

**ADEPT Waste Group Meeting**

**18 December 2018**

**Attendees:**

Ian Fielding, North Yorkshire (Chair)

Nick Bethell, EA

Karyn Punchard, Dorset

Kofi Adu-Gyamfi, Buckinghamshire - Defra Secondee

Tina Benfield, CIWM

Chris Murphy, CIWM

Steve Read, West Sussex

Simon Aries, Hertfordshire

Thom Koller, ADBA

Joel Hull, Norfolk

Teresa Mitchell, Oxfordshire

James Potter, Hampshire

Mickey Green, Somerset

Kate Hand, London Councils

Hannah Bartram, Adept

Sonica Sidhu, LGA

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Apologies |  | |
| Steve Palfrey | Suffolk | |
| Gurbaksh Badhan | Bucks |
| Mick Allen | Notts |
| Verity Palk | Cornwall |
| Paul Tripp | East Riding |
| David Beaver | Kent |
| Claire Brailsford | Derbyshire |
| Ian Hartley | Torbay |
| Chris Preston | DEFRA |
| Paul Jones | Northumberland |
| Tracy Carter | Wiltshire |
| Sean Kent | Lincolnshire |
| Adam Smith | Cambridgeshire |
| Paul Bellotti | East Riding |
| David Greenfield | SOENECS |
| John Ashworth | West Berks |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item** |  |
| **1** | **Welcome, Introductions and Apologies**  IF led introductions and JH agreed to take minutes. |
| **2** | **ADBA Presentation - Thom Koller, Senior Policy Manager, Anaerobic Digestion & Bioresources Association**  During the presentation in response to a question as to why capture rates were so low reference was made to the Wrap cost benefit tool and Wrap guidance on interventions such as provision of biodegradable bags or no food waste stickers on bins.  TK asked what Local Authorities need to communicate the benefits of food waste collections to the public and to engage with plant operators.  Points raised in discussion:   1. **additional cost was a / the barrier** 2. **logistics was not a barrier**, reference was made to food collections operating in 30 of 32 Scottish authorities, the 13 years’ of experience in Somerset and an example was also given of plants and collection services in Oxfordshire. 3. progress has been hindered by media agendas. 4. **food waste collections were often introduced with a move to AWC, adding a food collection to an existing AWC added costs** and may only work financially with a move to 3 or 4 weekly. 5. **was there enough AD capacity if food waste collections were rolled out by 2023?** 6. 51% of households currently had access to a food waste service (Wrap 2017/18 reference). 7. A link to national planning policy was required. 8. **this was a service that needed ongoing support (eg sack provision, stickers, communications)** to keep participation levels high as some areas experienced lack of buy in. 9. The lack of targets was a barrier and it was pointed out that it may be easier to add food collections to a multi-pod vehicle / kerbside sort collection model. 10. A successful Wrap funded intervention in Norwich was given as an example of the scale of benefits achievable and other interventions in Dorset and Somerset saw circa 20% uplift. 11. It was suggested that provision of liners and comms support is locked in to contracts to treat food waste.   **IF summarised that**:   1. a key area for local authorities was how their costs would be met. 2. best value for money options would vary depending on what a local authority’s existing service model was. 3. that additional revenue cost (communications, liners, caddies etc) would need to be weighed up against potential mitigation measures such as reduced frequency collections 4. there concern over the capacity of the sector to deliver in the indicative timeline to 2023, eg the influence of procurement timelines.   It was also pointed that:   1. **28 plants currently have an RHI tariff guarantee to benefit from if built out** – equivalent to 100MW. For example 180MW capacity is required to shift up all food treated at a lower standard. 2. ADBA recognises the requests for supported development and makes that point to Government, reference was made to page 67 of the Resources and Waste Strategy (RAWS). 3. **Garden waste services** - a concern was raised that EPR funds could be required to offset the effect of a loss of income if charged for were ended, but it was recognised that there was a new burdens consideration here. A link to issues around compostable packaging was also made and the recognition of a focus on quality was also made.   **In relation to the RAWS** consultation a question was asked on start date and timing with a concern that consultations may be 8 weeks and not 12. It was established that there will be a package of consultations delivered together as they are interlinked: EPR (including plastics taxs), DRS and Consistency. The intention of 12 weeks may be impacted in part by the move of the Environment Bill from June to April, meaning some elements may have to be addressed within 8 for them to be incorporated in that process. |
| **3** | **Resource and Waste Strategy**  SS and IF attended a Defra briefing on 17 December prior to the launch.  The Strategy’s ambition was recognised, with full cost recovery including in relation to disposal and the position on food waste was being covered clearly as real positive developments.  Other points highlighted were:   1. consultation on **not charging for garden waste** (with the conflict with home composting and budget effects recognised early). 2. reference to **recycling credits** 3. review of CWR and the references to **changing for DIY waste at HWRCs**. 4. **HWRCs to accept hazardous waste** and practicalities of space and permits raised (whilst driven as a cost effective alternative to options around collections the space, cost and permitting issues were highlighted). It was noted that HWRC options may be a low cost solution up to a point for some issues – the point where larger new sites were required at £2m+ cost per site. 5. **HWRC Reuse focus –** was highlighted as a positive but space restrictions have to be factored in eg versus fire prevention and other service enhancements. 6. **Urban recycling** coverage was lighter than hoped for but links to building regulations were to be appreciated. 7. **EFW** comments on capacitydrive towards CHP/R1 was noted but conflict between off takers and deliverable sites was recognised. The focus in some areas will be on heat usage – not additional capacity. 8. **Lack reference to the spatial need** for infrastructure and capacity development 9. **Little detail on funding and no reference to a waste plan for England.** 10. The **Adept press release** will be supportive underling a keenness to engage. 11. **Ring fencing funding** was raised – was this a concern or a positive for local authorities? Other stakeholders, eg Incpen have raised it and Producers are keen to see money spent on action and to avoid Government securing any surplus. IF clarified that the need was for transparency and SS identified the need to think about the benefits of the approach advocated. |
| **4** | **ADEPT Policy Position**  IF has made minor changes to version circulated to reflect RAWS published today. The following sections of the draft were discussed:   1. **A successful strategy – what must it achieve** – no changes 2. **Collections** – it was asked if development odf a standard would be consulted on and established that a core list of materials will be consulted on. 3. **Food Waste** – IF will change last sentence to reflect the varying starting points of services. 4. **Garden waste** – IF will add section to reflect potential conflict of policy intention with good practice and Adept apparent preference for charged for was established in this discussion. 5. **Deposit Return Scheme** – consultation will be on full scope and on the go, with Adept preference for on the go. It was noted that whilst it is a given there is some opposition. 6. **Governance** – consideration around wording in relation to London was discussed. Others pointed out the need for better WDA and WCA function alignment. 7. **Household Waste Recycling Centres** –issue of legislative requirement for places versus sites and possible need for a principle of sites per capita was discussed. IF to make link to statement on charging for DIY waste. 8. **Residues** –this section will be removed due to issues around End Of Waste barriers in place due to usage controls with respect to distance for water courses. 9. **To add –** support for the move away from weight based targets to be registered.   **ACTION:**  **IF to make amendments to policy position.**  **KH to provide wording from a London perspective on Governance theme.**  **ALL – to provide any detailed comments to IF directly on 18 December so press release can be made by HB pre-Christmas.** |
| **5** | **CIWM – Chris Murphy**   1. **Grades reduced from 8 to 5.** 2. **Trustee Board reduced from 27 to 12** – shift to a skills mix not just geographic representation. 3. **Member Council being established.** 4. **Delay in Privy Council approval** of changes to byelaws will mean some changes are delayed. 5. **Restructure driven by stronger focus on Member needs.** 6. **Competency Framework being established** – will work at all levels and will seek input from Adept and others. 7. **The Membership balance** was established as thirds (local authority, private sector and consultancy). 8. Aim is growth led by enhanced benefits and Journal will go bi-monthly. |
| **6** | **Environment Agency** - **Nick Bethell**  Focus in discussions was made on considerations of no deal Brexit outcome, with the following points registered:   1. **Additional controls and checks at ports would be expected, especially at Dover with sever disruption expected.** 2. Perishable goods would be prioritised but the **implications for waste were unclear**. 3. **Questions were posed**: what would be disrupted most? What knock effects could there be? What storage is available? What problems are predicted? What options are there on regulatory positions? 4. A **recent Defra workshop did cover implications for trans-frontier movements** with considerations around what could end on 29 March. But the legal advice is there is no reason for them to be terminated unless a competent authority requires that. Numbers referred to of how many TFS may be affected need to be revisited. 5. A **Defra event on 10 January** on implications of Brexit was referred to. 6. **The major concern raised was RDF** – raised by both JP and JH. 7. **RDF considerations** on logistics linked to delays include a need for additional wrapping at cost of £1+ a bale, a better blend with commercial waste, issues around odour and juxtaposition with perishable goods / consumables in ports and a potential nuisance factor that did not apply to recycalbles. 8. **RDF tariffs** – if WTO rules apply guidance is that RDF is a service not a product so 6% applies which is smaller than FX swing absorbed by contractors. RDF users also have the ability to reduce gate fees, as after 2008, to maintain viability of supply as they rely on the tonnage for energy supply. 9. **For recyclables the potential for internal market saturation due to export delays could lead to price instability / reductions** affecting contractor, secondary or tertiary processor or local authority income and the effect beyond Europe was raised. 10. **It was thought that the effect could be worse than and more abrupt in effect that Operation Sword consequences.** 11. As there are potentially only 10 weeks to **go a need for more engagement and communication with local authorities by Government was registered.** 12. **People movement affecting service delivery –** probable effect even in managed Brexit due to restrictions for temporary workers and minimum salary thresholds for example.   **ACTION:**  **TB to provided details of Defra event on 10 January to IF.** |
| **7** | **Stakeholder updates – discussion and matters arising**   1. **Adept**: Envt Board held a waste discussion around the conference workshop. Suez presented on EPR. The Newsletter was discussed highlighting Leadership Programme, policy on Highways and work with Proving on waste. 2. **Defra**: RAWS published. Consultations expected in mid-January but by end of January as fall back. The effects of the Environment Bill coming forward from June to April requires timely progress. 3. **Environment Agency**: Export focus is now wider than China. Noel Report on waste crime highlighted and the UKWin note was acknowledged. 4. **LGA**: Board met last week and has shifted emphasis from local first/bottom up approach to a focus on working with the RAWS and supporting the evolving policy as long as appropriate revenue and capital is included, there is appropriate allowance for transition and there is local consideration is recognised.   IF asked about ministerial engagement on **coffee cups**. MGs SPA has focussed on 2 questions: what is the cost of coffee cup collection and can they be collected with Tetrapaks (which KP explained was how they were collected in Dorset as part of the ACE UK scheme).  **Clinical waste** – legal advice was clear on local authority responsibility but it is worth working locally to see what arrangements could be accommodated with NHS.   1. **Wrap**: no questions raised. 2. **CIWM**: survey on policy direction closed, results being assessed for effect, eg changes to Knowledge Hub. |
| **8** | **Minutes of Last Meeting – 19 September 2018** – approved with no comment. |
| **9** | **Any Other Business**   1. Local Authority Updates 2. **Dorset**: focus on move to 2 unitaries and WDA split with end of DWP on 31 March but with good work strong brands to persist. Outcome of elections will then determine approach to partnership work. 3. **Hertfordshire**: clinical waste contractor on brink of administration. Interim contracts in procurement for 2+1 term. 4. **Norfolk**: DIY charges delivering significant savings and no noticeable fly-tip increase. WDA looking at alternative funding model with WCAs based on sharing more of avoided disposal costs to facilitate change / food waste roll out in new areas. Norfolk is now moving to an Executive Leader governance model. 5. **Oxfordshire**: revisiting case for alternative funding model with WCAs in lieu of a Partnership. WDA pays gate fee on food and garden waste. Now sharing a CEX with a WCA. 6. **Hampshire**: reviewing project Integra and next two year saving targets. Agreement on a super MRF has been delayed from April to allow the national strategy and consultations to conclude. 7. **Somerset**: extended with Viridor and in procurement for collections and agreed a risk share mechanism subject to CIL. Some local authority discussion on reorganisation. 8. **London**: work on input to Spending Review and on what infrastructure is required. 9. **Yorkshire**: all WCAs opted for a collaborative approach on credit alternative, ie WDA pays less not nothing. 10. **Adept**: Spending Review launch by HMT expected in February.   Latest unitary development is Bucks on a fast track by 2020.  Wiltshire and Derbyshire both operating without a CEX.  Adept scope and purpose review in hand.   1. **Waste Crime Consultation** – no Adept action required. |
| **1o** | **Date of Next Meeting**  20 March 2018 – LGA Offices |