

Agenda Item No:

NORTH LONDON WASTE AUTHORITY

REPORT TITLE:

WASTE PREVENTION IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

REPORT OF:

HEAD OF WASTE STRATEGY & CONTRACTS

FOR SUBMISSION TO:

AUTHORITY MEETING.

DATE:

20th December 2006

SUMMARY OF REPORT:

This report and accompanying plan outlines the additional actions needed in order to progress towards the waste prevention objectives outlined in the North London Joint Waste Strategy. The plan provides some interim targets to be reached and assigns responsibilities for achieving the same. The plan has been produced with guidance provided by the Strategy Implementation Board and an officer working group.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Authority is recommended to:

- (i) Approve the Waste Prevention Implementation Plan attached.
- (ii) Commend the Waste Prevention Implementation Plan to the constituent borough councils for approval under the North London Joint Waste Strategy.
- (iii) Note that progress in preventing waste will be monitored through the regular Joint Waste Strategy reports to the Authority.

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

.....

Date:.....

1.0 NATIONAL CONTEXT

- 1.1 A recent consultation on the National (English) Waste Strategy reinforced the position of waste prevention at the 'top' of the waste hierarchy, the most desirable of actions for waste materials, something to be carried out in preference to recycling and composting, burning the waste and recovering energy in the process and disposal to landfill, the least desirable of actions. The initial (August 2006) summary of responses to the consultation on the English Waste Strategy suggests that the vast majority of consultees support the view that waste prevention should remain at the top of the hierarchy and also support the need for government to do more in this field. A number of responses (38 out of the 4,000 or so received) also go further and call for a 'zero waste' charter to be adopted with the principles of zero waste as outlined in Appendix 1 of the draft Waste Prevention Implementation Plan attached, being adopted and targets achieved.
- 1.2 The National Waste Strategy consultation also suggests an approach to waste prevention which is targeted by sector - this approach was also supported by the majority of respondents to the consultation. Targeting activity by sector would allow government to set prevention targets for specific industry sectors, for example.
- 1.3 Within the household waste stream, there are no overall waste prevention targets for local authorities or targets to restrict the amount of residual household waste per household or per head. However, authorities such as the North London Waste Authority do have to report on the amount (kg) of household waste they collect per head on an annual basis. Best Value Performance Indicator (BVPI) 84 is used to measure this. This figure shows that in the Authority area the amount of household waste collected per head of population is growing, up from:
- 458.0 kg household waste collected per head in 2001/2002
 - to 480.2 kg in 2005/2006

This is an increase of 5% in 4 years.¹

¹ The Authority also publishes a local performance indicator of kg waste collected per household which has risen from 1,077 kg in 2001/2002 to 1,097 in 2005/2006, a 1.9% increase in 4 years.

2.0 WASTE PREVENTION OBJECTIVES IN THE NORTH LONDON JOINT WASTE STRATEGY

- 2.1 The North London Joint Waste Strategy (NLJWS) sets a target to reduce municipal waste growth down from a predicted 3% growth per annum until 2010 and to a desired 2.5% from then onwards. In the face of *per household* waste growth of 0.25% per annum between 2001-02 and 2005-06, this challenge looks achievable. However, the Strategy is based upon reducing the growth in the 'total' amount of municipal waste in North London and with predicted population increases in North London, even with a small (1 to 1.5%) increase in waste generated per household or per head, the total could increase significantly when combined with predicted increases in the number of households and residents.
- 2.2 The predictions of waste growth as outlined in the Procurement Report which is part of this Authority agenda will be reviewed on an ongoing basis in the light of both predicted waste per household increases, increases in household numbers and any amendments to the method by which the non-household/household split in the municipal waste stream is calculated. The spatial strategy for London, the London Plan, will also in future require each borough to manage as much of its own waste as possible as well as an allocated share of the waste from other boroughs which cannot manage all of their own material. Until these changes have been confirmed and modeled it is not possible to comment upon the implications of these changes for meeting or exceeding the growth reduction targets in the NLJWS.
- 2.3 However, the NLJWS does set out a series of Strategy Implementation Actions which the partners have agreed in order to achieve the waste growth reduction targets. These actions are at a strategic level and the plan which follows is designed to put some shorter term, practical actions in place which will enable the partners to deliver on the NLJWS Strategy Implementation Actions that relate to waste prevention.

3.0 WASTE PREVENTION IMPLEMENTATION PLAN PREPARATION PROCESS

- 3.1 The plan has been prepared in the following manner:
- 3.2 Firstly a meeting of the Strategy Implementation Board (SIB), in March 2006, reviewed the 14 Strategy Implementation Actions on waste prevention which are included in the NLJWS. Each of the actions was rated in terms of ease of implementation and potential impact.
- 3.3 The 'theoretical' impacts of different waste prevention activities (measured in terms of the percentage of waste that they can reduce) were also compared, as taken from the National Resource and Waste Forum's Waste Prevention Toolkit.

- 3.4 Out of the 14 Strategy Implementation Actions in the NLJWS, *lobbying government, sharing good practice* and *home composting* were identified as the three actions which would have most impact and would be most easy to do. Appendix 2 of the draft Waste Prevention Implementation Plan provides the ratings for the 14 Strategy Implementation Actions as outlined by the SIB.
- 3.5 The SIB also identified whether individual actions should be taken by the Authority, the constituent borough councils or both in partnership.
- 3.6 Relevant Authority and Borough officers then met in June 2006 to consider some practical activities which could be included in the waste prevention implementation plan, taking account of the guidance from the SIB. This second meeting also reviewed the results of a survey which had been carried out by London Remade on behalf of the Greater London Authority (GLA) to identify the current status of waste prevention activity across London.
- 3.7 After further officer-level liaison, a draft Waste Prevention Implementation Plan was presented for consideration and discussion at the Strategy Implementation Board meeting held on 2nd November. This meeting endorsed the draft plan (with some amendments that have now been incorporated) and recommended that it be adopted by the Authority and following this, taken to the other Partners for approval.

4.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 Members are asked to:
- (i) Approve the Waste Prevention Implementation Plan attached
 - (ii) Commend the Waste Prevention Implementation Plan to the constituent borough councils for approval under the North London Joint Waste Strategy.
 - (iii) Note that progress in preventing waste will be monitored through the regular Joint Waste Strategy reports to the Authority.

5.0 FINANCIAL ADVISER'S COMMENTS

The Finance Adviser has reviewed this report and comments that allowance has been made in the 2007/08 budget forecast elsewhere on this agenda for the priority items identified (and outlined in Appendix 1). All other comments from the Finance Adviser are incorporated within the body of the report.

6.0 LEGAL ADVISER'S COMMENTS

- 6.1 The Legal Adviser has been consulted in the preparation of this report and her comments are incorporated within.

Local Government Act 1972 – Access to information

Documents used: Review of England's Waste Strategy A Consultation Document
Summary of responses to the consultation, August 2006
Produced by Dialogue by Design for Defra

Household Waste Prevention Toolkit, National Resource and
Waste Forum, August 2006

Contact Officers: Andrew Lappage, Head of Waste Strategy & Contracts
&
Barbara Herridge, Policy & Development Manager

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

Tel: 020 8489 5730
Fax: 020 8365 0254
E-mail: post@nlwa.gov.uk

Appendix 1.

Budget for the Waste Prevention Implementation Plan Priority Actions

Prioritisation of Joint Borough/NLWA Waste Prevention Actions

Priority	Waste Prevention Action	Delivers on NLJWS Strategic Action No.	Budget Estimate	Notes
1	Review work carried out by other disposal authorities in order to assess whether it would be useful to carry out a piece of research to identify and assess all the re-use groups in North London to identify which might want to expand and what support they require in order to do so	10	£45,000	07/08 Please note- this expenditure is dependent on the results of a desktop feasibility study.
2	NLWA to clarify how household waste is calculated going forward	8	Nil	07/08
2	Identify re-use gaps (what can be re-used but currently isn't) - Gap analysis to support re-use schemes - As above but with charity shops	10	Nil	07/08
2	Continue with the nappy subsidy taking account of, and actively being involved in, the development of proposals for a pan-London scheme	7		Budget covered in separate Authority item.
3	Co-ordinate joint purchasing of capital equipment (e.g. wormeries, rockets and installation etc) leading to bulk purchase discounts and best practice synergies and the possibility of joint promotions	14	Nil	07/08
3	Produce a monthly web/email based summary or matrix of activity in NLWA boroughs – with level of activity graded 1-5. (look into this being pan-London too) <i>(Provides a 'Notice board' for recycling officers across North London.)</i>	5	Nil	07/08, 08/09
3	Run a regional packaging education programme for householders delivered in conjunction with supermarkets <i>This could be shelf talkers – as in a recent Recycle Western Riverside supermarket campaign</i> <i>It is noted that Camden started something similar in Sept 06</i> Follow findings from the Western Riverside campaign	3	Unknown-not until 08/09	This action is likely to require a budget but not undertaken until 08/09
4	Work with re-use organisations that have sound business cases, can develop best practice, support improvements in groups to raise standards and offer matrix for success to newcomers	10	£10,000	07/08
4	Investigate the potential to introduce differential tonnage charges for different categories of waste (Levy biowaste to give a greater incentive for boroughs to reduce this).	7	Unknown-not until 08/09	This action is likely to require a budget but not undertaken until 08/09
4	Review experiences from elsewhere to assess potential impact of a reduction in collection frequency and the impact of offering smaller bins.	5	nil	07/08
4	Establish a promotional scheme for trade waste customers – e.g. with posters saying they support waste prevention	2	£10,000	07/08
5	Review zero waste	3 & 4	Nil	07/08
5	Introduce more opportunities for home composting of cooked food waste (green cones and green Johannas)	13	Nil	07/08

Priority	Waste Prevention Action	Delivers on NLJWS Strategic Action No.	Budget Estimate	Notes
5	Talk to WRAP about the potential for funding a regional packaging prevention campaign/research. <i>Although it was noted that this may potentially be more effective if its is London wide</i>	3	Nil	07/08
6	Need a method for measuring the number of households who are actually composting at home and the number of households who are actually composting through community composting schemes and tonnes diverted as a result	13 & 14	nil	07/08
6	Education – run a schools programme including trips to NLWA composting facilities – NLWA to get waste education officers in North London together	14	nil	07/08
6	NLWA to coordinate compost bin subsidies with more choice for residents including wormeries and digesters	13	nil	07/08
6	Encourage creation of nappy laundry services	7	nil	07/08
6	Pay re-use credits for furniture (and other items) collected by third parties	7		Budget covered in separate Authority item.
6	Share ideas on methodologies to quantify impact of waste prevention actions (e.g. WRAP's methodology to quantify the impact of home composting on collected waste tonnages)	5	nil	07/08
6	Arrange quarterly NLWA/recycling/waste officer meetings to share good practice	5	£5,000	07/08, 08/09
6	Carry out a survey of business waste to see what the split is by sector of Borough's trade waste customers and then use this to decide where and how best to focus activity and whether it would be useful to establish a waste prevention club or whether waste prevention advice would be better delivered in a different way	2	Unknown-not until 08/09	This action is likely to require a budget but not undertaken until 08/09
6	Trade waste officers providing waste prevention advice	2	£10,000	07/08

Prioritisation of NLWA Waste Prevention Actions

Priority	Waste Prevention Action	Delivers on NLJWS Strategic Action No.	Budget Estimate	Notes
1	Seek funding to run waste reduction campaigns across North London for 15 years	4	nil	07/08
2	Support best practice	9	nil	07/08
3	Lobby government to do more	1	nil	07/08
4	Seek funding or regional support for a packaging waste prevention campaign with local businesses	3	nil	07/08

North London Joint Waste Strategy Waste Prevention Implementation Plan

Draft 10 for Consideration by the North London Waste Authority

December 2006

North London Joint Waste Strategy - Waste Prevention Implementation Plan

Introduction & Acknowledgements

- 1.0 This plan has been prepared by Members of the North London Joint Waste Strategy Strategy Implementation Board (SIB) and borough officers; with additional input from the Environment Council. Thanks go to all who contributed.
- 1.2 The plan sets out a series of specific actions to deliver the strategic objectives for waste prevention which are contained within the North London Joint Waste Strategy (NLJWS).
- 1.3 The timetable for the implementation plan is the remainder of the 2006/07 financial year and 2007/08, i.e. the rest of this current financial year and next, ending 31st March 2008.
The aim is to update the implementation plan following this period.

Definitions

- 2.0 Waste prevention means:

“Minimising the quantity (weight and volume) and hazardousness of household-derived waste” (usually within a defined ‘community’ such as the North London area.)

This encompasses:

- waste avoidance - not producing something in the first place
- waste reduction - reducing the amount produced, i.e. producing less
- waste re-use - re-using waste materials for another purpose, but not processing the material in any way as in the case of recycling.

Considerations in the Plan Preparation

- 3.0 The waste prevention implementation plan has been prepared with the following considerations in mind and taking account of:
 - existing work and activity
 - the national environment within which the partners are working - both in terms of the national (English) waste strategy consultation review and the current legislative framework

- the potential implications of the recently introduced tonnage based levy which has changed the system by which the North London Waste Authority (NLWA) levies the constituent borough councils for the costs of disposing of the household element of the municipal waste stream. The system is changing from one in which the majority of the levy is based upon council tax bands (based upon the number of band 'D' equivalent properties in each borough) to one which is based mainly upon the household waste tonnages delivered by each constituent borough council to the disposal authority. Whilst this change is being phased in over a 3 year period it will act as an immediate incentive to collection authorities to reduce the amount of material being presented for disposal.

List of strategic waste prevention actions outlined in the NLJWS

4.0 The NLJWS sets out a series of 12 Strategy Implementation Actions for the constituent authorities (the NLWA and the 7 constituent borough councils) on waste prevention. Two of the strategy implementation actions consist of two discrete activities, so for the purposes of the implementation plan these two strategic actions have been divided into two thereby providing us with 14 strategy implementation actions on which action is required.

4.1 The following list outlines the full list of actions above.

1. Lobby government to do more.
2. Give active support for waste minimisation clubs for business.
3. Seek funding or regional support for a packaging waste prevention campaign with local businesses.
4. Seek funding to run waste reduction campaigns across North London for 15 years.
5. Share good practice and consider the effects of waste reduction when introducing new services.
6. Support a move to a tonnage based levy with appropriate transitional arrangements.
7. Consider incentives and rebates.
8. Review the need for direct and variable charging during the 15 year strategy period.
9. Support best practice.
10. Encourage community sector and other partnerships to deliver effective re-use services.
11. Support bids for external funding of re-use services.
12. Seek to reward re-use services directly, possibly through the introduction of a re-use credit.
13. Provide a concerted and on-going promotional campaign to encourage home composting, including provision of subsidized bins. Aim is for 25% of residents with gardens to be composting at home by 2014.
14. Actively support appropriate community composting projects through support for external bids, direct funding and payment of third party recycling credits.

4.2 Table 1 below lists the 14 strategy implementation actions again and highlights the individual actions which are currently being carried out by the partners to deliver them. This shows where there are gaps in activity as well as areas in which activity is already concentrated. Table 1 also highlights the objectives on which the SIB recommended that the NLWA act and which actions the SIB suggested both the Boroughs and the NLWA work on together.

Table 1: Summary of NLJWS strategic implementation actions for waste prevention

Key	NLJWS Implementation Actions where the SIB recommended that NLWA act	
		NLJWS Implementation Actions where the SIB recommended joint Borough/NLWA activity
		A current activity being carried out by one of the North London authorities (NLWA or boroughs) – as taken from a recent GLA/London Remade survey
		An waste prevention activity identified in the GLA/London Remade survey on which none of the North London authorities (NLWA or boroughs) are acting
Avoidance	1	Lobby government to do more
	2	Give active support for waste minimisation clubs for business
		Waste Exchange Initiatives (2 partners currently doing this)*
	3	Seek funding or regional support for a packaging waste prevention campaign with local businesses
		Waste Aware Shopping (1 partner currently doing this)
		Retail Initiatives (0 partners currently acting on this)
Reduction	4	Seek funding to run waste reduction campaigns across North London for 15 years
	5	Share good practice & consider the effects of waste reduction when introducing new services
		Local Authority Internal Policies and Initiatives (5 partners acting on this)
		Communication Campaigns specific to Reduction and Reuse (5 partners currently doing this)
		Mailing Preference Service (5 partners currently acting on this)
		Other Schemes/Initiatives (no others mentioned)
	6	Support a move to a tonnage based levy with appropriate transitional arrangements
		A move to a tonnage based levy is being phased in over 3 years (8 partners acting on this)
	7	Consider incentives and rebates
		Real Nappy Schemes (All 8 partners acting on this aspect)
Re-use	8	Review the need for direct & variable charging during the 15 year strategy period
	9	Support best practice
	10	Encourage community sector & other partnerships to deliver effective re-use services
		Wood Re-use Schemes (1 partner currently acting on this)

		Furniture Re-use Schemes (5 partners currently acting on this)
		Paint Re-use Schemes (3 partners currently acting on this)
		Scrap store Projects (1 partner acting on this)
		Charity Shops (4 partners acting on this)
		WEEE Refurbishment Projects (4 partners acting on this)
		Re-use Initiatives at Reuse and Recycling Centres (7 partners acting on this)
	11	Support bids for external funding of re-use services
	12	Seek to reward re-use services directly, possibly through the introduction of a re-use credit
Home & Community Composting	13	Provide a concerted & on-going promotional campaign to encourage home composting, including provision of subsidised bins. Aim = 25% of residents with gardens composting at home by 2014
		Home Composting Initiatives (all 8 partners acting on this)
	14	Actively support appropriate community composting projects through support for external bids, direct funding and payment of third party recycling credits
		Community and Master Composting Schemes (all 7 boroughs & the NLWA doing work on community composting via a small grants scheme)

Note that the word 'partners' in the table above refers to the partners in the North London Joint Waste Strategy – the 7 boroughs and the North London Waste Authority.

* Although there was previously a waste exchange service attached to a business waste minimisation club in North London, two of the North London boroughs are now running waste exchanges for householders. This activity could also fit within avoidance or reuse.

NLJWS strategic actions where the SIB recommended that the NLWA act

5.1 Out of the 14 strategy implementation actions 4 have been identified as being primarily the responsibility of the NLWA, the other 10 require joint action by boroughs and the NLWA in order to implement them.

5.2 The 4 strategy implementation actions for the NLWA to implement have been identified as:

- Lobby government to do more (100% of SIB respondents said that this was the NLWA's responsibility).
- Seek funding or regional support for a packaging waste prevention campaign with local businesses (86% of SIB respondents thought that this should be the NLWA's responsibility).
- Seek funding to run waste reduction campaigns across North London for 15 years (100% of SIB respondents viewed this as the NLWA's responsibility).
- Support best practice on waste re-use (86% of SIB respondents said that this should be delivered by the NLWA).

Actions for the Implementation plan

- 6.1 Taking account of the guidance from the SIB, the following actions are proposed over the period of the Implementation Plan. Taking each of the NLJWS actions in turn the following section details the proposed actions to deliver on the strategy implementation actions. As some of the strategy implementation actions are primarily the responsibility of the NLWA and some are the joint responsibility of the constituent borough councils and the NLWA - the responsibilities are highlighted accordingly. The implementation actions are also grouped into actions on:
- avoidance,
 - reduction,
 - re-use and
 - home and community composting.

The comments which follow each table are factors which were taken into account when considering how best to act. These comments were made by members of the SIB. Where additional considerations were taken into account then these are listed at the start of the relevant section.

6.2 Avoidance NLJWS Strategy Implementation Action 1 - Lobby government to do more - NLWA prime responsibility

- 6.2.1 The Authority's response to the recent national Waste Strategy consultation argued for the following:
- More focus on waste prevention and minimisation by central government, including funding.
 - That an English waste prevention strategy should be produced (The Scottish Executive and SEPA have produced a prevention strategy for Scotland).
 - That a standard definition of 'prevention' should be adopted. The response recommended that the term 'minimisation' be dropped as this is sometimes taken to include recycling, on the basis that 'minimisation' can mean minimising the amount of waste going to landfill. The Authority recommended that the term 'prevention' be used as this is in line with OECD and EU definitions.
 - That BVPI 84a (kg of household waste collected per head) be made into a target, either statutory or non-statutory. This means that agreement would be required on a more up-to-date method for calculating how the percentage of non-household/household waste is calculated within the municipal waste stream. Within North London both household and non-household waste is collected in the same vehicles, but when the vehicles are weighed it is not possible to determine on the weighbridge, how much of the tonnage is household waste and how much non-household. The household/non-household split is therefore calculated on the basis of a historical survey. This is now out-of-date and a new method for doing this calculation needs to be reached to ensure an accurate baseline against which any future household waste reduction can be measured.

- The Authority response also supported existing Defra funded research which is currently underway to identify how best to measure the impact of waste prevention measures.

6.2.3 Any further lobbying by the Authority should continue to endorse the above proposals in the Authority's response to the English Waste Strategy Consultation.

The partners should set their own targets for BVPI 84a in the absence of government guidance for 2007/08.

In order to do this it is necessary to agree an updated methodology for calculating the percentage of household waste in the municipal waste stream. An 'in principle' proposal on the same was presented to the Authority meeting in September 2006 for approval, with further detail to be submitted to the December 2006 Authority meeting.

6.2.4 Authority officers will continue to engage in the national debate about waste prevention, including:

- Making representation on the above issues through attendance at events.
- Engaging with ongoing research on measuring the impact of waste prevention activities.
- The Authority will also consider adopting any measurement methodologies proposed as result of the research.

6.2.5 At a meeting of Authority officers held in June 2006, to discuss the Waste Prevention Implementation Plan officers also considered the issue of the Authority becoming a 'zero waste' authority. (Appendix 1 outlines some of the key principles of zero waste requested by some consultees to the national Waste Strategy consultation). It was considered most appropriate that the Authority review the principles of zero waste when the North London Joint Waste Strategy is reviewed.

6.2.6 In making the recommendations on **lobbying government to do more the following comments and considerations were taken into account:**

- That lobbying is a long term activity which may not ultimately result in a change so that the level of activity required and the areas in which activity is focused must be carefully considered e.g. when deciding which consultation responses should be prioritised.
- That the Authority may not always be the most appropriate organisation to lobby at a particular point in time and this should also be taken into account when considering how best to implement action.
- Two potential areas for focus were considered to be packaging reduction, (particularly plastic bottles) and legislative enforcement.
- The point was also made that whilst the Authority is responsible for implementing this action in the NLJWS, everyone needs to work on this collectively and individually.

6.3 Avoidance NLJWS Strategy Implementation Action 2 - Give support for waste minimisation clubs for business - Joint borough/NLWA responsibility

6.3.1 Over recent years several waste minimisation clubs for businesses have ceased due to a lack of funding. Historical sources for funding such clubs in North London, particularly the landfill tax credit scheme, are no longer available. It is unlikely therefore that the partners will be developing waste minimisation clubs along the same type of model as in the past, which primarily involves businesses attending meetings and having support from business advisors. The focus of implementation activity in North London will therefore focus on trade waste customers to whom the constituent boroughs are providing a collection service and 'taking the message' of waste avoidance to businesses directly rather than asking businesses to sign up to a 'club' and come along to meetings and events. The table which follows outlines a series of ideas for action, the objectives of the actions, who needs to be involved and the timetable for the action.

Idea	Objectives	Involve who?	Lead Responsibility	Comments
<p>1) Investigate opportunities for bidding for BREW funding for North London (BREW = Business Resource Efficiency & Waste programme)</p>	<p>Find out funding timetable and scope of support</p>	<p>Borough waste officers NLWA</p>	<p>NLWA Waste Prevention Officer</p>	
<p>2) Work with National Industrial Symbiosis Programme (NISP) to bring partners together (NISP aim to match up companies so that a company with excess resources in one area is matched with a company who needs those resources)</p> <p><i>- May be useful links with the Tidy business standard and street stars.</i></p>	<p>Contact NISP to find out more details on whether they can help on waste</p> <p>Contact Envirowise to find out if we could promote/offer their services to businesses in North London</p>	<p>Chamber of commerce North London group? Community business groups – Business women etc NLWA Trade waste managers Trade waste customers</p>	<p>NLWA Waste Prevention Officer</p>	
<p>3) Carry out a survey of business waste to see what the split is by sector of Borough's trade waste customers and then use this to</p>	<p>Decide what waste prevention services to offer trade waste customers and what is affordable</p>	<p>Borough waste officers CESMB at Middlesex University NLWA</p>	<p>NLWA Waste Prevention Officer with external support</p>	<p>Potential to send out a postal survey with the April trade waste</p>

decide where and how best to focus activity and whether it would be useful to establish a waste prevention club or whether waste prevention advice would be better delivered in a different way				invoices
Idea	Objectives	Involve who?	Lead Responsibility	Comments
4) Identify existing business groups based on the above survey and ask if it is possible to do a presentation on waste prevention at a future meeting	Raise the profile of waste prevention within the local business community	Borough waste officers Chamber of Commerce Local Groundwork Trusts NLWA	NLWA Waste Prevention Officer with external support	
5) Target building waste with assistance from CaféVan and investigate expanding this concept to other sectors	Contact CaféVan to find out the cost of offering their services in North London, or opportunities for funding and extending the concept. (CaféVan go onto building sites provide tea/coffee and bacon rolls etc and talk about waste prevention and recycling)	Borough waste officers Building control NLWA Planning department	NLWA Waste Prevention Officer	
6) Trade waste officers providing waste prevention advice	Run a training day for trade waste officers which explains the pros and cons on integrating waste prevention promotion into the trade waste advice that is provided	Camden who are already doing this CESMB at Middlesex University NLWA Trade waste officers	NLWA Waste Prevention Officer	Investigate long term opportunities to have local sector waste minimisation officers
7) Establish a promotional scheme for trade waste customers – e.g. with posters saying they support waste prevention	Links to number 2. on Strategic Action 3 below			This could be based upon a similar scheme for local garages run by Trading Standards
8) Assess current trade recyclers in boroughs and assess	Have approved or recommended business recycling	Borough officers London Remade	Led by borough officers but coordinated by	Assess annually

private recycling companies that offer services in North London in order to promote them equally (could produce a directory of service providers for local businesses)	providers (important that businesses act on both recycling and prevention)	NLWA Service suppliers	NLWA Waste Prevention Officer	
Idea	Objectives	Involve who?	Lead Responsibility	Comments
9) Zero waste industrial park	Set up a trial in North London of a zero waste industrial park- i.e. an industrial park which is trying to send zero waste to landfill (this is an idea from CESMB)	Borough and NLWA officers CESMB at Middlesex University Groundwork North London	CESMB	

6.3.2 In considering the actions necessary for **giving active support for waste minimisation clubs for business** the following considerations were incorporated:

- That it is time consuming to work with businesses and may not be viewed by local taxpayers as an important area on which the partners should be focusing attention.
- Boroughs can implement promotion, the NLWA to finance and support.
- That consideration should be given to the potential role of the voluntary to help, deliver training.
- Some of the actions proposed are already in progress in Islington and these should be reviewed and can provide guidance for others.

It was concluded that this is not a priority action area.

6.4 **Avoidance** NLJWS Strategy Implementation Action 3 - **Seek funding or regional support for a packaging waste prevention campaign with local businesses.** NLWA responsibility

Idea	Objectives	Involve who?	Lead Responsibility	Comments
<p>1) Talk to WRAP about the potential for funding a regional packaging prevention campaign/research. <i>Although it was noted that this may potentially be more effective if its is London wide</i></p>	<p>Establish what packaging is regional and can be targeted regionally</p>	<p>Borough waste officers NLWA Trade associations WRAP</p>	<p>NLWA Waste Prevention Officer</p>	
<p>2) Regional packaging education programme for householders delivered in conjunction with supermarkets <i>This could be in line with recent Recycle Western Riverside campaigns. It is noted that Camden started something similar in Sept 06</i></p>	<p>Design a programme and get supermarkets on board. Have letter writing campaign Design competition /award scheme for supermarket groups.</p>	<p>Supermarkets such as: Aldi, Asda, Budgens, Co-Op, Morrisons, Netto, Sainsburys, Tesco, Waitrose <i>It is noted that most of these do not use a local authority collection service</i> Also involve compliance schemes Discuss with WRAP NLWA & Borough waste officers</p>	<p>NLWA Waste Prevention Officer</p>	<p>Assess over one year Then design a programme and start to liaise with supermarkets & WRAP etc by end of 2007</p>

6.4.1 The following comments, questions and considerations were taken into account when considering the actions to **seek funding or regional support for a packaging waste prevention campaign with local businesses.**

- That there will need to further discussion about how best to link waste prevention advice with recycling services (for trade waste customers for example)
- 30% of PET is in the South East so there is a need to tackle plastic bottle waste, e.g. through a campaign to encourage residents to drink tap water. Recycle Western Riverside has been doing work on this which could be replicated in North London.
- It is important to note that every borough is doing something different on trade waste.
- Getting councils themselves on board is an important first step

- There are possible resource issues with this objective.

6.5 **Reduction** NLJWS Strategy Implementation Action 4 - **Seek funding to run waste reduction campaigns across North London for 15 years** – NLWA responsibility

6.5.1 It will be the NLWA's responsibility, once the Waste Prevention Implementation Plan is agreed by all partners to review funding sources, including those for sustainable consumption and production or 'SCP'. This is an ongoing task throughout the Strategy period.

6.5.2 It was noted by the Strategy Implementation Board that:

- A long term waste reduction campaign could possibly focus on plastic bottle reduction.
- That achieving this objective will be very dependent upon what funding is available.

6.6 **Reduction** NLJWS Strategy Implementation Action 5 - **Share good practice and consider the effects of waste reduction when introducing new services.** – Joint Borough and NLWA responsibility

Ideas	Objectives	Involve who?	Lead Responsibility	Comments
1) Monthly web/email based summary or matrix of activity in NLWA boroughs – with level of activity graded 1-5. (look into this being pan-London too) (<i>Provides a 'Notice board' for recycling officers across North London.</i>)	Share good practice/learning To get the best value for money for all Avoid costly mistakes	All boroughs GLA NLWA	NLWA Waste Prevention Officer	Longer term this could be pan-London or further afield depending upon the Waste Strategy Review
2) Share ideas on methodologies to quantify impact of waste prevention actions (e.g. WRAP's methodology to quantify the impact of home composting on collected waste tonnages)	Prioritise actions Assess impact	Borough waste officers Defra GLA NLWA WRAP	NLWA Waste Prevention Officer	WRAP is developing a methodology to quantify the diversion from home composting. Consider adopting this measure once it is published
3) Review experiences from elsewhere to assess potential impact of a reduction in collection frequency and the impact of offering smaller bins	Establish whether these actions would have a similar impact given the different types of housing in North London, such as flats, mansions and kerbside services	Borough waste officers Defra Waste Implementation Programme NLWA	Boroughs to lead on decision-making	A literature review necessary to identify others to help followed by regular review
4) Quarterly NLWA/recycling/waste officer meetings to share good practice	Networking Sharing best practice Building relationships	Officers	As soon as possible	Quarterly

6.6.1 In agreeing the above actions to **Share good practice and consider the effects of waste reduction when introducing new services** the SIB considered that:

- Jointly the partners should initiate good practice.
- That all best practice should be considered and that this has the potential for high impact.
- Good practice should incorporate best practice locally, nationally and from elsewhere and that all should be shared.

- This should include sharing lessons learnt from local initiatives and activity – such as Hackney starting a compulsory recycling scheme following Barnet's introduction of the same.

6.7 **Reduction** NLJWS Strategy Implementation Action 6 - **Support a move to a tonnage based levy with appropriate transitional arrangements.** – Joint responsibility

- 6.7.1 This action is completed and a transition to a tonnage based levy is being phased in over the next three years for the major element of the Authority's household waste disposal costs, (although a smaller percentage will continue to be apportioned on a council tax basis). In 2006/2007 the cost of levy which the NLWA makes upon the constituent boroughs for the majority of the household waste is one third on a tonnage basis and two thirds on a council tax basis. In 2007/2008 the levy will be two thirds tonnage based and one third council tax based and in 2008/2009 it will be completely tonnage based
- 6.7.2 As boroughs move increasingly towards a levy which is based upon the tonnes of waste delivered to the NLWA there will be an increasingly strong incentive on boroughs to reduce the amount of waste that is delivered to the NLWA for disposal.

6.8 **Reduction** NLJWS Strategy Implementation Action 7 - **Consider incentives and rebates.** - Joint responsibility

Ideas	Objectives	Involve who?	Lead Responsibility	Comments
1) Continue with the nappy subsidy taking account of, and actively being involved in, the development of proposals for a pan-London scheme	Reduce nappy waste Broader environmental educational benefits	Boroughs Waste prevention officers including NLWA	NLWA Waste Prevention Officer	Continuous work with review following the publication of Real Nappies for London research and costings for involvement in a pan-London scheme
2) Encourage creation of nappy laundry services	Nappy laundry services in/or covering all boroughs	Borough officers Links to re-use services so involve London CRN NLWA Existing laundry companies	North London Nappy Steering Group	Run parallel with meetings with Health Authorities to make the most of the subsidy
3) Evaluate current literature to assess the potential impact of charging for waste by weight/volume	Potentially this would have a significant impact on waste arisings Driven by central Government	This will be driven centrally by government	NLWA Waste Prevention Officer	
4) Pay re-use credits for furniture (and other items) collected by third parties	Reduce waste arisings	'Approved' re-use organisations London CRN Other councils who have already introduced re-use credits Borough and NLWA officers	NLWA Principle Policy & Projects Officer	A policy decision to pay re-use credits has been taken. The scheme now needs to be established
5) Investigate the potential to introduce differential tonnage charges for different categories of waste (Levy biowaste to give a greater incentive for boroughs to reduce this)	Encourage moving up the waste hierarchy	NLWA Boroughs		Focus more attention on this once facilities in place

6.8.1 The SIB considered the following issues when deciding upon the actions to implement the objective to consider incentives and rebates.

- Firstly that there is a need to ensure that (we) cover the costs of running a real nappy subsidy scheme, so that it is not burdensome in the long term.
- Any changes to a nappy scheme should ensure the continued involvement of both boroughs and the NLWA. The NLWA should liaise with the boroughs on this issue and then boroughs to residents.
- It was agreed that whilst the NLJWS objective was to 'consider' incentives and rebates the implementation action was to consider, evaluate and then introduce incentives and/or rebates if they prove to be a cost-effective method of incentivising residents to recycle. It was noted that no examples had been provided in order to assess the efficacy of incentives and rebates to date. However, it was noted that there was a need for central government guidance and that central government may be best placed to act upon this as well.
- Concern was expressed about the risk of fly tipping if incentives, charges or rebates are introduced, however it was noted that with strong enforcement then this could potentially be avoided.

6.9 **Reduction - NLJWS Strategy Implementation Action 8 - Review the need for direct and variable charging during the 15-year strategy period.** - A joint action for NLWA and boroughs

Ideas	Objectives	Involve who?	Lead Responsibility	Comments
1) NLWA to review and clarify how household waste is calculated as a percentage of the municipal waste stream (& therefore charged)	To produce a consistent up-to-date system which allows benchmarking on a per head basis of the amount of household waste produced in each borough	Borough and NLWA Officers and Members Consultants	NLWA Head of Waste Strategy & Contracts	A paper was presented to the September 2006 Authority meeting and an agreement in principle to update the method for calculating the NLWA's levy on boroughs was agreed Any changes which result will be in place from 1 st April 2007
2) NLWA to review the available evidence on the impact of direct and variable rate (DVR) charging on household waste arisings	To develop a policy position (statement) on this issue	Boroughs NLWA	NLWA Policy & Development Manager	

6.9.1 How the percentage of household waste in the municipal stream is calculated in North London is based upon the results of a historical survey of the percentage of household and non-household waste in the municipal waste stream in North London. A review in 2005 proposed some different options for introducing a more up-to-date method for calculating this percentage. However, due to the move to a tonnage based levy, this work has required further review in 2006. A paper was presented at the September 2006 Authority meeting outlining some revised proposals and agreement in principle was gained for adopting a new method of calculation, the detail of which will be submitted for approval to the Authority's December 2006 meeting. The NLWA will need to engage in any policy review of this at a national level as part of its role in implementing Strategic Action 1 – 'Lobby government to do more'.

6.9.2 In relation to the potential introduction of DVR charging the SIB considered and commented upon the strategic objective to Review **the need for direct and variable charging during the 15 year strategy period.**

- That this would be something which was introduced at a national level – for boroughs to implement.
- Concern was expressed about how this would affect people who live in flats?
- Whether it would be enforceable.
- That this would need a wider a political debate
- That local choice would still be needed.
- that fly tipping was a risk

The SIB concluded that DVR charging is something being actively considered within the review of the English Waste Strategy, so that the North London partners should review this after the revised National Waste Strategy is produced.

6.10 **Re-use** NLJWS Strategy Implementation Action **9 - Support best practice.** – An activity for the NLWA

6.10.1 There are a number of areas in which the NLWA could support best practice, including providing opportunities such as meetings to share best practice, regional research in order to support best practice, central administration which enables best practice activities to be shared across North London as well as providing delivery support within the resource limits of one waste prevention officer.

6.10.2 SIB participants felt that this was a strategic action on which the NLWA should take the lead. Participants further commented that:

- NLWA should initiate good practice.
- That it was important to consider all best practice; as this has the potential for high impact.
- The scope should include looking at best practice abroad.

6.11 **Re-use NLJWS Strategic Action 10 - Encourage community sector and other partnerships to deliver effective re-use services.** - A joint action for NLWA and boroughs

Ideas	Objectives	Involve who?	Lead Responsibility	Comments
<p>1) Review work carried out by other disposal authorities in order to assess whether it would be useful to carry out a piece of research to identify and assess all the re-use groups in North London to identify which might want to expand and what support they require in order to do so</p>	<p>Identify all groups</p> <p>Review operations</p> <p>Create a 'registered list' of projects for re-use credits</p> <p>Grow groups who are keen to expand</p>	<p>Borough and NLWA officers</p> <p>Lancs & Hants CC who have both done similar projects</p> <p>London CRN</p> <p>London Remade</p> <p>NAWDO (National Association of Waste Disposal Officers)</p> <p>Re-use networks e.g. Furniture Re-use Network</p>	<p>NLWA Waste Prevention Officer</p>	<p>Review on an annual/bi-annual basis thereafter</p>
<p>2) Incorporate re-use groups more proactively into the North London Recycling Forum, so providing a space/forum for groups.</p> <p>Ensure that a future meeting of the Forum has a focus on re-use</p>	<p>Communication/best practice sharing</p> <p>Skills sharing</p> <p>Market identifications</p> <p>Cost synergies</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>NLRF Steering Group</p>	<p>Review in 2006/2007</p>
<p>3) Identify boroughs' needs from re-use schemes (working standards, sustainability, employment, location etc.) Demand for a service</p>	<p>Review existing problems/best practice</p> <p>Survey boroughs' needs</p> <p>Co-ordinate information sharing</p>	<p>Boroughs</p> <p>NLWA</p> <p>External authorities</p>	<p>NLWA Waste Prevention Officer</p>	<p>Incorporate this work into the payment of re-use credits and fit to borough requirements</p>
<p>4) Define 're-use' and agree a standard with Boroughs Other waste authorities may help define 're-</p>	<p>Ensure all working with the same definition</p>	<p>As above</p>	<p>NLWA Waste Prevention Officer</p>	

use' – necessary for the payment of re-use credits				
Idea	Objectives	Involve who?	Lead Responsibility	Comments
5) Identify re-use gaps (what can be re-used which currently isn't in North London? Gap analysis to support re-use schemes Also need this for review for charity shops	From assessment above it will be possible to identify gaps and then support the growth of schemes	Boroughs NLWA Community sector organizations such as Furniture Reuse Network and London CRN	NLWA Waste Prevention Officer	Do this after agreement has been reached on the definition
6) Work with London Remade and others to strengthen re-use markets	Long term stability of re-use schemes	NLWA Boroughs London Remade	NLWA	Ongoing
7) Work with organisations that have sound business cases can develop best practice, support improvements in groups to raise standards and offer matrix for success to newcomers	Encourage self sufficiency Encourage partnering Encourage social agenda enterprise	NLWA Boroughs Organisations that would function more effectively on a regional pan-North London level	NLWA	Ongoing

6.11.1 It was noted that some borough representatives had not heard of the North London Recycling Forum so that there is a need to promote it more extensively to borough officers.

6.11.2 Secondly it is necessary to define 're-use' primarily for the purpose of paying credits.

6.11.3 In considering how best to Encourage community sector and other partnerships to deliver effective re-use services the SIB noted that:

- There is a need for long term establishment funding, and that there are short-term funds available for start-up funding but very little for the long term.
- That the impact of this objective on waste tonnages to disposal depends on the level and type of support which is required and that the volumes are potentially low.
- Typical of this type of partnership and organization is MORPH in Hackney.

6.12 **Re-use NLJWS Strategy Implementation Action 11 - Support bids for external funding of re-use services** - A joint action for NLWA and boroughs

Ideas	Objectives	Involve who?	Lead Responsibility	Comments
1) Identify sources of funding	Encourage expansion of re-use	NLWA Waste Prevention Officer London CRN	NLWA Waste Prevention Officer	
2) Boroughs to tell NLWA if they want to bid	Encourage expansion of re-use	Borough Officers NLWA Waste Prevention Officer London CRN	NLWA Waste Prevention Officer to alert others to funding opportunities as appropriate	
3) Support Boroughs to make a business case	Encourage expansion of re-use	Borough Officers NLWA Waste Prevention Officer London CRN	NLWA Waste Prevention Officer	
4) Look for an opportunity to get match funding through the Enhance programme (this programme provides a business advisory service)	Encourage expansion of re-use	Borough Officers NLWA Waste Prevention Officer London CRN	NLWA Waste Prevention Officer	

6.12.1 When considering the NLJWS objective to **Support bids for external funding of re-use services** it was noted that:

- There is start-up funding available but very little for the long term support of organisations, particularly if they are not in a regeneration area.
- Clear auditing is needed if the partner authorities are going to support bids for funding by third parties.
- The funding available is becoming scarcer. .

6.13 **Re-use** NLJWS Strategy Implementation Action 12 - **Seek to reward re-use services directly, possibly through the introduction of a re-use credit.** - A joint action for NLWA and boroughs

6.13.1 This action is completed in principle. NLWA officers have reviewed government guidance on the payment of re-use and recycling credits and put forward proposals on the same to Members. The ‘in-principle’ decision was taken in September 2006 to award re-use credits to third parties from 1st April 2007. Further detailed notes and guidance for applicants is being developed. The other incentive/reward that is being paid at a pan-North London level is the payment of an incentive to parents who use real nappies. .

6.13.2 Boroughs are also individually doing work in this area:

- Islington is carrying out a project on furniture re-use
- CRISP (Community Recycling in Southwark Project) supports re-use projects and has been doing work with universities to encourage re-use of student furniture etc at the end of term.
- Camden, Enfield, Hackney, Islington and Waltham Forest are all running ‘give and take’ days where residents bring items that they no longer want and give them to residents who want to ‘take’ them away.

6.13.3 Information on these activities can be shared across North London through the networking events already mentioned. This action also crosses over with strategic action 10.

6.13.4 In considering paying re-use credits as a way of seeking to **reward re-use services directly** it was noted that:

- :
- Re-use can be difficult to measure.
 - The administrative burden needs to be taken into consideration

6.14 **Home & Community Composting** NLJWS Strategy Implementation Action 13 - **Provide a concerted and on-going promotional campaign to encourage home composting, including provision of subsidized bins. Aim = 25% of residents with gardens composting at home by 2014.** - A joint action for NLWA and boroughs

Ideas	Objectives	Involve who?	Lead Responsibility	Comments
1) Need a method for measuring the number of households who are actually composting	<p>Measure the success of Action 13.</p> <p>Measure the cost effectiveness of compost bin sales and the campaign in general to promote home composting</p>	<p>Best done regionally, i.e. by involving WRAP, GLA, NLWA</p> <p>Note that a model which aims to quantify tonnes diverted by home composting is being developed by WRAP</p>	Boroughs	

Idea	Objectives	Involve who?	Lead Responsibility	Comments
<p>2) Extend compost campaigns, newsletters, workshops etc (e.g. work in Camden) across the whole of North London (and further?) e.g. resource finders, master composters and compost newsletters</p> <p>Home composting promotions best implemented at a borough level, but boroughs can share best practice</p>	<p>Retain and increase interest in composting</p> <p>Raise public awareness and understanding</p>	<p>NLWA with boroughs</p> <p>London CRN</p> <p>GLA?</p> <p>Henry Doubleday Research Association (HDRA)</p> <p>WRAP</p>	<p>Boroughs</p>	<p>This is ongoing</p>
<p>3) Support any lobbying activity for the deregulation of small community composting sites</p>	<p>Create a legal framework to make community composting easier, i.e. no need for a waste transfer license etc</p>	<p>Boroughs</p> <p>Community Composting Network (CCN)</p> <p>London CRN</p> <p>Defra</p> <p>GLA</p> <p>NLWA</p> <p>Environment Agency</p>	<p>Other organizations such as CCN to lead but NLWA to lead support from North London</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
<p>4) NLWA to coordinate compost bin subsidies with more choice for residents such as wormeries, digesters etc</p>	<p>Bulk purchasing discount</p>	<p>Boroughs</p> <p>NLWA</p> <p>Suppliers</p>	<p>NLWA Waste Prevention Officer</p>	<p>Continue on an ongoing basis</p>
<p>5) Introduce more opportunities for home composting of cooked food waste (green cones and green Johannas)</p>	<p>Reduce residual waste for collection</p>	<p>Boroughs</p> <p>NLWA</p> <p>Suppliers</p>	<p>Boroughs</p>	<p>The move to a tonnage based levy provides an incentive for boroughs to maximize diversion</p>

6.14.1 There is an issue in relation to LATS (the landfill allowance trading scheme) because home composting does not contribute towards Boroughs' landfill diversion figures (because the amount of biodegradable municipal waste which is diverted away from landfill by home composting cannot be easily measured and there is currently no agreed method for doing so). This has resulted in authorities expanding organic collection services because the tonnage diverted by centralized composting can more easily be measured and therefore counted towards the targets. It is hoped that with the publication of WRAP's home composting model which will enable local authorities to determine how much material they are diverting away from landfill by home composting and also ideally allow them to count this towards their targets that the situation will change. The NLWA and the constituent boroughs will consider using the WRAP model immediately it is available.

6.14.2 In considering the objective to **Provide a concerted and on-going promotional campaign to encourage home composting including provision of subsidised bins. Aim = 25% of residents with gardens compost at home by 2014** the following comments and considerations were taken into account:

- The potential for expansion and impact of home composting could be difficult in boroughs with lots of flats.
- It was noted that this work is already in progress.
- There are potentially opportunities for the NLWA to buy home composters to bring economies of scale.

6.15 **Home and Community Composting** NLJWS Strategy Implementation
Action 14 - Actively support appropriate community composting through support for external bids, direct funding and payment of third party credits. - A joint action for NLWA and boroughs

Ideas	Objectives	Involve who?	Lead Responsibility	Comments
1) Need a method for measuring the number of households who are actually composting through community composting schemes and tonnes diverted	Measure the success of Action 14. Measure the cost effectiveness of compost bin sales and the campaign in general to promote home composting	Best done regionally, i.e. by involving WRAP, GLA, NLWA Note that through the NLWA Small Grants Fund, some common measurement methodologies have been used – these need to be reviewed by and rolled out to all	NLWA Waste Prevention Officer	
2) Support any lobbying activity for the deregulation of small community composting sites	Create a legal framework to make community composting easier, i.e. no need for a waste transfer license etc	Boroughs Defra GLA Environment Agency NLWA	Community Composting Network or other community group network to lead but NLWA to lead support	
3) Co-ordinate joint purchasing of capital equipment (e.g. wormeries and rockets) and installation etc	Bulk purchasing discount Best practice/implementation synergies and the possibility of joint promotions	Boroughs London CRN NLWA Suppliers	NLWA	A long term action
4) Education – schools programme, including trips to NLWA composting facilities	NLWA to co-ordinate borough education officer forum for sharing information and resources	Boroughs London CRN/community composters NLWA Schools	NLWA Policy & Development Manager	

6.15.1 In discussing the implementation actions in order support appropriate community compost projects through support for external bids, direct funding and payment of third party recycling credits the SIB considered that:

- The ability to actively support community composting is dependent upon having the community groups in place.
- Once it is published, reference should be made to a report being produced on the East London Community Recycling Partnership (ELCRP) in Hackney.
- That in order to achieve this objective it will be necessary to engage with the composting community.
- Volumes diverted away from landfill are likely to be relatively small.

Prioritising Actions

- 7.1 The preceding tables outline a series of activities to implement the NLJWS implementation actions on waste prevention. These form a work programme for the Waste Prevention Officer for the NLWA working alongside borough officers.
- 7.2 However, given the large number of activities identified in order to implement the NLJWS objectives, it has been necessary to prioritise. The prioritisation exercise was carried out by borough technical and NLWA officers taking account of the comments of the SIB. Note that only the joint activities were prioritised so objectives 1, 3, 4 and 9 which are the responsibility of the NLWA also need to be prioritised; these are listed in priority order at the end on the table

Prioritisation of Joint Borough/NLWA Waste Prevention Actions

Priority	Waste Prevention Action	Delivers on NLJWS Strategic Action No.
1	Review work carried out by other disposal authorities in order to assess whether it would be useful to carry out a piece of research to identify and assess all the re-use groups in North London to identify which might want to expand and what support they require in order to do so	10
2	NLWA to clarify how household waste is calculated going forward	8
2	Identify re-use gaps (what can be re-used but currently isn't) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gap analysis to support re-use schemes - As above but with charity shops 	10
2	Continue with the nappy subsidy taking account of, and actively being involved in, the development of proposals for a pan-London scheme	7
3	Co-ordinate joint purchasing of capital equipment (e.g. wormeries, rockets and installation etc) leading to bulk purchase discounts and best practice synergies and the possibility of joint promotions	14
3	Produce a monthly web/email based summary or matrix of activity in NLWA boroughs – with level of activity graded 1-5. (look into this being pan-London too) <i>(Provides a 'Notice board' for recycling officers across North London.)</i>	5

Priority	Waste Prevention Action	Delivers on NLJWS Strategic Action No.
3	Run a regional packaging education programme for householders delivered in conjunction with supermarkets <i>This could be shelf talkers – as in a recent Recycle Western Riverside supermarket campaign</i> <i>It is noted that Camden started something similar in Sept 06</i> Follow findings from the Western Riverside campaign	3
4	Work with re-use organisations that have sound business cases can develop best practice, support improvements in groups to raise standards and offer matrix for success to newcomers	10
4	Investigate the potential to introduce differential tonnage charges for different categories of waste (Levy biowaste to give a greater incentive for boroughs to reduce this).	7
4	Review experiences from elsewhere to assess potential impact of a reduction in collection frequency and the impact of offering smaller bins.	5
4	Establish a promotional scheme for trade waste customers – e.g. with posters saying they support waste prevention	2
5	Review zero waste following publication of Islington's strategy	3 & 4
5	Introduce more opportunities for home composting of cooked food waste (green cones and green Johannas)	13
5	Talk to WRAP about the potential for funding a regional packaging prevention campaign/research. <i>Although it was noted that this may potentially be more effective if its is London wide</i>	3
6	Need a method for measuring the number of households who are actually composting at home and the number of households who are actually composting through community composting schemes and tonnes diverted as a result	13 & 14
6	Education – run a schools programme including trips to NLWA composting facilities – NLWA to get waste education officers in North London together	14
6	NLWA to coordinate compost bin subsidies with more choice for residents including wormeries and digesters	13
6	Encourage creation of nappy laundry services	7
6	Pay re-use credits for furniture (and other items) collected by third parties	7
6	Share ideas on methodologies to quantify impact of waste prevention actions (e.g. WRAP's methodology to quantify the impact of home composting on collected waste tonnages)	5
6	Arrange quarterly NLWA/recycling/waste officer meetings to share good practice	5
6	Carry out a survey of business waste to see what the split is by sector of Borough's trade waste customers and then use this to decide where and how best to focus activity and whether it would be useful to establish a waste prevention club or whether waste prevention advice would be better delivered in a different way	2
6	Trade waste officers providing waste prevention advice	2

Prioritisation of NLWA Waste Prevention Actions

Priority	Waste Prevention Action	Delivers on NLJWS Strategic Action No.
1	Seek funding to run waste reduction campaigns across North London for 15 years	4
2	Support best practice	9
3	Lobby government to do more	1
4	Seek funding or regional support for a packaging waste prevention campaign with local businesses	3

Joint Borough/NLWA Waste Prevention Actions which have NOT been prioritised

Not Prioritised	Waste Prevention Action	Delivers on NLJWS Strategic Action No.
	Investigate opportunities for bidding for BREW funding for North London (BREW = Business Resource Efficiency & Waste programme)	2
	Work with National Industrial Symbiosis Programme (NISP) to bring partners together (NISP aim to match up companies so that a company with excess resources is one area is matched with a company who needs those resources) <i>- May be useful links with the Tidy Business standard and street stars.</i>	2
	Identify existing business groups based on the survey of trade waste customers and ask if it is possible to do a presentation on waste prevention at a future meeting	2
	Target building waste with assistance from CaféVan and investigate expanding this concept to other sectors	2
	Assess current trade recyclers in boroughs and assess private recycling companies that offer services in North London in order to promote them equally (could produce a directory of service providers for local businesses)	2
	Zero waste industrial park	2
	Evaluate current literature to assess the potential impact of charging for waste by weight/volume	7
	Incorporate re-use groups more proactively into the North London Recycling Forum, so providing a space/forum for groups. Ensure that a future meeting of the Forum has a focus on re-use	10
	Identify boroughs' needs from re-use schemes (working standards, sustainability, employment, location etc.) Demand for a service	10

Not Prioritised	Waste Prevention Action	Delivers on NLJWS Strategic Action No.
	Define 're-use' and agree a standard with Boroughs Other waste authorities may help define 're-use' – necessary for the payment of re-use credits	10
	Work with London Remade and others to strengthen re-use markets	10
	Identify sources of funding for re-use services	11
	Boroughs to tell NLWA if they want to bid	11
	Support Boroughs to make a business case	11
	Look for an opportunity to get match funding through the Enhance programme (this programme provides a business advisory service)	11
	Extend compost campaigns, newsletters, workshops etc (e.g. work in Camden) across the whole of North London (and further?) e.g. resource finders, master composters and compost newsletters Home composting promotions best implemented at a borough level, but boroughs can share best practice	13
	Support any lobbying activity for the deregulation of small community composting sites	13
	As above	14

Appendix 1

Appendix 1 Review of England's Waste Strategy - A consultation document. A summary of responses to the consultation August 2006 Dialogue by Design for Defra Zero Waste

There were 38 letters to the consultation recommending the adoption of a Zero Waste Charter: a nine-point plan to transform Britain's waste economy. (Note that some of the points refer to the UK although the strategy consultation was only for England).

1. Set a target of Zero Waste for all municipal waste in the UK by 2020 (50% recycling by 2010, 75% of 2015).
2. Extend the doorstep collection of dry recyclables to every home in the UK without delay.
3. Supplement home composting with doorstep collection of organic waste, and establish a network of local closed vessel compost plants.
4. Convert Civic Amenity sites into Re-use and Recycling Centres.
5. End thermal treatment of mixed waste and limit disposal contracts to a maximum of ten years.
6. Extend the Landfill Tax into a disposal tax, increase its level, and use it to fund the Zero Waste programmes.
7. Extend Producer Responsibility legislation to all products and materials that are hazardous or difficult to recycle.
8. Open up waste planning to greater public participation and end the commercial confidentiality of waste contracts.
9. Establish a Zero Waste Agency to promote resource efficiency and act as guardian of public health.

Appendix 2 – Rating of the NLJWS Waste Prevention Implementation Actions as Outlined by the Strategy Implementation Board, March 2006

Type & Proposal	Impact**	Ease**	Resultant priority**	Government to act?	GLA to act?	NLWA to act?	Boroughs* to act?	Voluntary sector to act?	Business to act?
Avoidance									
Lobby government to do more	2.7	2.4	2.6	14%	14%	100%	29%	29%	14%
Give active support for waste minimisation clubs for business	2.0	2.3	2.1	0%	0%	29%	100%	14%	0%
Seek funding or regional support for a packaging waste prevention campaign with local businesses	1.9	2.4	2.1	0%	14%	86%	29%	0%	0%
Reduction									
Seek funding to run waste reduction campaigns across North London for 15 years	2.4	2.4	2.4	0%	0%	100%	57%	0%	0%
Share good practice & consider the effects of waste reduction when introducing new services	2.6	2.9	2.7	0%	14%	43%	86%	0%	0%
Support a move to a tonnage based levy with appropriate transitional arrangements	2.6	1.9	2.3	0%	0%	29%	29%	0%	0%
Consider incentives and rebates	2.4	1.9	2.1	14%	0%	57%	86%	0%	0%
Review the need for direct & variable charging during the 15 year strategy period	2.4	1.6	2.0	43%	0%	14%	57%	0%	0%
Re-use									
Support best practice	2.1	2.6	2.4	0%	14%	86%	100%	0%	0%
Encourage community sector & other partnerships to deliver effective re-use services	1.7	2.3	2.0	0%	0%	71%	100%	14%	0%
Support bids for external funding of re-use services	1.7	2.3	2.0	0%	0%	71%	86%	14%	0%
Seek to reward re-use services directly, possibly through the introduction of a re-use credit	1.6	1.6	1.6	0%	0%	71%	71%	14%	0%

Provide a concerted & on-going promotional campaign to encourage home composting, including provision of subsidised bins. Aim = 25% of residents with gardens composting at home by 2014	2.7	2.7	2.7	0%	0%	43%	86%	14%	0%
Actively support appropriate community composting projects through support for external bids, direct funding and payment of third party recycling credits	2.0	1.9	1.9	0%	0%	71%	86%	14%	0%

*NB. Two references to Heads of Service have been subsumed here under 'Boroughs'

**Higher number indicates greater impact/ease score on a scale of 1 to 3 (low, medium, high).

Guidance given:

Prioritisation of actions for waste minimisation

- At borough level
- Over the time horizon of the strategy (to 2020)

Task

- Based on technical, resource and ownership considerations, grade the strategies relative to each other in terms of impact (high, medium, low) and ease (high, medium, low).
- State who is best placed to deliver.

**Appendix 3 - Review of England's Waste Strategy - A consultation document.
A summary of responses to the consultation August 2006 Dialogue by Design**
which provides some context for the Waste Prevention Implementation Plan

Executive Summary

The public consultation on the review of England's Waste Strategy ran from 14 February until 9 May 2006. In all 4017 responses were received through the online web pages, by post or by email from a diverse range of individuals and organisations. The range of views expressed was wide and varied and this report provides a brief summary of the responses to each question and provides a flavour of the main issues raised.

There was broad support from stakeholders for the main vision and general direction of the strategy, with main concerns centred around how we deliver the strategy, particularly given the current lack of infrastructure, and whether we have the right balance of options in line with the waste hierarchy. Overall England is felt to be making some progress and to have some of right drivers in place (e.g. LATS) but could be aiming to do more – at least as well as the best in UK and abroad.

Key points included:

- Wide agreement for more emphasis on **waste prevention** and minimisation activities, although the challenge this represents is recognised. Main suggestions are around the better use of regulation, incentives and penalties, and in particular better use of producer responsibility. There was strong support for taking a life-cycle approach during decision-making.
- More effort is needed on **education, information and awareness raising**, for the general public (as consumers) and businesses (e.g. design profession, SMEs) to encourage waste minimisation, reuse and recycling.
- There was strong support for **variable charging and/or making waste management costs more transparent** on council tax bills for household waste, although there were some that felt costs were not high enough yet to change people's behaviour. There were also strong concerns over the potential for increased flytipping, and hence calls for greater enforcement and better data capture if any such scheme was introduced.
- Recognition that **LATS** will be strong driver for local authorities to move waste management up the waste stream but strong support for higher **landfill tax** to drive sustainable waste management in other sectors. Many felt it was time to move away from using economic instruments targeted at the end of pipe and instead target resource efficiency through **taxation on materials/products**.
- Support for **more ambitious national targets**, provided there are clear delivery mechanisms in place and continued **local authority targets**, provided adequate resources are provided, but little consensus on how high they should be, how they should be designed and who they should fall on.
- **Energy from waste** and incineration remains controversial with many opponents (mainly through campaign letters), however many of those responding directly to the question see it as a viable option, provided options higher up the hierarchy are exhausted first. Many acknowledge that more evidence and information was needed.

- Most agree that **landfill** should be the last resort for non treatable waste in the long run (once alternative treatment and infrastructure are fully developed)
- The need to **simplify regulation** and change it where it could be more enabling and less obstructive of strategic objectives – especially around the **definition of waste**
- Ongoing support for WRAP. While most respondents favour development and encouragement of **domestic markets** for recyclates rather than relying on international ones, it was recognised that we live in a global economy and that there is a legitimate global market for some waste materials provided standards are met.
- Strong support for **more effort on commercial and industrial waste**, including support for C&I diversion target, but few suggestions on how this would be delivered. The landfill tax escalator and producer responsibility (e.g. packaging targets) seen as the main drivers.
- Strong support for the **sectoral approach**, including prevention targets, especially for packaging and food waste, targeted at the manufacture and retail sectors. Caveats are around availability of reliable data necessary for prioritisation and how targets would be implemented. Most respondents favour a **statutory approach** over purely voluntary agreements, or a combination of both, with voluntary agreements being backed by the threat of regulation.
- Strong support for **more integration** of municipal and other waste streams, but concerns over impacts on LATS. Widespread support for a **greater strategic role for LAs** in facilitating this, provided adequate funding and resources are made available.
- Support for **stronger regional co-ordination in procurement** of waste management services; and strong support for **partnership working** at regional and sub-regional level but disparate views on the effectiveness of Local Area Agreements (LAAs).
- Strong support for **Sustainable Waste Programme Board** provided it has the powers to get things done. Main caveats are around its membership, remit, funding and operation.