

**Agenda Item No:**

**NORTH LONDON WASTE AUTHORITY**

**REPORT TITLE:**

**WASTE PREVENTION**

**REPORT OF:**

**HEAD OF WASTE STRATEGY & CONTRACTS**

**FOR SUBMISSION TO:**

**AUTHORITY MEETING.**

**DATE:**

**11<sup>th</sup> February 2008**

**SUMMARY OF REPORT:**

This report advises Members of the waste prevention activity and achievements in 2008/09 and presents a work programme for 2009/10 for approval.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Authority is recommended to:

- i) note the waste prevention activity in 2008/09; and
- ii) approve the proposed waste prevention activity for 2009/10, as set out at Appendix 2.

**Signed** Head of Waste Strategy &  
**by:** Contracts

.....

**Date:**.....

## **1.0 REPORT STRUCTURE**

- 1.1 The report starts with an outline of the strategic context and rationale for waste prevention work.
- 1.2 With regard to the waste prevention activity during 2008/09 this report first looks at its lobbying work in relation to the House of Lords Science and Technology Select Committee's work and then at its own activities undertaken in partnership with the constituent borough councils.
- 1.3 The report then looks forward to the work programme proposed for 2009/10, which is recommended for approval.

## **2.0 STRATEGIC CONTEXT AND RATIONALE**

- 2.1 The Waste Strategy for England 2007 reinforces the position of waste prevention at the 'top' of the waste hierarchy. Within the hierarchy, waste prevention should be carried out in preference to recycling and composting, recovering energy from waste and disposing waste to landfill, the least desirable of actions.
- 2.2 While the Waste Strategy for England 2007 introduced 'reduction' targets for the first time, these were based on residual waste not recycled or composted. As such, these targets do not focus on total waste arising and therefore may provide an incentive to increase recycling and central composting without necessarily promoting actions to reduce the generation of waste in the first place.
- 2.3 The Authority has always recognised that preventing waste from arising in the first place is the most environmentally and financially efficient outcome for it. This has been explicitly stated in the North London Joint Waste Strategy and its implementation through the major long-term procurement programme currently underway. If preventing waste from arising into the municipal waste stream means lesser investment in the next generation of waste facilities for North London, and therefore fewer costs for North Londoners over a twenty-five year period, then the Authority and its partners have a demonstrable financial incentive, as well as the obvious environmental logic, to maximise efforts in this area.
- 2.4 The North London Joint Waste Strategy (NLJWS) shows waste prevention activity reducing the rate of growth in the waste stream by 0.5% from 2010/11 from the historic growth rate of 3% per year to 2.5% per year.

- 2.5 Analysis of past tonnages indicates that municipal waste growth varies considerably year on year. Between 2003/04 and 2006/07, growth ranged between 1.90% and -0.54%. This has been a period of much lower growth than shown in earlier years, when 3% growth was more typical, as noted above.
- 2.6 While these figures indicate that NLWA is currently well within targets for waste growth, predicted population increases in North London mean that total growth in waste could exceed the annual rates set out in the NLJWS in the future, if no action to prevent waste production is taken.
- 2.7 The NLJWS sets out a series of Strategy Implementation Actions which the partners have agreed in order to achieve waste growth reduction. As these Strategy Implementation Actions are 'high-level' actions, the *North London Waste Prevention Plan 2008-10* (NLWPP) identifies the shorter term, practical actions that are needed to achieve these high-level aims. This Plan was developed in full partnership with the seven constituent borough councils in order to ensure no duplication of effort, and that each activity was undertaken at the optimum level.

### **3.0 WASTE PREVENTION ACTIVITY 2008/09**

- 3.1 The Authority budget for waste prevention activity in 2008/09 was £66,650 (0.11% of total budgeted expenditure). Individual constituent borough councils will have had their own budgets. The policy work set out below was covered by standing salary budgets, £39,400 was spent on Watch Your Waste Week and £7,500 on the ACR+ European Week for Waste Reduction, excluding any additional costs for printing the final reports<sup>1</sup>.

#### Policy work

- 3.2 In August 2007, a Sub-committee, of the House of Lords Science and Technology Select Committee, announced an inquiry to look at sustainable approaches to waste reduction and invited submissions of evidence. The resultant consultation involved looking at the way in which materials are designed and used, the business framework that supports the implementation of new technologies, the legislation in place to incentivise sustainable production, and consumer attitudes towards waste reduction.
- 3.3 The Authority was one of two local authorities responding in writing to the consultation, the other being Essex County Council, although the Local Government Association also gave oral evidence to the Committee.

---

<sup>1</sup> This also excludes payments of reuse and recycling credits and Real Nappy subsidies and vouchers.

- 3.4 The Lords Committee has since published its report, and the Government has published its response to the Lords.
- 3.5 Whilst a more detailed account is given at Appendix 1, the main implications for the Authority are that the Government is considering banning the landfilling of specific waste streams (potentially hazardous waste) and restructuring local authority waste targets to encourage greater integration of the treatment of different types of waste regardless of how and where they arise.
- 3.6 In both cases, more specific consultations will follow in relation to particular legislative and regulatory changes. These will be brought to Members' attention.

#### Watch Your Waste Week, 4<sup>th</sup> – 12<sup>th</sup> October 2008

- 3.7 As with the over-arching two-year plan, the programme of events for Watch Your Waste Week (WYWW) was developed and delivered in full partnership with the seven constituent borough councils to ensure maximum impact.
- 3.8 The aim of the week was to raise awareness of waste prevention and promote measures which can achieve a reduction in waste. During WYWW North London residents were encouraged to think about the amount of waste they produce and were challenged to create less waste.
- 3.9 The actual activities were reported to the last meeting of the Authority, and a separate detailed report on activities and outcomes is available on request and will be on the Authority's website. In summary however it was estimated that in total 12,000 residents participated in Watch Your Waste Week and its activities<sup>2</sup> and that potentially some 3,000<sup>3</sup> further residents may have changed their behaviour. Whilst the actual 162 tonnes measured as prevented during the week itself were modest, the very enthusiastic group of "waste challengers" managed to halve their waste production during a week of relatively intense attention (and might reasonably be expected to continue diverting waste at half this rate). On this basis the programme of events during WYWW may appear expensive, but there have at the same time been many valuable lessons learned from this first ever attempt to co-ordinate such a programme across our seven-borough area (c. 1.7m residents).

---

<sup>2</sup> The figure was estimated by taking into account participation in the Watch Your Waste Week Challenge, Give and Take Days, launch event, composting workshops, school projects, real nappy events, 'Love Food Hate Waste' workshops, assuming that MPS registrations and Freecycle new memberships were attributed to WYWW, too.

<sup>3</sup> Over 2m 'opportunities to see' WYWW publicity, with 50% readership, 33% sight of material and 1% changing behaviour. This excludes radio, internet and billboard exposure.

3.10 Based on the overall evaluation of the project, a number of recommendations were made to assist planning and delivery of future campaigns, and the main points are outlined below:

- Thorough preparation of printed material meant almost none was left over at the end of the week.
- The wide variety of activities and events engaged a wide cross-section of people (school children, journalists and community groups).
- Waste prevention images and footage for the long-term procurement Bidders' Day are now available.
- ACR+ have been encouraged to fix the European Week of Waste Reduction further in advance (see paragraphs 3.12 – 3.16) so we can co-ordinate the two next year.
- WYWW demonstrated that the Authority and the seven constituent borough councils can successfully co-ordinate a wide-ranging series of events within a 7-10 day period. A base level of all-year promotion is however needed too.
- An agreed evaluation methodology for the Authority and the seven constituent borough councils was agreed in advance, but will be refined as in some cases it did not quite fit events. This will be improved upon for 2009/10, as it is essential to be able to demonstrate the cost-effectiveness of such work, or to re-direct efforts if this cannot be done.
- If WYWW had been part of a simultaneous pan-London campaign, it is believed that it may have got through to more people; doing this however may reduce local flexibilities unless the pan-London messages are kept relatively generic.
- WYWW 'challengers' also demonstrated that for a short period of time it is possible to dramatically reduce the amount of waste produced by North London residents. However, at present there is no evidence that this behavioural change is going to be sustained at this high level over time; but it clearly demonstrates that North London residents understand the need to reduce their waste and therefore there is potential to convert residents' awareness into long term action.

3.11 Given that the week took place during a financial downturn, concerns were raised by Members at the December Authority meeting regarding whether the reduction in waste arisings could be attributed to the current financial situation or the awareness raised during the week. In an attempt to investigate this concern further, an email will be sent to WYWW Challengers in two months time (i.e. six months after the event) to assess if the knowledge on waste prevention issues they acquired during the week and the change in behaviour was sustained over time.

## ACR+ European Week for Waste Reduction, 22<sup>nd</sup> - 20<sup>th</sup> November 2008

- 3.12 The background to the ACR+ European Week for Waste Reduction (EWWR), the reasons for our WYWW not coinciding with it and the fact that an underspend on WYWW was used to fund further limited activity to support EWWR was reported to the last Authority meeting. In North London this week was used to promote the successful outcomes of WYWW and to add further weight to WRAP's "Love Food – Hate Waste" campaign through a series of North London roadshows.
- 3.13 Over fifty feedback forms were completed and the headline results are as follows:
- 63% of the interviewees believed that their knowledge and behaviour in food waste reduction issues changed as a result of the roadshow, while only 2% thought that the roadshows were not effective;
  - 94% found the workshop helpful and informative and
  - 98% would like to see more roadshows happening in their area.
- 3.14 Overall the feedback suggests that, for the majority of people, the roadshows were effective in changing their behaviour and were useful and informative. The feedback also confirms demand for further roadshow campaigns in the region to help residents to reduce their food waste.
- 3.15 The results of the week are shared with other participating regions across Europe and will be published by ACR+. Members will be notified when the final report on EWWR in North London is available in printed form and is on the Authority's website.
- 3.16 The Authority's demonstrable commitment to waste prevention in 2008/09 may have helped secure additional support for 2009/10, as noted below.

### **4.0 PROPOSED WASTE PREVENTION ACTIVITY 2009/10**

- 4.1 As noted above, 'waste prevention' is at the top of the waste hierarchy as it is better for waste never to arise in the first place than it is for any type of treatment of that waste (recycling, energy recovery or disposal to landfill). If the costs of the procurement of the next generation of local waste facilities can be reduced by this and lower or reduced waste levels can be sustained, services to local residents will be of lower cost.
- 4.2 The full proposed actions for 2009/10 are set out at Appendix B, and it is these that are recommended for approval. In summary, however, they are:

- Run 'Watch Your Waste Week' in 2009-10, to coincide with the European Week for Waste Reduction;
- Support a food waste reduction campaign, building on WRAP's 'Love Food Hate Waste' campaign;
- Deliver a trade waste promotion programme;
- Further engage with the 3<sup>rd</sup> sector on reuse and waste minimisation programmes based on research findings and recommendations drawn from GLA's 'Third Sector Reuse Capacity in London' report, published in July 2008, i.e.:
  - Investigate the opportunities for donation and collection points at Reuse and Recycling Centres in North London;
  - Run a promotional campaign with tenants and officers and training for Housing Association Officers;
  - Carry out 'service intensification' work with furniture reuse projects to maximise tonnages being reused;
  - Reconfigure work on bulky waste;
- Provide and promote a financial incentive to parents opting to use reusable 'real nappies' on their babies and;
- Provide direct funding support to community composting projects.

4.3 The proposed budget for the continuation of the Waste Prevention Plan for 2009-10 is £102,000 excluding the costs of real nappy subsidies, and the Community Fund which are also listed in the Plan and in Appendix 2 (less than 0.2% of budgeted expenditure for the Authority in 2009/10), which is provided for in the Budget and Levy report elsewhere on this agenda. It is anticipated that this will result in a significantly raised profile for waste prevention across North London, in turn contributing to a reduction in total waste arising. Reuse and recycling credits also arguably contribute to waste prevention by supporting reuse projects, but as there have historically been few or no claims for *reuse* credits, these are not included within the Plan.

#### Prioritising Waste Prevention Activities in North London Workshop

4.4 Finally, in December last year, the Authority applied to WRAP for support on waste prevention. As a result of this, WRAP has offered to run a waste prevention prioritisation workshop in North London in March 2009. This possibility was discussed at the December Waste Prevention Officer meeting and all attendees expressed interest in participating. A similar exercise was held in June 2006 when relevant Authority and Borough Officers met to consider actions and identify priorities in the development of the North London Waste Prevention Implementation Plan 2006-08.

- 4.5 In the light of the current Waste Prevention Plan expiring at the end of March 2010, the workshop will be useful in reviewing the previously implemented plan and assessing new priorities for the replacement plan which will follow from the above.
- 4.6 WRAP is also discussing a range of other activities in North London focusing on the “Love Food – Hate Waste” campaign and the potential for it to give substantial financial assistance to the Authority in this regard. A verbal update will be given at the meeting.

## **5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 5.1 The Authority is recommended to:
- i. note the waste prevention activity in 2008/09; and
  - ii. approve the proposed waste prevention activity for 2009/10, as set out at Appendix 2.

## **7.0 COMMENTS OF THE FINANCIAL ADVISER**

- 7.1 The Financial Adviser has been consulted in the preparation of this report and has no further comments to add.

## **8.0 COMMENTS OF THE LEGAL ADVISER**

- 8.1 The Legal Adviser has been consulted in the preparation of this report and has no further comments to add.

## **Local Government Act 1972 – Access to information**

**Documents and Websites used:** North London Waste Prevention Plan 2008 -10

House of Lords Science and Technology Committee, Waste Reduction, Volume I: Report, August 2008

House of Lords Science and Technology Committee, Waste Reduction, Volume II: Evidence, August 2008

NLWA submission to the House of Lords Science and Technology Select Committee - Sub-Committee on Waste Reduction, September 2007 Authority meeting

Association of Cities and Regions for Recycling and  
Resource Management, European Waste Reduction  
Week 2008-Pilot Edition information at:

[http://www.acrplus.org/wastereductionweek\\_pilot2008](http://www.acrplus.org/wastereductionweek_pilot2008)

**Contact Officers:** Andrew Lappage, Head of Waste Strategy & Contracts  
Barbara Herridge, Policy and Development Manager  
&  
Dimitra Rappou, Waste Prevention Officer

Lee Valley Technopark  
Unit 169, Ashley Road  
Tottenham, N17 9LN

Tel: 020 8489 5730

Fax: 020 8365 0254

E-mail: [post@nlwa.gov.uk](mailto:post@nlwa.gov.uk)

**HOUSE OF LORDS SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE  
WASTE REDUCTION REPORT**

**INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 The North London Waste Prevention Plan 2008 – 2010 which was approved by the Authority at the meeting on 6th February last year includes a short term action under the heading of ‘Lobby Government to do more to minimise waste growth’. Specific actions included to continue to submit responses to government consultation processes promoting the waste hierarchy and waste considerations, whenever possible, and lobby for a legislative backing for ‘no junk mail’ stickers, so they are legally binding on advertisers, distributors and delivery services.
- 1.2 In August 2007, a Sub-committee, of the House of Lords Science and Technology Select Committee, announced an inquiry to look at sustainable approaches to waste reduction and invited submissions of evidence. The resultant consultation involved looking at the way in which materials are designed and used, the business framework that supports the implementation of new technologies, the legislation in place to incentivise sustainable production, and consumer attitudes towards waste reduction.
- 1.3 The Authority was one of two local authorities responding in writing to the consultation, the other being Essex County Council, although the Local Government Association also gave oral evidence to the committee.
- 1.4 The House of Lords Sub-Committee reviewed the written and oral evidence submitted to their consultation and the *House of Lords Science and Technology Committee, Waste Reduction, Volume I: Report* and *Volume II: Evidence* were issued in August 2008.

**2.0 SUMMARY OF THE LORDS’ WASTE REDUCTION REPORT**

- 2.1 The report focuses on how waste material in the industrial, commercial, and construction sectors could be reduced and the impact of consumer choice in influencing these sectors. The Committee highlighted the need for waste reduction to be taken into account from the design stage to the consumption stage.
- 2.2 The report also suggested that it is vital that all stakeholders, in both the supply chain and the usage phase, collaborate so that product design systems can be optimised. The design aim should be to minimise the generation of waste throughout the service life rather than manage waste products, provided that this is compatible with the service requirements.

2.3 There were differences as well as similarities between the recommendations made by the Authority and the House of Lords Committee report final recommendations:

- Better design was a key theme in both, but whilst the Authority recommended re-manufacturing of products, better design and selection of components and some form of regulatory control to provide more reliable information to the public, the House of Lords focused on embedding sustainability into the design curriculum, providing designers with guidance on how to comply with eco-design legislation and encouraging the development of sustainable and profitable business models.
- Waste targets were another important theme of both the Authority's response and the House of Lords final report. The Authority noted that a waste reduction target which specifies the absolute amount of waste per household may provide a better means to target waste generation rather than the current target of waste not reused, recycled and composted, whereas the House of Lords recommended restructuring of waste targets and costs imposed in order to allow local authorities to address commercial and industrial waste.
- Involvement of businesses was another common topic, but whilst the Authority emphasised the need for practical tangible measures such as extended producer responsibility, tougher material specific targets and compliance with monitoring and enforcement schemes, the House of Lords recommended clear guidance, knowledge transfer and leadership within the business community, particularly for the benefit of small businesses and that big businesses should take the lead in tackling waste by demonstrating the profitability of waste reduction measures and demanding good practice from their suppliers. They also suggested that simple methodologies should be developed to allow businesses to analyse the lifetime implications of the materials, products or services they produce.
- Both the Authority and the House of Lords agreed that following campaigns to promote reuse and recycling, waste reduction is now a priority. The UK's high rate of wasteful consumption must be reduced and addressing consumer behaviour will require a combination of education and encouragement. In particular, both reports recognised the need for support to encourage businesses and consumers to reduce waste.

2.4 The Authority was quoted twice in the Committee's report in 'The Consumer Perspective' section (para 5.4 and 5.20). More specifically, the Committee acknowledged the Authority's concern that whilst bringing recycling to the public's attention is undoubtedly a good thing, there is a danger that the public may not understand the real need for waste reduction as well as the Authority's argument that once consumers have been educated about a certain issue collectively they have the power to influence businesses.

### **3.0 GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO THE LORDS' SELECT COMMITTEE**

- 3.1 In November 2008 the Government issued a detailed response to the Committee's recommendations. The Government welcomed the report for highlighting the issue of business waste and waste reduction and for raising the prominence of these issues.
- 3.2 However, in its response, the Government added that the importance of these issues had already been raised in the Waste Strategy 2007 and that good progress on the strategy's targets has been made. The Government also said that current arrangements for waste reduction ensured necessary funding was available.
- 3.3 The Government also defended its Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme (LATS), which was described as a crucial scheme to ensure compliance with the Landfill Directive. In the response it said: "Rather than restructure waste targets and costs, the Government is putting in place support to encourage local authorities to address commercial and industrial waste".
- 3.4 The Government rejected suggestions that budget cuts for delivery bodies such as the Waste & Resources Action Programme could damage business recycling and said that the move from individual business projects to develop the evidence base for improving businesses resource efficiency was "in line with Defra's wider strategy on behavioural change".
- 3.5 The response also said it was actively considering landfill bans for specific waste streams and new or stronger sector specific voluntary agreements, like the Courtauld Commitment. Other areas under consideration included stronger standards on public sector purchasing, using the Centre of Expertise in Sustainable Procurement and new consumer-facing campaigns to change environmental behaviour.
- 3.6 A new system of Individual Producer Responsibility (IPR) for waste electronic and electrical equipment was supported in principle but also highlighted the complexities of such a system. However, the Government has agreed to explore the options for introducing IPR.

### **4.0 IMPLICATIONS FOR THE AUTHORITY**

- 4.1 The main implications for the Authority of this consultation document, if the Government's recommendations to introduce landfill bans for specific waste streams are implemented, may result in legislative changes. This proposal may apply in specific waste streams such as hazardous waste and lead to redirection of the generated waste to other waste management methods.
- 4.2 The proposals for restructuring local authority waste targets and costs and allow them to address commercial and industrial waste by

providing support and disposal facilities to businesses should also be kept under review. The NLWA and its constituent boroughs will need to actively engage in discussions about future changes and address any issues in order to identify any gaps in this area at an early stage.

## 5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE AUTHORITY AND THE COMMITTEE'S RESPONSE

Area of consultation	Authority Recommendation	Committee Response
Better design and the use of materials- <i>what role can better design of materials play in minimising the creation of waste?</i>	Design to reduce waste: Urge the Committee to heed the work of the Waste Resources Action Programme (WRAP) on the development of lightweight wine bottles which highlights the potential to reduce a product's environmental impact through its lifecycle.	Not covered
	Design for easier recycling: Better design and material selection of components can allow easier recycling at the end of the product's useful lifetime, in turn reducing residual waste	Not covered
	Realising the benefits of better design: The adoption of new designs and materials must be carefully considered to ensure that potential waste reduction benefits are realised, e.g. biodegradable plastic bottles	Not covered
	Realising the benefits of better design: Some form of regulatory control of either the use of either the term "recyclable" or a new logo that would inform the public reliably as to the genuine practical recyclability of different materials in the UK may be beneficial	We recommend that the Government should continue to work with the European Commission to examine the types of information that should be included on eco-labels and promote the development of eco-labels which are clear and easy for consumers to understand, but we are not convinced that the use of eco-labels alone will be enough to change consumer behaviour (para 5.21).
Business Framework- <i>Does the current policy, regulatory and legal framework support and incentivise the development of better, more</i>	The requirement of manufacturers to take-back their end-of-life products and reduce their packaging should encourage manufacturers to minimise packaging, develop products that are more durable and can be repaired more easily and ensure packaging and products can be more easily recycled.	Not covered

Area of consultation	Authority Recommendation	Committee Response
<p><i>sustainable products and processes? How is the framework communicated to businesses and what is the level of awareness and understanding among businesses?</i></p>	<p>The introduction of tougher material specific producer responsibility targets, particularly with sub-sets for household waste, has the potential for far greater impact than the existing system.</p>	<p>Not covered</p>
	<p>The effectiveness of producer responsibility legislation will be determined to some extent by the compliance monitoring and enforcement regime.</p>	<p>Not covered</p>
<p><b>Government Policy- What is and should be the role of Government in addressing the issue of waste reduction?</b></p>	<p>A waste reduction target which specifies the absolute amount of residual waste allowed per household may provide a better means to target waste generation.</p>	<p>Responsibility for the recycling and collection of waste has been given to local authorities, not all of whom meet the needs of businesses. Poor quality recycled material, a lack of disposal facilities and a fragmented approach between local authorities hinders the attempts of those businesses which are striving to reduce their waste. In turn, local authorities are hampered by weight-based targets and landfill allocations which discourage them from supporting industry. Targets for local authorities currently focus on decreasing the weight of domestic waste sent to landfill but a more holistic approach to waste reduction is required. We recommend that the Government should restructure the waste targets and costs imposed upon local authorities to allow them to address commercial and industrial waste by providing the necessary support, disposal facilities and high quality materials to businesses (para 4.34).</p>
	<p>Producer responsibility programmes can drive improvements in product design, help influence consumer behaviour and will ensure that the responsibility for waste management and prevention does not sit solely on the shoulders of local authorities.</p>	<p>Not covered</p>

Area of consultation	Authority Recommendation	Committee Response
	<p>The Government's waste strategy should be integrated with one on materials used by industry.</p>	<p>We recognise that individual producer responsibility will be more appropriate for some products than others and it is important that the Government continue to consult stakeholders on the practicalities of such a system. Nevertheless, we believe that the time has come for action and recommend that the UK Government should take the lead in implementing true individual producer responsibility and, at the very least, should introduce it for those products for which industry requests it (para 4.63).</p>
<p>Government Policy- <i>How does Government policy link up with European strategies and action plans?</i></p>	<p>One way to address both the concern of the public that the UK lags behind Europe, as well as the desire of businesses for a level playing field within Europe, would be to ensure that the UK leads debate on new waste prevention approaches (such as absolute waste prevention targets). This would ensure the UK is pro-active in the development of new waste prevention policies, whilst ensuring that EU Member States all meet equivalent regulations and requirements in the future.</p>	<p>With the development of quality protocols by the Environment Agency and the Waste and Resources Action Programme, the UK is in a good position to contribute effectively to the development of end-of-waste criteria at the EU level and we urge the Government to continue to work closely with the Commission and other Member States to develop quality criteria as quickly as possible (para 4.45).</p>
<p>Government Policy- <i>What lessons can be learnt from other countries - within the EU and globally</i></p>	<p>Industry driven voluntary codes of practice play an important role in helping an industry sector demonstrate its environmental and social responsibility. However, because they are voluntary they only cover those members who are signatories and do not always capture the less 'progressive' operators. This can lead to a gap between the expectations of the public and the ability of a voluntary code of practice to deliver results. In these circumstances, a statutory mechanism can play a role to ensure that the entire sector meets its social and environmental responsibilities, e.g. unwanted advertising material ("junk mail").</p>	<p>We support the use of voluntary sectoral agreements to bring stakeholders together in tackling specific waste streams, enabling businesses to recognise the costs of their waste and giving them the opportunity and guidance to minimise it. The Government must be prepared to monitor these agreements and review policies when necessary (para 7.41)</p>

Area of consultation	Authority Recommendation	Committee Response
<p>Consumer behaviour- <i>How can better product design be used to effect a change in consumption patterns and behaviour?</i></p>	<p>The UK Government's Sustainable Development Strategy 'Securing the Future' (2005) devotes a chapter to the considerations needed to help people make more sustainable choices in their lives. The importance of government engaging, encouraging, enabling and leading by example are all identified as essential to achieve real behaviour change.</p>	<p>It is vital that government departments lead by example in reducing their own waste. Although pan-governmental performance on waste reduction has been good, some departments still lag behind and we are concerned that targets are not challenging enough. Departmental performance on sustainable procurement has been disappointing and procurement staff often fail to recognise the lifetime cost of products. We welcome the establishment of the Centre of Expertise for Sustainable Procurement and recommend that it should urgently review the knowledge of procurement staff, providing training where necessary, to ensure that staff recognise the true costs of the products they buy and understand how the principles of waste reduction fit into the larger aims of sustainability (para 7.10)</p>
	<p>The Sustainable Consumption Roundtable, run between the Sustainable Development Commission and the National Consumer Council, finished its work in May 2006. Its final report "I will if you will" also provides detailed information on actions to help promote sustainable consumption amongst the public, businesses and government.</p>	<p>We endorse the message of the Sustainable Consumption Roundtable's report, <i>I will if you will</i>, that in order to reduce consumption, a joint effort from government, businesses and consumers is required. Whilst the Government's <i>Framework for Pro- Environmental Behaviours</i> outlines a good approach to address consumer behaviour we urge the Government to follow this up by using its approach to reduce the wastage of a wider range of products, rather than just food (para 5.35)</p>
	<p>On a more practical level, improvements in product durability generally provide the opportunity for reduced consumption. For products that perform a function that has remained relatively unchanged, an improvement in durability leads to reduced product turn-over and less waste.</p>	<p>Not covered</p>

Area of consultation	Authority Recommendation	Committee Response
	<p>One product design option that may help address this issue is improved upgradeability, expandability and reparability. If a durable product can be adapted to new developments in technology by having a single component replaced, rather than the whole item, this may help reduce waste tonnages. If a product can be repaired when something goes wrong, rather than being thrown out for a new product, this can also help reduce waste tonnages.</p>	<p>Waste could be reduced if consumers were encouraged to retain products for longer and repair them when necessary, but this is usually an uncompetitive strategy and businesses cannot be expected to promote something which leads to a reduction in profits. Business models must therefore be developed which are both sustainable and profitable. Such strategies might include the production of modular products which can be continually added to and upgraded, or schemes that reward customers for recycling but which also foster brand loyalty. If repair work is to be encouraged, changes to the Value Added Tax regime may be required. We therefore recommend that the Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform should work with retailers and academia to promote the use of sustainable business models and must review the range of policies and incentives required to accelerate their implementation (para 5.30).</p>
	<p>Retrofitting new operational components to durable products is common in some sectors. For example, in some countries exhaust particulate filters have been retrofitted to diesel vehicles to help them comply with new emission standards, avoiding the need to purchase new engines or whole vehicles</p>	<p>Not covered</p>
	<p>Extended producer responsibility also plays an important role in product design and in-turn consumption behaviour. If a manufacturer is required to design their product to minimise its waste and ensure its recyclability, they are likely to make significant investment research and development.</p>	<p>Not covered</p>
<p>Consumer behaviour- <i>What role do marketing strategies play in influencing more sustainable design?</i></p>	<p>Marketing strategies can play a key role influencing sustainable design and production, driven from both the consumer side and the manufacturer and retail side. Consumer side demand is often initiated by campaign organisations and pressure groups who raise awareness of particular social and environmental issues that can be affected by purchasing decisions, e.g. support for free range eggs and the support for fair-trade products.</p>	<p>Not covered</p>

Area of consultation	Authority Recommendation	Committee Response
	<p>Government has a limited role in influencing manufacturer and retailer side marketing, they can promote the potential commercial benefits of switching to sustainable products to companies, but their main ability to influence is through economic or legislative instruments. The role of government to raise public awareness of key environmental and social issues is more obvious and has the potential to drive real change in consumer demand for sustainable products. However, a decision to support and promote any particular product on the basis of its sustainability must be based on sound science- the promotion of a product that turns out to have a minimal or negative environmental or social benefit can undermine the credibility of future campaigns.</p>	<p>Following the successful drive to improve the energy efficiency of products, we believe that a similar strategy should be employed to encourage the purchase of more sustainable products which produce less waste. We recommend that the Government should encourage change by continuing to work with retailers to promote choice editing on the grounds of waste reduction. (para 5.22)</p>
<p>Consumer behaviour- <i>Are there any gaps in knowledge in this area?</i></p>	<p>However, while recycling has undeniable environmental benefits compared to traditional waste disposal, it is significantly less beneficial than waste reduction or product reuse. Whilst the success of both national and local recycling promotion is to be applauded, the success of the recycling publicity campaigns has seen the 'reduce' and 'reuse' messages often overlooked by the public.</p>	<p>There is widespread support for waste reduction and the development of a more sustainable society. A strong campaign to increase recycling has meant that the waste reduction message has been overlooked and consumers are often ill-informed about the environmental impacts of their products and the way they use them. (para5.21). Following their campaign to promote re-use and recycling, the Government must now provide clear and consistent signals that waste reduction is a priority. Businesses will not invest in sustainable practices unless they are confident of the Government's long-term policies, and consumers will not change behaviours without education or incentives (para 7.40)</p>
	<p>Reduction can mean both an absolute reduction in consumption and a reduction in the consumption of unsustainable products.</p>	<p>Not covered</p>

Area of consultation	Authority Recommendation	Committee Response
	<p>We need to find more ways to achieve waste reduction for day to day products that people buy, whilst ensuring their lifestyles remain the same or improve. Examples of how this can be achieved already include the light-weighting of bottles (discussed earlier), refillable containers and refill stations for detergents (<a href="http://www.ecover.com/gb/en/Products/Dishes/Refill.htm">www.ecover.com/gb/en/Products/Dishes/Refill.htm</a>), reusable shopping bags and the upgrading of computer components such as hard drives and RAM within the existing case.</p>	Not covered
	<p>We also need to know how to effectively deliver the reduction and reuse message to the community, along with the best way (not just legislation) to engage and drive improvements in product design amongst manufacturers and retailers going forward. Whilst a new Waste Strategy for England has recently been published, and Scotland already has a Waste Prevention Strategy, limited information exists regarding how best to communicate the “non-consumptive” message to the public. If we are to move to a zero-waste, low carbon economy, this will be essential.</p>	Not covered

**APPENDIX 2**

**WASTE PREVENTION IN NORTH LONDON - PROGRESS SO FAR AND PROPOSED ACTIVITIES FOR 2009/10**

**Short Term Initiatives**

Initiative	Specific Actions	Progress in 2008-09	Actions for 2009-10	Budget Implications
<p>Public awareness and education campaigns</p>	<p>Waste Prevention Week in 2008 and 2009 including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Pan-North London Shop Smart campaign</li> <li>- Used clothes fashion show and art fair event</li> <li>- Family zero-waste challenge</li> <li>- Schools design competition for reusable bags</li> <li>- Give and take days across the boroughs</li> <li>- Free compost advice and give-away</li> </ul> <p>Support a food waste reduction campaign (building on WRAP's national "Love Food, Hate Waste" campaign).</p> <p>Run a schools programme including trips to NLWA composting facilities.</p> <p>Support "no junk mail" schemes.</p> <p>Promote swap/re-use schemes such as Freecycle and SwapXchange.</p> <p>Support for ACR+ 100kg waste reduction campaign</p>	<p>Watch Your Waste Week was completed and incorporated all the actions listed with the exception that the reusable cotton bags were designed by a community artist and not school children.</p> <p>Food Waste awareness promotions took place across all seven constituent boroughs in November 2008, involving roadshows at supermarkets and shopping centres to encourage residents to reduce food waste.</p> <p>This could not be delivered due to Health and Safety implications.</p> <p>Completed as part of Watch Your Waste Week.</p> <p>Completed as part of Watch Your Waste Week.</p> <p>This support was demonstrated by participating in the European Week for Waste Reduction (EWWR) which took place from 22<sup>nd</sup> to 30<sup>th</sup> November 2008.</p>	<p>The 2009 Watch Your Waste Week is suggested to take place in the second week of October 2009 to allow schools to participate fully. Given that timescales involved agree with our needs, it is suggested to coincide with the European Week of Waste Reduction. Borough activities on separate waste prevention actions will also be supported throughout the year.</p> <p>Following funding from WRAP a number of campaigns will be delivered across all seven boroughs focused on the 'Love Food Hate Waste' campaign.</p> <p>Ongoing in 2009-10</p> <p>Ongoing in 2009-10</p> <p>Join ACR+ and participate in the European Week for Waste Reduction.</p>	<p>£55,000 (including support materials and resources that can be used by boroughs throughout the year. Based on the cost of Watch Your Waste Week and European Week for Waste Reduction in 2008.</p> <p>£15,000 Additional financial contribution expected to be covered by WRAP funding.</p> <p>The cost is included above and includes 10,000 for the ACR+ campaign plus annual membership (€2,400).</p>

Cost benefit analysis	Based on findings from Watch Your Waste Week, the campaign could potentially result in an annual reduction of 97.5 tonnes of waste from those households and schools going forward. It is estimated that in total 12,000 residents participated in Watch Your Waste Week and its activities <sup>4</sup> ; hence the cost of the campaign is approximately £3.28 per resident. .			
	According to WRAP's 'Love Food Hate Waste' campaign metric, in terms of the total food waste, 1.4565kg per household per week respectively would be saved due to a 'Love Food Hate Waste' campaign. Assuming that 10% of the north London households are affected, the Love Food Hate Waste campaign may result in 105 tonnes of food waste diverted.			
Seek funding or regional support for a retail packaging waste prevention campaign with local businesses.	Monitor available research relating to packaging waste, identifying where possible the fastest growing types of retail packaging that could be targeted by a waste prevention campaign.  Approach organisations such as WRAP and commercial companies to seek external funding for regional retail packaging prevention campaign/research. Consider both wide-scale campaigns and campaigns aimed at specific packaging sectors (e.g. single use shopping bags) taking account of the research findings.	This action has not been progressed.	Prepare and convene a meeting with Trading Standard Officers from north London to see how the campaign could be funded.  Depending on outcomes from funding discussions, incorporate retail packaging waste as one of the key messages in next year's WYWW.	No budget implications.  No budget implications, as dependent on external funding.
Anticipated Benefits	There will be long term benefits as there will be less waste entering the waste stream at first place and the costs will be shared with waste producers. If the discussions for funding are successful, the Waste Prevention Plan's implementation Authority budgets may be reallocated to other waste prevention activities.			
Seek funding to run waste reduction campaigns across North London for 15 years.	Approach organisations such as WRAP and commercial companies to seek external funding for waste reduction campaigns.	In November 2008 a funding bid was submitted to WRAP for a 'Love Food Hate Waste' campaign. In December 2008, WRAP agreed to offer support to assist with waste prevention across North London.	On-going in 2009-10	No budget implications
Anticipated Benefits	Subject to successful funding applications, the Authority's costs are going to be reduced as a result of this action			
Lobby government to do more to minimise waste growth.	Continue to submit responses to government consultation processes, promoting the waste hierarchy and waste prevention considerations wherever possible. Lobby for a legislative backing for "no junk	The Authority responded to the House of Lords Select Committee on waste reduction. The response included a request that legislative backing	On-going in 2009-10	No budget implications

<sup>4</sup> The figure was estimated by taking into account participation in Watch Your Waste Week Challenge, Give and Take Days, launch event, composting workshops, school projects, real nappy events, 'Love Food Hate Waste' workshops, assuming that MPS registrations and Freecycle new memberships were attributed to WYWW, too.

	mail" stickers, so they are legally binding on advertisers, distributors and delivery services.	be forthcoming for 'no junk mail' stickers.		
Anticipated Benefits	Successful lobbying may result in changes in governmental policies and practices for the financial and environmental benefit of north London residents.			
Enforcement	NLWA Legal Officers to undertake research into the current use of the Packaging (Essential Requirements) Regulations 2003 to prosecute excess packaging and develop recommendations for Trading Standards Officers on the best way to enforce the Regulations.	A packaging event was held in Enfield and it was attended by NLWA officers and members, but more work is needed for measurable outcomes.	Further work with Trading Standards officers to confirm (or otherwise) the efficacy of these powers in practice.	No budget implications
Anticipated Benefits	The action's outcomes are medium to long-term, therefore no direct impact is expected in 2009-10			
Facilitate trade waste officers providing waste prevention advice.	Update the written reference material prepared in 2007/08 to ensure it reflects current programmes, infrastructure and services available to businesses.  Investigate opportunities for waste awareness training of borough staff.	The suggestion for waste awareness training and support to borough staff was initially rejected by borough officers. This was reassessed in October 2008 and January 2009 by waste prevention and technical officers respectively. It was agreed that the priority should still be to provide support materials for officers to leave with trade waste customers, rather than delivering some bespoke training.	Deliver a trade waste promotional campaign.	Reproduction of the 'Waste Prevention for Businesses' guide will come out of the 'campaign' budget at the top of the table. Print numbers to be verified with borough officers.
Anticipated Benefits	Reduction in the Authority's costs as the amount of material entering the municipal waste stream will be reduced			
Expand promotional scheme for trade waste customers.	Expand the trade waste promotion scheme to more areas across North London.	A business waste prevention guide has been written and made available on the NLWA website. A series of business waste prevention posters have also been produced.	Completed in 2008-09	No budget implications
Anticipated Benefits	Reduction in the Authority's costs as the amount of material entering the municipal waste stream will be reduced			
Support best practice in waste re-use and encourage the community sector and other	Lobby for, and support the development of, a project to expand the capacity of re-use organisations in North London, building upon the results of the "Re-use capacity in London" project lead by GLA with NLWA's support.	A report on Restore Community Projects was produced in September;	Continuation of the Reuse Capacity in London project which now needs to be built upon for the rest of the year including investigating the opportunities for donation	This work is already budgeted for 2008/09 and work will be completed by 31 <sup>st</sup> March 2009

<p>partnerships to deliver effective re-use services.</p>	<p>Investigate opportunities to further engage with the 3<sup>rd</sup> sector on re-use and waste minimisation programmes through organisations such as LCRN and funding via Futurebuilders.</p> <p>Investigate opportunities for donation/ collection points at re-use and recycling centres in North London.</p>		<p>and collection points at RRCs in North London.</p> <p>Run a promotional campaign with tenants and officers and training for Housing Association Officers on using reused furniture in housing association premises to increase furniture reuse.</p> <p>Based on Recommendation 5 and 6 of the GLA report ('developing a more favourable climate for reuse' and communications, marketing and publicity' respectively, it is proposed to carry out 'service intensification' work with furniture reuse projects to maximise tonnages being reused.</p> <p>Strategic reconfiguration work, based on Recommendation 1 of the GLA report on bulky waste. This work is conditional on borough approval and it will need to be linked to work on medium to long-term restructuring of services.</p>	<p>£12,000</p> <p>£8,000</p> <p>£5,000</p>
<p>Cost benefit analysis</p>	<p>Based on similar projects carried out elsewhere, work with Housing Associations could potentially result in 346 tonnes of waste being diverted from immediate disposal which is equivalent to £34.4 per tonne diverted. Evidence from similar project run in Croydon shows that service intensification work with reuse projects could result in 114 tonnes diverted a year, equivalent to £70 per tonne. The benefits of strategic reconfiguration work in terms of tonne diversion cannot be estimated yet.</p>			
<p>Real nappy subsidies</p>	<p>Provide and promote a financial incentive to parents opting to use reusable 'real nappies' on their babies.</p>	<p>This was reported upon the September Authority meeting. There are however some problems with the RNfL database access at Waltham Forest.</p>	<p>On-going in 2009-10</p>	<p>£80,000, based on annualised figure from the September Authority report.</p>

Anticipated Benefits	Based on data received for April to December 2008, a total of 549 vouchers and cash back claims have been issued which resulted in 343 tonnes of waste diverted from disposal, equivalent to £58 per tonne diverted.			
Home composting	Support and lobby for the inclusion of home composting tonnages in boroughs' recycling figures. Consider joint purchasing of capital equipment (e.g. wormeries, bokashi, Johannas, green cones, rockets etc) where support is forthcoming from a majority of constituent boroughs.	There is nothing that can be done on the lobbying front at this stage. Joint purchasing has been rejected at this stage by borough officers.	Reconsideration of joint purchasing of capital equipment by boroughs if WRAP support ceased.	No budget implications
Anticipated Benefits	Boroughs are already benefiting from the centralised agreement from WRAP and therefore it is concluded that the benefits of joint purchasing wouldn't sufficiently justify the work.			
Community composting NEW ACTION FOR 2009-10	Support community composting initiatives and provide direct funding support to initiatives, programmes and events that facilitate better communication and understanding between the government, community and business sector	£25,000 Fund provided for in 2008/09 but not included in the Waste Prevention Plan as the Fund is for both recycling and community composting and prevention initiatives	Community Fund to be managed by LCRN (Fund to support reuse, community composting and recycling projects)	£35,000 to be allocated for the support fund and associated management costs for 2009-10
Anticipated Benefits	Evidence shows that the fund can encourage community composting activities. Previously funded community composting projects (2005-06) showed average cost of £46.97 per tonne and provided an organics collection service to an extra 1,950 households.			
'Other work'	An additional amount of money has also been allowed for other projects that might arise for other waste streams (potentially WEEE) or other sectors. £7,000			

## Medium Term Initiatives

Initiative	Specific Actions	Progress so far and future plans
Food waste disposal units	Investigate the issues, problems and opportunities surrounding the promotion and subsidisation of under-sink waste disposal units for high-rise apartments and units with no access to a garden or balcony.	Action completed. Opportunities for under-sink waste disposal units were investigated in 2009 but it was decided that they will not be progressed further.
Enforcement	<p>Boroughs to ensure that all small to medium businesses have trade waste and/or recycling agreements, ensuring this waste does not end up in the household stream.</p> <p>NLWA and boroughs to lobby for improvements to the <i>Packaging (Essential Requirements) Regulations 2003</i> to allow easier prosecution for excess packaging.</p>	To be progressed in 2009-10
Lobby government to do more to minimise waste growth	Lobby for a requirement on businesses to accept and recycle retail packaging waste deposited by customers prior to leaving the shop.	To be progressed in 2009-10
Public awareness and education campaigns (ongoing)	<p>Assist boroughs to engage with regional and national schools waste minimisation programmes.</p> <p>Investigate options to provide educational material to support waste prevention awareness programmes in schools across North London.</p> <p>Promote the sharing of educational materials and resources across North London boroughs.</p> <p>Develop a pan-North London waste prevention directory, providing information to the public on goods and services that support waste prevention.</p>	<p>Three Waste Education Officers meetings were held in 2008-09 to promote sharing of educational materials and resources across north London. Ongoing in 2009-10.</p> <p>Information on Recycle for London reuse database. To be updated in 2009-10</p>
Community Composting	Engage with the Community Composting Network on the best way to ensure current legislative arrangements do not place overly onerous requirements on small scale community composting schemes.	To be progressed in 2009-10
Towards a service culture	Promote a switch towards a service culture, reducing focus on products and items e.g. promoting and encourage tool libraries, car clubs, refillable containers and other examples of service hire.	This was initiated with Watch Your Waste Week and is to be progressed further in 2009-10
Support best practice in waste re-use and encourage the community sector and other partnerships to deliver effective re-use services.	<p>Investigate support for a single service level agreement for furniture re-use services in North London, ensuring value for money for boroughs and NLWA and access to re-use services for the community.</p> <p>Investigate opportunities for a North London Community RePaint scheme.</p>	A Compact document has been drafted to promote good working arrangements between the NLWA and the community sector in North London. Document to be finalised in 2009-10

Work with appropriate organisations to strengthen reuse markets	Work with government, retail and re-use organisations to identify and develop end-markets for re-used materials.	To be progressed in 2009-10
Options to move towards zero waste	Consider any of the North London boroughs' zero waste strategies, with a view to sharing ideas for reducing waste generation across North London.	Concerns were expressed by some boroughs for the use of the term 'zero waste'. To be progressed further in 2009-10.

**REPORT ENDS**