.

##### **Structural / Institutional and Delivery Issues**

- Local authority waste targets are weight based and do not recognise the volume of otherwise valuable materials such as plastics.
- Too much attention given to targets for recycling (including composting). More focus needed on minimising waste. Too many small targets – confusing “bean-counting” between MSW and household waste rather than focusing on end objectives.
- Scope of targets - they do not apply to re-use or to commercial and industrial wastes that are collected by Local Authorities. This does not give authorities an incentive to collect household waste for re-use or to collect commercial and industrial waste.
- LA facilities – especially CA sites - should be made available for SME's wastes.
- Targets vary from authority to authority.
- Regional (spatial) strategies do not impact enough on individual local authority strategies.

- Uncertainty in recyclates markets leads to too many short-term contracts for collection and recycling. This is not necessarily best practice, e.g. centralised composting facilities benefit significantly from long term certainty of material supply.
- More doorstep recycling collections needed.

**Policy and Legislation Issues:**

- Inconsistent enforcement, slow delivery of environmental permits and the view taken by the Agency regarding trials for new technologies etc.
- Household Waste Recycling Act 2003 not effective until 2010.
- Definition of waste - rethink needed re when and how it ceases to be "waste".

**Waste Producer / Product Issues:**

- Products are not designed with re-use in mind - built in obsolescence.

3.2.2

***Question 2....." How can we overcome those obstacles? Who needs to do what?"***

**Economic and Financial Issues:**

- Take VAT off recycled materials / products.
- A greater emphasis should be placed on financial incentives and penalties eg. the charge for plastic bags in the Republic of Ireland.
- Make generation of residual waste 'difficult' through penalties / incentives – e.g. Barnet.
- TAX ALL (single use) items such as nappies, throw-away cutlery and plates, where they do not get recycled.
- Increase landfill tax escalator (large steps) and increase the inert rate which hasn't changed since it was introduced in Oct 1996 (£2).
- Tax relief on recycling collection vehicles, especially sustainable fuels.

**Communications:**

- Consistent, nationwide approach to communicating the need for resource conservation and supply and use of more sustainable products / services.
- Long term investment in public / private sector awareness and education initiatives.

**Structural and Delivery Issues:**

- Support / develop markets for recycled materials and re-use to stimulate collection and recovery infrastructure. Markets may well be overseas.
- Public procurement policies to increase recycling/re-use.
- Review all local authority waste targets.
- Need for more joined up thinking between central, regional and local government - would allow for economies of scale to be realised. More uniform approach towards collection systems and receptacles.
- Regional variations in disposal cost (before landfill tax) need to be addressed to prevent waste being transported increasing distances.
- International market opportunities: export for recycling should be explored, eg. “back-loading” ELVs / paper / plastic to Far East was given especially as tanker ballast.
- Reuse needs a focused (e.g. WRAP?). Programme to develop it properly.
- Find a way to recycle street sweepings.
- Variable trade waste charges in favour of recycling rather than disposal.

**Policy and Legislation Issues:**

- More streamlined and consistent (“modern”) enforcement of legislation.
- More emphasis (regulations) on design for recycling.
- All (medium and large) companies to report on environmental performance.
- A permanent/standing committee to review technical restrictions / regulations on a regular basis.
- Joint enforcement by EA & Trading Standards.

**Waste Producer / Product Issues:**

- Require / incentivise manufacture of repairable goods.
- Virtual Eco-park where one company can transfer its by-products to others who can use them as a feedstock.

3.2.3

**Question 3.....” Which existing measures are Effective and which less effective?”**

Effective	less effective
Landfill tax – but change is slow.	
	Simplification of legislation needed
WRAP - some good, some bad, very bureaucratic.	
DEFRA for organic waste.	
DEFRA grants.	Not enough funding for community sector.
Good Practice from the construction industry with standardised colours of containers for different materials.	Recycling targets had been effective, it was felt that the driver for Local Authorities to recycle waste materials was in meeting the target and not in material conservation and sustainability.
	Home composting - not in tonnages
	PRNs were perceived to be ineffective and other Producer Responsibility initiatives to be only partially effective.
	Planning.
	20 year contracts, not easy to be flexible (not all agree).

3.2.4

**Question 4.....” What changes in policy are needed, if any, to drive up rates of re-use and recycling?”**

**Economic and Financial Issues:**

- Variable charging for household waste - good and/or bad - to give greater incentives.
- More resources for community sector.
- Tax on virgin natural resources, although it is recognised that this would need to be a world / EEC wide initiative.

**Communications:**

- More education at all levels.

- DEFRA should have a communications plan to address public awareness with respect to recycling/re-use.

**Structural / Institutional and Delivery Issues:**

- Recycling targets should cover all municipal wastes and include re-use and take into account volume as well as weight. The targets should be consistent throughout England and Wales.
- Both Central Government and Local Authority procurement policies should reflect the need for recycling and re-use.
- Any future strategy should be linked to concepts of sustainability and address such issues as Life Cycle Analysis.

**Policy and Legislation Issues:**

- Building Regulations should require new housing to be designed to ease recycling.
- Review the definition of “what is waste?” and “when materials cease to be waste?”
- Regulators and planners should allow trials of technologies to encourage R & D and remove the current need for lengthy permit determinations. This could be incorporated into the environmental permit review.
- Legislative review –to make compliance and consistent regulation easier.

**Waste Producer / Product Issues:**

- Policies needed to require the payment for waste management to be incorporated in the cost of the product as in the case of plastic bags in the Republic of Ireland and bottles in Denmark, as in the UK with soft drinks bottles in the past.

### 3.3 **Energy from Waste**

#### 3.3.1

#### ***Question 1....." Is there a case for an expansion in energy from waste?"***

##### **Policy and Legislation Issues:**

- "Yes", but only as part of an integrated waste strategy, and where it fits in with the waste hierarchy. LCA might show EfW is / can be BPEO. This would substantially increase the confidence of decision makers in selecting their individual solutions.
- Proximity principle, EfW allows waste to be dealt with locally.
- Landfill Directive Targets, EfW is the only way to achieve these in the short term. It is already too late to affect the 2010 target, 2013 and 2020 targets are only likely to be delivered through new EfW capacity. Recycling/composting alone will clearly be insufficient and could lead to significant EC enforcement / fines.
- "Alternative" fuel, reduces reliance on fossil fuels.
- Needed to burn the outputs of MBT, though some debate about why waste should be further pre-treated in this way.
- Thermal treatment should be considered in the broadest sense not just "traditional" incineration. Acknowledged issues re "bankability" of gasification / pyrolysis and other advanced thermal treatment technologies. Clear Defra guidance is needed on what EfW includes / excludes.

#### 3.3.2

#### ***Question 2....." What are the barriers to diverting waste from landfill to EFW?"***

##### **Financial and economic Issues:**

- Investment needs and poor "bankability" of advanced thermal treatments.
- Inequality of Renewables Obligation Certificates (ROCs), Green Certificates etc.
- Low landfill prices.

##### **Communications**

- Public perception and their faith in environmental lobby groups and negative campaigning of NGOs - plus lack of faith in govt and govt scientists especially re perceived health effects.

- Government has given out mixed messages regarding its support for EfW.
- Lack of any public education campaign to redress / add balance to arguments.
- LA Member perception: the investment is longer term than the foreseen targets.
- Lack of knowledge of benefits of EfW and confusion between EfW and incineration.

**Policy and Legislation Issues:**

- Planning and permitting process too complex / slow.
- Definitions of recycling, recovery, biomass etc.
- EU product directives that specify recycling with no environmental justification.
- Definition of recycling from bottom ash and contribution to recycling targets.

**Structural / Institutional and Delivery Issues:**

- Political inconsistency at all levels of government eg calling in schemes agreed at a local level and overturning the decision at the national level.
- Conflict between the proximity principle and communities taking responsibility for their waste and the larger more economic EfW facilities at a regional or sub-regional level.

3.3.3

**Question 3....." How do we overcome those barriers? Who needs to do what?"**

**Economic and financial issues:**

- LATS are a good way to encourage EfW.
- Revisit ROCs through DTi and link with energy strategy.

**Communications:**

- Health effects: recent Defra study helps but needs wider promotion.
- More consistent policy and messages govt to local authorities: integrated waste management includes many technologies/ processes, and make clear their support for EfW through the review of WS2000.
- Strong leadership from the Government with regard to supporting EfW, and raising people's awareness: supporting and highlighting the scientific facts behind the technology, and stressing the benefits of EfW, district heating and electricity for local residents, at a reduced cost to them.

- Education on the whole of the waste hierarchy rather than just recycling. A long term commitment to public education re residual waste responsibility and management as well as waste minimisation and recycling.

**Policy and Legislation Issues:**

- Definition of waste and its interpretation by the courts to recognise waste as a fuel / resource eg. using RDF to co-fire power stations, without the need for them to comply with the Waste Incineration Directive, would reduce emissions from those units.
- Streamlining and simplifying permitting and planning.
- Defra funded LCA to determine BPEO on environmental and economic grounds for each waste component, to be interpreted at a local level for the planning process.
- Govt statement: no incineration tax for at least 10 years.
- Clear planning policies: combined heat and power (CHP) should be required for new facilities. These new facilities (with CHP) could be integrated with new developments (industrial, and possibly housing) to provide cheap heat and electricity locally, plus a presumption that new build within the catchment area must connect to the network.
- The delivery of the policies contained in the consultation on the new PPS 10 with the clear identification of sites for waste treatment facilities.
- Compensation for people living in the vicinity of EfW facilities, for example, by exempting residents near an EfW facility from paying Council Tax.

**Structural / Institutional and Delivery Issues:**

- Planning for all wastes: domestic, commercial and industrial, not each in isolation.
- Change to the planning regime: use the same approach as for motorways; namely, take the decision out of local planning control.
- Government guidance needed on identifying the “best” thermal technologies in different circumstances. It can be difficult for LAs assess; and each individual authority has to go through the same assessment of technologies when drawing up their waste strategy. It was recognised, that Government was beginning to address this issue through the WIP New Waste Technology Data Centre.
- “WRAP” - like body to focus on EfW promotion and markets for residues.
- Single government department to deal with waste, and more “joined up” thinking across waste issues, from cradle to the grave.
- Increased segregation of waste by WCAs.
- Regional Development Agencies influencing the future shape of waste disposal facilities across their areas.
- More investment in rail transport of waste to larger and therefore more “economic” plants – but may conflict with the proximity principle and communities taking responsibility for their own waste.

- Architectural design to make a positive feature in the local landscape, possibly reducing public opposition. Plants can become an attraction through the use of visitor facilities, etc. – positive experience of this in Europe.

### 3.3.4

#### ***Question 4.....” How does EfW fit with other parts of the waste hierarchy?”***

##### **Policy and Legislation Issues:**

- There is a place for everything in a balanced / integrated waste strategy – therefore EfW should be on the same hierarchy level as recycling / recovery.
- Need to use LCA for each waste stream to determine BPEO rather than a restrictive hierarchy. One size does not fit all - individual communities must devise the “right” solution for their locality.
- It is the only currently proven and bankable technology for residual waste after recycling / composting, not raw MSW, for authorities to meet the Landfill Directive.
- The problems of minimum tonnage guarantees, crowding out of recycling/composting and waste minimisation need to be resolved.

### 3.3.5

#### ***Question 5.....” Do we need to restrict the waste materials used to generate energy, and on what grounds?”***

##### **Legislative / Policy Issues:**

- Restrict / prevent burning of all materials which are easily recyclable / not economically viable (on basis on LCA), and Hazardous Household Waste. EfW should only be used as a **residual** waste treatment.

### 3.3.6

***Question 6.....” Are there risks in promoting EfW and if so, how do we mitigate those risks?”***

**Communication:**

- Political backlash, members / candidates using waste as an election tool. High political risk to central and local government. Misinformation by some NGOs portrays EfW as anti-environment.
- Promotion of EfW may decrease public enthusiasm for recycling: “Why bother if the Government wants to burn all our waste?” Strong message from Government that EfW is part of an **integrated** waste strategy - not to replace recycling. Need to stress successful balance of high levels of EfW and recycling in other EU countries.
- EA/ Health Protection Agency need to publicise balanced message re health / environmental effects.

### 3.4 **Role of Technologies in Advancing Sustainable Waste Management**

#### 3.4.1

**Question 1.....” Is there a role for all technologies (advanced thermal treatment, biological treatment, mechanical and biological treatment (MBT)) or are some more desirable than others?”**

**Communications:**

- Strong Govt lead needed in accepting limits to recycling /composting and that residual waste management plant WILL BE NEEDED. Most guess that a realistic limit to recycling / composting (with favourable market conditions) will be between 40 and 50% for municipal – higher for industrial / commercial wastes. Many LAs will struggle to meet even 2010 targets without introducing something like MBT / energy recovery.

**Structural / Institutional and Delivery Issues:**

- Potentially a role for all technologies.
- Given the lead time to develop and bring to market novel technologies – any technology that can deliver medium term UK targets (up to 2020) can already be seen in operation somewhere in the world.
- Need to consider whether technology is proven or experimental, and will they work in the UK? Many are only “new” to the UK or are proven in non-waste sectors.
- Many proposals will include several technologies in parallel or tandem – strategies must consider how to sort and treat all the waste streams, recognising that minimisation, re-use and recycling come first.
- Need to match local waste needs with appropriate solutions – a case of “horses for courses”. These should be chosen on objective criteria.
- Some decisions are political, not technical – public acceptability must be borne in mind when selecting the preferred technology.
- Some industrial wastes do not yet have a particular technology to treat to a quality suitable for landfill. More R&D needed – by the producers.
- Must not “put all eggs in one basket”. Flexibility needed over strategy lifetime.
- Need to take account of cost and economies of scale.

### 3.4.2

**Question 2....."Should the choice of technology drive the approach to collection and segregation or vice versa? How can this be incorporated into local and regional waste management strategies? Is more central guidance needed?"**

**Communications:**

- More central guidance IS needed – access to relevant information and tools and successful communications strategies to support consultation.

**Structural / Institutional and Delivery Issues:**

- Waste treatment technologies adopted now will affect methods of collection, message to householders and ultimately cost or vice versa.
- Early development of recycling strategies may have already reduced the viability of some technologies.
- LAs are target-driven - choice of technology will be to deliver LATS.
- Drivers and Technologies will change over time. Need flexibility in waste collection.
- Level of source segregation, population size and density all affect collection practise with knock-on effects to technologies.
- Hazardous household waste (and the range of wastes thus classified) may have an adverse effect on the chosen technology.
- Need for partnership between WCA and WDA as well as targets: the requirements of BVPI and LATS may not be compatible. Unitary authorities have significant advantages.

**Policy and Legislation Issues:**

- Political decision making process should be removed or aided by strong guidance from DEFRA. Not allowed to be passed to the planning inspector or Government.
- This would help the location of strategically positioned facilities, which can be used by neighbouring councils and potentially commerce. It is necessary to have a site specific strategy at a local/regional level.
- These facilities should manage wastes other than municipal waste, to avoid duplication of waste treatment facilities.

### 3.4.3

#### **Question 3.....” What role should each play as we move forward over the next 10-20 years?”**

##### **Structural / Institutional and Delivery Issues:**

- Selection of technologies will deliver legislative targets (especially under LATS). Will it become redundant or impede future collection / treatment requirements? Are we making rushed decisions as a knee jerk reaction to legislation?
- For whose benefit are they being built? Industry / banks / public / govt?
- Evidence from Europe, especially Scandinavia, shows that thermal treatment is compatible with high recycling rates. Is international experience transferable to UK?
- The choice / mix of technologies can never be perfect. Understanding will evolve – circumstances will change – new variants of technologies will be developed. Objective decision making will only get us so far – after that the question is what is politically deliverable in the area?
- Good front-end segregation opens up more specialised treatment of different fractions / material types within the stream.
- Pyrolysis/gasification remain unproven.
- The most flexible technologies are likely to be the most successful.
- For 2010 the only way to meet targets is to burn. Up to then other techs will deliver. Composting is needed now, AD is coming soon, but food waste ban will push this higher up importance.
- New technologies need to be modular to allow expansion.
- We need the outcome of the New Technologies Demonstration Programme (and to a degree TRIF) to help answer this question. These initiatives – and others eg Waste Data Strategy, WAG, BREW are welcomed – a pity they didn't start earlier.

### 3.4.4

#### **Question 4.....”Where does the balance lie between them and how do we find that balance?”**

##### **Structural / Institutional and Delivery Issues**

- There is no perfect balance. Clear political and technical leadership needed from Government and others that residual waste treatment capacity IS NEEDED, and that there are a range of options available – including EfW and advanced thermal

treatments. The choice of the option(s) depends on local circumstances.

- PFI may be driving MBT; PFI pushes new technologies out.
- A balance is unnecessary as technology will be "site specific".
- Public acceptability will remain an important driver;
- Composting before thermal.

### 3.4.5

#### **Question 5....." How do we encourage the use of the "desired" technologies?"**

##### **Economic and Financial Issues:**

- Ability to get grants without distorting the market.
- Need to make landfill more expensive through increased landfill tax;

##### **Communications:**

- Public awareness / understanding of technologies - DEFRA & WRAP must help LAs to "sell" new techs by widening the "Recycle Now" campaign. Communications strategy to accompany the new National Waste Strategy, Defra led and co-ordinated.
- Leadership from government through technical guidance, not direction.

##### **Structural / Institutional and Delivery Issues:**

- Support for waste strategy development regionally and locally. WRAP and WIP support concentrates on collection and recycling. Tools exist to help decision making - officers need skills and support to use them.
- Critical risks for technology selection need to be reduced:
  - Reliability – proven ability to deal with composition of waste arising in UK. Problem of predicting future composition means more robust technologies favoured.
  - Finance Availability – what will the banks be prepared to back?
  - Sites and Planning – will enough suitable sites be available, plus unpredictability of political dimension of planning process.
- Tie the technologies into end markets for outputs – especially MBT.
- Many local authorities do not see provision for non MSW waste as their business. Priority is MSW contracts and this must not be compromised.

- Tension between WDAs and WCAs is problematic. We need single authorities with responsibility for collection and disposal. Unitaries seen to be more efficient in having shared collection and disposal budgets.
- We need working examples of these technologies in UK that people can see, measure etc. DEFRA - WIP demo projects accepted as a great idea, but results may be too late to really help anyone.
- DEFRA / ODPM and other departments should establish a National Waste Strategy for waste throughout England. What are the possible role, function and responsibilities of a Strategic Waste Authority?
- Public / private sector partnership – joint planning and provision or risk sharing eg. the LA taking on the planning issues for a proposed facility.
- Investment needs a stable policy / legislation background supported by: more “horizon scanning” of EU policy / legislation and its impacts.

**Policy and Legislation Issues:**

- Revise Local Government targets – they can only invest in solutions to avoid LATS penalties and meet BVPIs. Wider issues of quality and innovation are not encouraged in a risk averse approach. Longer term and coherent targets needed (residual waste rather than recycling).
- Efficient planning/permitting regime.

### 3.5 **Joining-up Action Across Waste Streams**

#### 3.5.1

#### **Question 1.....” Which particular issues should we worry about in relation to non-municipal waste ?”**

##### **Communications**

- Prevention / Minimisation not top priority for SMEs. More resources needed to give them reliable waste minimisation / awareness advice.

##### **Structural / Institutional and Delivery Issues:**

- Lack of Reliable Data – re types, quantities or locations. More detailed analysis, and models to predict future arisings needed. Access to EA database is difficult. Some surveys have asked SMEs questions they don't know the answer to!
- Need for regional strategies to ensure adequate provision of facilities to handle NMW, reduce excessive transport distances and overcome local planning issues.
- Division of responsibilities for MSW and C&I waste streams creates an artificial barrier and inefficiency.

##### **Policy and Legislation Issues:**

- Producer Responsibility - particularly WEEE - uncertainty of who will be responsible. Packaging/PRN system does not incentivise reduction.
- Current emphasis too municipal waste orientated.
- Waste definitions disincentive to recycling / re-processing investment.
- Wastes classification by origin, rather than what they are, prevents coordination between the two tiers of local authorities commercial waste collected by Districts providing support to a community, in direct opposition to a County Council's requirement to keep commercial waste out of the municipal stream to reduce LATS diversion tonnages.

##### **Waste Producer / Product Issues:**

- Products not easy to recycle due to design – manufacturers have no influence over dismantlers / shredders. Need to use technology to develop better sorting procedures.

### 3.5.2

#### **Question 2....." What additional action could/should be taken on non-municipal waste?"**

##### **Economic and Financial Issues:**

- Incentives for landfill alternatives – increase landfill tax.
- Enhanced Capital Allowances for industry, for recycling / minimisation investment.

##### **Structural / Institutional and Delivery Issues:**

- Targets and Incentives for Businesses - currently no targets for NMW and no incentives for SMEs to minimise / recycle waste.
- Incentives for businesses not more regulation, Need an infrastructure for dealing with NMW before setting targets.
- Planning - too time consuming. Businesses do not always think ahead. Technologies develop after plans are set. Unlock planning for new sites that can handle NMW.
- Need to use the existing infrastructure for dealing with both MW and NMW. Also a need to ensure that new facilities/technologies can deal with multiple waste streams
- Need for more partnerships between private sector and LAs and in dealing with similar waste from different waste streams eg. Paper & cardboard.
- Wider responsibility for Local Authorities to provide services for SMEs eg. kerbside box schemes for SMEs.

##### **Policy and Legislation Issues:**

- Better and more consistent regulation.

### 3.5.3

#### **Question 3....." What is the rationale for joining up across waste streams?"**

##### **Structural / Institutional and Delivery Issues:**

- Better Segregated Waste at source.
- Reduced transport – cost, emissions, and traffic.
- Economies of Scale - Facilities dealing with multiple waste streams could lead to reduced planning costs. Also cost savings if the materials can be processed together using the same process /technology.

### 3.5.4

#### **Question 4.....” What is not happening that could or should to effect such joining up? Where does the responsibility lie?”**

##### **Economic and Financial Issues:**

- Landfill Tax is imposed on the basis of waste property regardless of source –a variable tax could be used for differing waste types.
- Refined PRN system to reward closed loop recycling more than “down-cycling”.
- Local authority funding to implement the strategy should be determined on a national need basis, not by who puts the best bid forward.
- Incentives for businesses to reduce / re-use / recycle eg. reduced business rates, reduced / differential collection charging according to the waste type.
- Virgin/raw material tax.

##### **Communications:**

- Better advice to SMEs on waste minimisation. Create capacity and incentivise waste producers to invest in developing new facilities.
- Greater public awareness and political understanding of the major changes arising from the Waste Strategy and the need for new facilities.
- National strategic leadership.

##### **Structural / Institutional and Delivery Issues:**

- Design “bottom up” integrated waste management systems for individual waste streams - large and small scale - with resource parks or trade equivalent of CA sites.
- Complexity of waste streams, eg. Plastics, can make it uneconomic to recycle. Need to consider whether it may be more practical/economic to use ‘energy from waste’ for some wastes, and that BPEO may be different for individual waste streams.
- On-board weighing systems should allow for co-collection of materials from commercial and household premises in the same round.
- Non municipal waste omitted or specifically excluded from PFI MSW contracts. MSW plants monopolise suitable sites – frustrating provision of planning permission for non MSW facilities in the area. DEFRA should change the criteria for acceptance of PFI proposals to require non-MSW to be included in the scheme.
- If targets for non-municipal waste are imposed an admin body would be needed to enforce/monitor compliance – a possible role for a Strategic Waste Authority.
- Too many authorities with inadequately experienced staff to support the implementation of the Waste Strategy.

- Lack of technical support directly at DEFRA, and access to such support in the EA.
- Fragmented voice of government for waste, eg. DEFRA / DTI / ODPM split.
- The waste strategy must incorporate all wastes to the same extent. The largest proportion of waste produced is not MSW.
- Make wastes management a utility.
- Regional planning for wastes.

**Policy and Legislation Issues:**

- Danger of LATS swamping other initiatives. Local authorities reducing collection of trade waste and excluding trade waste from CA sites.
- Material specific targets should be set across waste streams.
- Comprehensive producer responsibilities, simple to implement and enforceable, that encourage “cross over” planning and provision between private and public sectors – as with WEEE, but not for packaging in UK. UK producer responsibility does not promote more resource efficient approaches or reduce waste. The fear of penalties drives toward lowest cost compliance not resource efficiency. The German Green Dot scheme appears to subsidise / finance collection regardless of source.
- Specific and auditable / enforceable recycling and waste minimisation targets for industry and commerce as well as for the public sector.
- Promotion of eco-design.
- Clarify legal definitions – particularly “MSW” and “other similar waste”.
- Voluntary sectoral agreements on waste management practices.
- Best practice review for C&I waste across EU member states.

3.5.5

**Question 5.....” Are there particular problems preventing SMEs from becoming more resource efficient? How can they be overcome?”**

**Economic and Financial Issues:**

- There is no incentive to reduce / re-use / recycle – it is cheaper to have waste collected and landfilled, due to market forces, geography etc.
- True waste costs not identifiable to SMEs.
- Grants needed to assist SMEs to write waste plans.

**Communications:**

- SMEs need advice on quality standards for materials separated for recycling.
- Some want to Reuse, Recycle, Recover but not know how or realise it can save money. Communication require some leadership but where from? Regulators, planners, producers, local authority?

**Structural / Institutional and Delivery Issues:**

- Need to help – not advise - SMEs. DEFRA should provide similar support to that given to farmers following the Foot and Mouth outbreak. Forum needed which includes representatives from industry, SMEs and local / national government.
- LAs need to work more with commerce and industry to promote waste minimisation / diversion strategies. A tacit agreement that they do not at present, as they do not have a duty to recycle C&I waste.
- Logistics, geography, extra staff, extra vehicles, narrow streets / lanes are all barriers all lead to extra costs for the local authority which have to be passed onto the tax payer.
- Political and geographical boundaries can often lead to inefficiencies when waste movements are concerned.

**Waste Producer / Product Issues:**

- Difficult to achieve co-operation across companies - (hence the need for a Regulatory Body for C&I waste).
- Not all have formal contracts for their waste management, often leading to taking it home or to CA sites.
- SMEs don't see waste minimisation re-use / recycling as their responsibility.

## **4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 4.1 Comments from delegates to this series of four workshops represent a valuable input to Defra for the Waste Strategy Review for England. They are presented in this report with no CIWM comment and with the minimum of editing necessary to present the main points being made.
- 4.2 CIWM would be pleased to explore with Defra, how to develop some of the main themes coming from this exercise. The degree of detail possible in a short workshop environment and an even shorter rapporteur report leaves some gap between comments gathered and the degree of analysis / development needed to make full proposals for the draft strategy.
- 4.3 Defra's stakeholder engagement in this strategy review is warmly welcomed – both through this workshop programme and otherwise. CIWM would like to work with Defra to maximise the opportunity for further input by stakeholders as part of any formal draft strategy consultation.
- 4.4 Further stakeholder engagement through workshops or similar should involve more careful identification of delegates to allow a more representative spread of sectoral input.
- 4.5 The CIWM "Lessons Learned" report drew on practices elsewhere in the UK. We would urge Government to undertake a similar review of strategies / practise in other EU Member States.
- 4.6 Government will need to make the scope of the current strategy review clear. Many proposals from workshop delegates include issues which may be beyond the bounds of this review.

## APPENDIX 1: Delegate Lists for Each Venue

Friday 28<sup>th</sup> January 2005, Birmingham

COMPANY NAME	NAME	JOB TITLE
Advantage Waste Brokers Ltd	Ian McQuaid	Director
Amber Valley Borough Council	Margaret Baile	Waste Performance Manager
Amber Valley Borough Council	Louise Cordery	Waste Recycling Officer
Birmingham City Council	Stuart Lattimer	Waste Disposal Operations Manager
BMW Manufacturing (Ltd) UK	Nick Hill	Environmental Advisor
BMW Manufacturing (Ltd) UK	Paul Jackson	Waste Centre Manager
Business Link Nottinghamshire	Dr Michael Huxley	Business Advisor
Cheltenham Borough Council	Vanessa England	Waste & Cleansing Services Manager
Chesterfield Borough Council	David Hibbert	Principal waste Management Officer
Country Land & Business Association	Oliver Harwood	Head of Rural Economy
Coventry and Solihull Waste Disposal Company Ltd	Richard Scawin	Environment & Performance Manager
Derbyshire County Council	Steve Pearson	Waste Management
Derbyshire County Council	Clive Robertson	Waste Contracts Project Manager
East Midlands Environment Link (Friends of the Earth)	Nigel Lee	
Egniol Ltd	Chris Nicoll	Principal Planning Manager
Egniol Ltd	Sally James	Senior Recycling Consultant
Gloucester City Council	Cat Phelps	Recycling Officer
Golder Associates (UK) Ltd	David Hall	Director
Hampshire County Council	Jeremy Smith	Team Manager
Hampshire County Council	Adrian Lynham	Local Plans Officer
Leicestershire County Council	Sarah Alder	Senior Waste Policy Officer
MEL Research	Dr Barbara Leach	Head of Waste Management
Motor Vehicles Dismantlers Association	Duncan Wemyss	Association Secretary
Moulton College	Colin Mulholland	Training Consultant
National Grid Transco	Adrian Carran	SHE Business Partner
Northamptonshire County Council	Dr Fiona Unett	Waste Strategy Team Leader
ORM	Philippa Stanley	
Redditch Borough Council	Sue Horrobin	Waste Management Manager
RPS Planning, Transport & Environment	Claudia Amos	Senior Consultant

Severn Trent Water Ltd	Ken Shapland	Permits Manager
Sheffield City Council	David Bird	Head of Waste Management
Sheffield City Council	Gillian Charters	Assistant Head of Waste Management
Shrewsbury and Atcham Borough Council	John Wallen	Waste Services Manager
Skanska U.K. Civil Engineering	Rod Dengate	Sustainable Development Advisor
Stroud District Council	Carlos Novoth	Tech Officer
Sustainable Recycling Solutions U.K. Ltd	Philip May-Brown	Business Development Manager
Tarmac Recycling Ltd	Alan Sheppard	Managing Director
Telford & Wrekin Council	Katherine Kynaston	Environment Manager
Telford & Wrekin Council	Paul Sobczyk	Waste Strategy Coordinator
Uttlesford D.C.	Ed Lock	Recycling Officer
Uttlesford D.C.	Ron Pridham	Services Officer
Waste Recycling Group Limited	Paul Green	Properties and Estates Manager
Wastefile U.K.	Chris Holliday	Environment & Compliance Officer
Worcestershire County Council	Ashley Collins	Contracts Manager
WRAP	Patrick Mahon	Policy Analyst
<b>Facilitators</b>	Andrew Maunder	AEA Technology
	Andy Barker	CIWM
	Chris Davey	WRAP
	Derek Greedy	Derek Greedy Associates
	Margaret Bates	University College Northampton
<b>Defra</b>	Paul Green	
	Vanessa Fandrich	
	Martin Cox	
	David Wood	
	Tom McGowan	

**Monday 31<sup>st</sup> January 2005, Hamilton House, London**

COMPANY NAME	NAME	JOB TITLE
ABRO	James Hodges	Sales Manager
Alcan Aluminum can Recycling	Terry Marks	Business Development manager
Beyond waste	Alan Potter	Consultant
British Glass Manufacturer's Confederation	Andrew Hartley	Director of Strategy & Communications
British Glass Manufacturer's Confederation	Ben Stone	Recycling Manager
British Metals Recycling Association	Howard Block	Legal & Environment Advisor
British Metals Recycling Association	Neil Marshall	Director General
Buckinghamshire Waste Partnership	Mark Tipton	Waste Partnership Officer
Cleanaway Limited	Gloria Rampton	Business Development Manager
Corus	Paul Brooks	Group Environment Manager
Crawley Borough Council	David Solomon	Waste & Technical Services Manager
East Sussex County Council	Gary Urwin	Contract Implementation Manager
East Sussex County Council	Martyn Perry	Waste Services Manager
ECT Group Ltd	Ruth Prior	Business Development Manager
ENDS Report	Gerraint Roberts	Journalist
EnviroCentre	Dr Robin Curry	Sector Manager
Environment Agency	Matthew Topsfield	Regulatory Officer (waste)
Environment Agency	Mike Tregent	Environment Officer
EQ Waste Management	Simon Lupson	Director
EQ Waste Management	Adrian Lupson	Director
Fareshare	Alex Green	Director of Marketing and fundraising
Fareshare	Roger Seoul	Environmental consultant
Green Alliance	Ben Shaw	Head of Strategy
Hampshire County Council	Paul Archer	Head of Waste Management
INCPEN-Industry Council for Packaging and the Environment	Jane Bickerstaffe	Director
Independent Consultant	Gerwyn Jones	Independent Consultant
International Agenda 21 Ltd	Alan Brewer	Sustainable Waste Consultant
Legal & general property Ltd	David John Mummery	Customer services manager
London Borough of Ealing	Beverley Simonson	Waste Minimisation & Recycling Officer
London Borough of Ealing	Stuart Pohler	Waste Minimisation & Recycling Officer: Team Leader

London Borough Of Hammersmith & Fulham	Stephen McAndrews	Team leader: Environment policy
London Borough Of Hammersmith & Fulham	Dave Newman	Waste Development manager
Mike Tobin Consultancy Ltd	John Pavitt	Consultant
National Audit Office	Paul Mills	Audit Principal
National Audit Office	Jeremy Gostick	Audit Principal
Newham University Hospital trust	Fiona Heyland	Environmental Manager
Norfolk County Council	Paul Borrett	Waste Resource Manager
Norfolk County Council	Oliver Furbur	Waste partnership & Strategy Officer
Norfolk County Council	Adrian Tyas	Waste reduction officer
North Norfolk District Council	John Peet	Environmental Services Manager
Oakdene Hollins Ltd	David Fitzsimons	Senior Consultant
ONYX Environmental Group	James Potter	General Manager, materials recovery
Peterborough City Council	Richard Peam	Waste management officer
Peterborough City Council	Jacqui Warren	Waste & Recycling Officer
Robert Long Consultancy Ltd	Richard McAree	Project Director
South Kesteven District Council	Dawn temple	Sustainable Waste Management policy officer
Thames Water Utilities	Mark Terrell	Waste Management Advisor
Three Rivers District Council	Karl Murdoch	Head of Environmental Protection
Wandsworth Council	Richard Hobbs	Head of Waste Management
Wandsworth Council	Michael Singham	Waste Policy Officer
<b>PRESS</b>	Geraint Roberts	ENDS Report

**Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2005, Lancashire**

<b>COMPANY NAME</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>JOB TITLE</b>
ARUP	Andy Woodland	Director
Association for Public Service Excellence	John Marsh	Principal Advisor
Atkins Environment	Steve Gibbs	Principal Consultant
Biffa Waste Services Limited	Kerry Halford-Evans	Operations Development Manager
Blackpool Council	Annette Kydd	Waste Minimisation Officer
Blackpool Council	Kathy Harrison	Waste Management Officer
Borough of Pendle	Carole Taylor	Waste Management Co-ordinator
Borough of Pendle	Ian McInery	Operational Services Manager
Centrica Energy Operations Ltd	Joseph Dafimu	Maintenance Engineer
Chorley Borough Council	John Lechmere	Head Of Services
Chorley Borough Council	Simon Clark	Commercial Manager
Cleanaway Ltd	Gill Weeks	Regulatory Affairs Director
Corus Engineering Steels	John Rockett	Business Affairs Manager
Corus Research, Development and Technology	Dr Nicholas Avery	Senior Researcher
Corus Research, Development and Technology	Louise Payne	Senior Researcher
Department of Health & Housing	Simon Johnson	Head of Environment
East Ridings Of Yorkshire Council	Cassie Hart-Fisher	Senior Environmental Services Officer
Enviros Consulting Ltd	Genevieve Smith	Research Consultant
Furniture Matters	Stephen Buchanan	Projects Delivery Manager
Gordon Mackie Associates Ltd	Duncan Lummis	Senior Consultant
Gordon Mackie Associates Ltd	Gordon Mackie	Managing Director
Government Office For Yorkshire and The Humber	Sarah Smith	Environment Policy Manager
Greater Manchester Waste Ltd	Imogen Billings	Research & Policy Advisor
H.J. Banks	Malcolm Mundy	Director of Waste Management Operations
Harrogate Borough Council	Deborah Rowe	Environmental Services Manager
Lancashire County Council	Clare Atkinson	Waste Minimisation Team Leader
Merseyside Waste Disposal Authority	Pamela Butler	Assistant Waste Strategy Manager
Myerscough College	Betty Whittaker	College Lecturer
Netherton Consultants	Richard Curry	Consultant
North West Regional Assembly	Dr Bryony Cunningham	Minerals & Waste
North West Regional Assembly	Peter Greifenberg	Consultant
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough	Adrian Gabriel	Waste Strategy Manager

Council		
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	Dave Hill	Project Officer
Safetykleen	Roger Creswell	Director
Scout Green Solutions	Harold Tonge	Principal
Shropshire County Council	Joy Blizzard	Waste Initiatives Officer
SITA U.K. Ltd	Steve Hunter	Disposal Sales Manager
South Lakeland District Council	Dr Francis Obale-Ebanga	Waste Minimisation & Campaigns Officer
Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council	Dr Andrew Craig	Waste Management Development Officer
United Utilities	Jan Tyson	Regulation & Compliance Manager
United Utilities ( Service Delivery)	Brian Smith	Waste Regulation Manager
United Utilities Plc	Richard Mills	Waste Management Advisor
Vale Royal Borough Council	Alison Hunter	Waste Development Manager
Vale Royal Borough Council	Steve Bakewell	Head Of Environmental Operations
Wastefile U.K.	Brian Marshall	Environmental & Compliance Manager
<b>Facilitators</b>	Steve Lee	CIWM
	Tina Benfield	CIWM
	Keith Simmonite	Paladin Consultancy
	Keith Roberts	SafetyKleen
	Terry Bradley	
<b>Defra</b>	Tom McGowan	
	Vanessa Fandrich	
	Neil Thornton	
	Suzie Daykin	
	Dave Brooks	

**Thursday 10<sup>th</sup> February 2005, Thistle Hotel, Exeter**

<b>COMPANY NAME</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>JOB TITLE</b>
Alcan Aluminum Can Recycling	Terry Marks	Business Development Manager
Bournemouth Borough Council	Robert Osborough	Waste Manager
Brightstar Environmental	Peter Cumberlidge	General Manager
Bristol and Weston NHS Purchasing Consortium	Carine Verstraete	Head of Supply Chain Management
Cranfield University	Dr David Aldred	Lecturer
Crown Castle U.K Ltd	Adam Leslie	Environment & Quality Specialist
Devon County Council	Annette Dentith	Principal Waste Management Officer
Devon County Council	Ben Jennings	County Waste Management Officer
Devon County Council	Bobby Hughes	Senior Waste Management Officer
EMAG Ltd	Claire Moody	Director
Borough Council Of Poole	Stephen Chapple	Team Manager-Waste Operations
Environment Agency	Ian Smith	Waste Strategy Officer
Environment Agency	Iain Baines	Regulatory Officer (Devon)
Environment Agency	Gitty Ankers	Regulatory Specialist
Environment Agency	Adrian Harding	Policy Advisor (Producer Responsibility)
Exeter City Council	Mike Trim	Manager
Exeter City Council	Steve Freeman	Assistant Manager
First Great Western Trains	Colin Cusack	Depot Services Engineer
First Great Western Trains	Barry Buckfield	Services Manager
First Great Western Trains	Lester Pickhaver	Fleet Operative Grade 4
Hyder Marcus Hodges	Dave Lerpiniere	Environmental Management Consultant
IET Energy	Chris Pope	Director
Leicester City Council	Steven Weston	Head Of Waste Management
Lloyd Maunder Ltd	Graham Melhuish	Environmental Manager
Mineral Industry Research Organisations (MIRO)	Derren Cresswell	Project Manager
New Earth Solutions Ltd	Ted Bleszynski	Planning Director
North Bristol NHS Trust	Helen Passmore	Senior Purchasing Specialist
North Bristol NHS Trust	Marta Paulo	Waste Minimisation Officer
North Cornwall District Council	Kevin Colwill	Cleansing Manager
Remade Ltd	David Chambers	Operations Director
University of Southampton	Angela Maycox	Research Fellow
South East England Development Agency	Melvin Caton	Head of Waste Market Development
South Hams District Council	Verity Palk	Waste Management Officer
South West Regional Assembly	Craig Frost	Regional Policy Manager
Sustainability South West	Sylvie Channon	Regional Liaison & Approval Coordinator

SWEET	Sally Campbell	Director
Teignbridge District Council	Phil Shears	Head of Teignbridge Services
Teignbridge District Council	Chris Braines	Waste Management Officer
Torbay Council	Michael Trevarthen	Service Manager
Torbay Council	Andy Dumont	Service Manager
Tycoelectronics U.K. Ltd	Alan McKenzie	Technical Services Manager
University of Exeter	Mike Pearce	Contracts Officer
WasteSavers Ltd	Mike Croxford	General Manager
WasteSavers Ltd	Paul Jones	Coordinator
West Devon Borough Council	Jane Savage	Recycling Officer
West Devon Borough Council	Jill Skelton	Waste Contracts Manager
West Sussex CC	Susan Gibbons	Project Development Officer
Weston Area Health Trust	Clive Durian	Estates & Facilities Manager
<b>Facilitators</b>	Tracy Moffatt	CIWM
	Mike Brown	County Environmental Services Ltd
	David Hooper	Wyvern Waste Services Ltd
	Richard Hogg	Compact Power Ltd
	Dr Paul Dacombe	University of Southampton
	Adrian Hawkes	Valpak
<b>Defra</b>	Lindsay Cornish	
	Simon Givern	
	Ben McKie	
	Vanessa Fandrich	
	David Wood	

## **APPENDIX 2: Workshop Facilitators**

### **Birmingham Facilitators**

Waste prevention/reduction  
Andrew Maunder, AEA Technology

Recycling and re-use  
Chris Davey, WRAP

Energy from waste  
Margaret Bates, UCN

Role of technologies in advancing sustainable waste management  
Derek Greedy, Warwickshire County Council

Joining up action across waste streams  
Andy Barker, Membership Manager, CIWM

### **London Facilitators**

Waste prevention/reduction  
Tony Breton, Communications Manager – am

Recycling and re-use  
Jane Bickerstaffe, INCPEN - am  
Tony Breton, Communications Manager - pm

Energy from waste  
- pm

Role of technologies in advancing sustainable waste management  
Alan Potter, Consultant, Beyond Waste – am  
Chris Murphy, Deputy Chief Executive, CIWM – pm

Joining up action across waste streams:  
Chris Murphy, Deputy Chief Executive, CIWM – am  
Alan Potter, Consultant, Beyond Waste - pm

### **Chorley Facilitators**

Waste prevention/reduction  
Tina Benfield, Technical Officer, CIWM

Recycling and re-use  
Keith Roberts, Safety Kleen

Energy from waste  
Keith Simmonite, Consultant, Paladin

Role of technologies in advancing sustainable waste management  
Steve Lee, Chief Executive, CIWM

Joining up action across waste streams:  
Terry Bradley, Consultant

### **Exeter Facilitators**

Waste prevention/reduction  
Mike Brown, CES

Recycling and re-use  
David Hooper, Wyvern Waste Services Ltd – am  
Adrian Hawkes, Valpak - pm

Energy from Waste  
Paul Dacombe, Southampton University - am  
Richard Hogg, Compact Power – pm

Role of technologies in advancing sustainable waste management  
Richard Hogg, Compact Power – am  
David Hooper, Wyvern Waste Services Ltd – pm

Joining up action across waste streams:  
Tracy Moffatt, Technical Manager, CIWM

## **APPENDIX 3:**

### **Briefings from Defra on 5 Topics Covered in Workshops**

#### **Facilitator brief: waste prevention/reduction**

##### Purpose:

Explore the waste prevention/reduction agenda and to help place action on prevention / reduction in a strategic context. Making real progress in reducing the amount of waste produced is perhaps the holy grail of waste policy – many countries have set themselves aspirational reduction targets, but with little success in bringing down the level of waste arisings.

##### Questions to explore include:

- What is stopping us from reducing the amount of waste society produces, whether at home or in businesses / industry?
- How can we overcome those obstacles? Who needs to do what?
- Which existing measures are effective and which less effective?
- What changes in policy are needed, if any, to encourage waste prevention?

##### Scope of discussion:

Should cover all waste. Reduction / prevention should also be taken to mean reduction in hazardousness as well as reduction in volume. We are looking for specifics. Part of the discussion should identify specific problems / barriers, but we are particularly interested in the potential solutions to those problems. The solutions may include action / activity already taking place or planned; or they may be new measures. In identifying new measures, it is important to try to identify where the responsibility would lie and what role, if any, central government would have.

If time allows, having identified any potential new specific measures/policies (or expansion/confirmation of existing ones), views on their suitability (e.g. conflict with other policies, adverse impacts), feasibility (e.g. scale of resources needed) or acceptability (e.g. public or political support; private sector concerns) would be helpful.

## **Facilitator brief: recycling (including composting) and re-use**

### Purpose:

Explore recycling and re-use of waste and help place action to encourage recycling and re-use in a strategic context. Encouraging recycling forms one of the key objectives of government policy on waste and is crucial to making our society more resource-efficient. International comparisons show that the UK lags behind many OECD partners in the proportion of waste recycled. Re-use is perhaps the Cinderella of the waste hierarchy, despite its evident contribution to improving sustainability, for reasons including the challenges of measurement and therefore incentivisation, and the very small scale on which re-use activity currently takes place.

### Questions to explore include:

- What is stopping us from recycling more of the waste that households and business produce?
- What is stopping us reusing waste products more frequently?
- How can we overcome those obstacles? Who needs to do what?
- Which existing measures are effective and which less effective?
- What changes in policy are needed, if any, to drive up rates of re-use and recycling?

### Scope:

Discussion should cover all waste and try to distinguish between recycling and re-use. It may get into the question of whether there is an over-emphasis on recycling or how much of our waste it makes economic / environmental sense to recycle. But we are looking for specifics. Part of the discussion will have to identify specific problems/barriers, but we are particularly interested in the potential solutions to those problems. Solutions may include action / activity already taking place or planned; or new measures. In identifying new measures, it is important to try to identify where the responsibility would lie and what role, if any, central government would have. We should try to avoid getting too bogged down in debate over the definition of waste, but look at how to encourage recycling/re-use.

If time allows, having identified any potential new specific measures/policies (or expansion/confirmation of existing ones), views on their suitability (e.g. conflict with other policies, adverse impacts), feasibility (e.g. scale of resources needed) or acceptability (e.g. public or political support; private sector concerns) would be helpful.

## **Facilitator brief: energy from waste (EfW)**

### Purpose:

Explore the role that energy from waste should play in our medium to long term strategy on waste. International comparisons show that the UK incinerates a far lower proportion of its waste than many OECD partners. Although reducing landfill and increasing recycling are key objectives of Government policy underpinned by targets and other measures, the role of energy from waste is perhaps less clearly articulated.

### Questions to explore include:

- Is there a case for an expansion in energy from waste?
- What are the barriers to diverting waste from landfill to EFW?
- How do we overcome those barriers? Who needs to do what?
- How does EFW fit with other parts of the waste hierarchy? Do we need to restrict the waste materials used to generate energy, and on what grounds? Are there risks in promoting EFW and if so, how do we mitigate those risks?

### Scope:

Discussion should cover all waste. Discussion may become polarised, but we are looking for specifics. Part of the discussion will have to identify specific problems / barriers, but we are particularly interested in the potential solutions to those problems. The solutions may include action / activity already taking place or planned; or they may be new measures. In identifying new measures, it is important to try to identify where the responsibility would lie and what role, if any, central government would have.

If time allows, having identified any potential new specific measures/policies (or expansion/confirmation of existing ones), views on their suitability (e.g. conflict with other policies, adverse impacts), feasibility (e.g. scale of resources needed) or acceptability (e.g. public or political support) would be helpful.

## **Facilitator brief: the role of technologies in advancing sustainable waste management**

### Purpose:

Explore the merits of the various waste management technologies and identify the role that each might play in delivering more sustainable waste management and improved resource efficiency. Although some technologies are described as new, their newness relates more to their relative absence from the current mix of waste management techniques used in this country.

### Questions to explore include:

- Is there a role for all technologies (advanced thermal treatment, biological treatment, mechanical and biological treatment) or are some more desirable than others?
- Should the choice of technology drive the approach to collection and segregation or vice versa? How can this be incorporated into local and regional waste management strategies? Is more central guidance needed?
- What role should each play as we move forward over the next 10-20 years?
- Where does the balance lie between them and how do we find that balance?
- How do we encourage the use of “desirable” technologies?

### Scope:

Discussion should cover the full range of available waste management techniques. Part of the discussion should identify specific problems / barriers to bringing “desirable” technologies on line, but we are particularly interested in the potential solutions to those problems. Solutions may include action / activity already taking place or planned; or they may be new measures. In identifying new measures, it is important to try to identify where the responsibility would lie and what role, if any, central government would have. We should try to avoid getting too bogged down in debate over the definition of waste and waste incineration directive.

If time allows, having identified any potential new specific measures/policies (or expansion/confirmation of existing ones), views on their suitability (e.g. conflict with other policies, adverse impacts), feasibility (e.g. scale of resources needed) or acceptability (e.g. public or political support; private sector concerns) would be helpful.

## **Facilitator brief: joining up across waste streams**

### Purpose:

Discussion is to explore whether enough action is being taken on non-municipal waste and whether there are synergies / efficiencies to be exploited by “joining-up” activity across various waste streams. A particular focus should be small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs).

### Questions to explore include:

- Which particular issues should we worry about in relation to non-municipal waste?
- What additional action could/should be taken on non-municipal waste?
- What is the rationale for joining up across waste streams?
- What is not happening that could or should to effect such joining up? Where does the responsibility lie?
- Are there particular problems preventing SMEs from becoming more resource efficient? How can they be overcome?

### Scope:

Discussion should encompass all the principal waste streams. It might explore synergies between municipal and non municipal waste management and joining up businesses in a locality to minimise waste production. We are particularly interested in establishing the extent to which criticism of current policy - being too municipal waste focussed – is valid and how we might redress any imbalance. But we are looking for specifics. Part of the discussion will have to identify specific problems / barriers, but we are particularly interested in the potential solutions to those problems. The solutions may include action / activity already taking place or planned; or they may be new measures. In identifying new measures, it is important to try to identify where the responsibility would lie and what role, if any, central government would have.

If time allows, having identified any potential new specific measures/policies (or expansion/confirmation of existing ones), views on their suitability (e.g. conflict with other policies, adverse impacts), feasibility (e.g. scale of resources needed) or acceptability (e.g. public or political support; private sector concerns) would be helpful.

**APPENDIX 4:**  
**Feedback Summary on the 4 Workshops**

	Birmingham	London	Chorley	Exeter	
Venue	2.8	3.0	3.0	3.3	3.05
Ease of Access	2.8	3.0	2.9	3.0	2.9
Conference rooms	2.6	3.0	2.9	3.2	2.9
Sound quality / sight line	2.6	2.0	2.6	3.0	2.6
Visual aids	2.1	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.4
Breakout sessions – am.	3.1	2.5	3.0	3.2	3.05
Breakout sessions - pm.	2.8	2.5	3.0	2.9	2.8
Catering	3.5	2.8	3.3	3.5	3.25
General IWMBMS organn	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.2	3.1
Timings	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.2	3.05
	2.85	2.75	2.95	3.1	

4 = Excellent  
 3 = Good  
 2 = fair  
 1 = poor