

**North London Waste Authority
Members' Recycling Working Group (MRWG)
13 February 2020
Crowndale Centre
Committee Room 4**

Present

Cllr C Bond (Cllr CB)
Cllr R Champion (Cllr RC)
Cllr P Zinkin (Cllr PZ)
Cllr J Burke (Cllr JB)
Cllr C Loakes (Cllr CL)

Apologies

Cllr A Harrison (Cllr AH)
Cllr S Chandwani (Cllr SC)
Cllr C Bond (Cllr CB)

Borough officers present

XXX - XXX
XXX - XXX
XXX - XXX

NLWA officers present

Martin Capstick (MCK) - Managing Director
Andrew O'Connor (AOC) - Head of Strategy & Services
Barbara Herridge (BH) - External Relations Manager
XXX - XXX
XXX - XXX

		Action
1.	Introductions/Apologies Cllr Harrison and Cllr Chandwani were not in attendance.	
2.	Notes of last meeting held on 21 January and matters arising MC advised the meeting that as it had only been three weeks since the last MRWG meeting all the key actions from that meeting were still outstanding: X advised that there is a need for a yearly Work Plan to provide officers continuity. Timescales are also extremely important. So rather than use the MRWG meetings just for "blue sky thinking" alone X considered it useful to have a work plan too. MC invited Members to contact him direct if they had urgent issues that were outside the work plan which they would like added to the next agenda.	
3.	Reducing Residual Waste Plan (2020-2022) – detail of the proposed activities 1 April 2020 – 30 September 2020 for consideration Members had received a briefing note circulated prior to the meeting regarding the draft two-year plan for reducing residual waste. This briefing note included a schedule that set out the proposed activities planned for the first six months and the meeting was advised that the objective was to gain a collective view on activity. XX advised that a stakeholder group of senior officers would be developed to obtain value for money for the Boroughs. A discussion on the 6-month proposals ensued. School waste prevention programmes.	

The proposal of splitting school visits by either waste prevention officers or specialised educators followed – i.e. primary/secondary schools. X asked whether there was a possibility of piggy backing on other existing schemes that had proven effect and to use these to expand the current programme without any additional costs. He also thought it would be helpful if the schedule reflected the amount of money associated with each of the proposed programmes. MC advised that cost should definitely taken into consideration.

X questioned whether officers had factored in the cost of taking this approach e.g. working with Eco Schools to avoid replicating what is already being done. Have officers sat down and measured Eco Schools, Woodland Trust, UN Programme –It is important to extract more value and then create something bespoke, identifying common themes within schools to drive down waste. X suggested it may be possible to develop a methodology beforehand, e.g. comparing the patterns of waste generation by school type – Victorian buildings against modern buildings – to help tease out commonalities in order to create a library of documents – the NLWA way. it was also suggested that the new approach could be trialled in a few schools first with different characteristics before the project is rolled out to all north London schools.

ACTION – find the range of proven activities that are already delivered. **XX**
ACTION – officers come back within two months with some answers. **MC**

Food Waste prevention outreach work.

X raised the issue using NLWA branded cooking demonstration videos (YouTube) X said this would be an idea to get additional value-for-money out of the videos that are already in existence. XX advised that the footage for Save Your Spuds is still being used in workshops. MC advised that the idea is to create a buzz around food waste and X said it would be good to direct the schools to our own YouTube channel.

ACTION. – Come back to the next meeting with an update on videos. **XX**

Recycling Outreach.

Members noted that whilst this is good work, X stated that the level of impact was venue dependent e.g. a venue that was used for a food outreach event in Enfield should in his opinion not be used on a Saturday again because not many people go to the venue on Saturdays.

ACTION. It was suggested that the Authority Waste Prevention team liaise with Members when selecting suitable venues in each borough and also involve Members in the promotion of events so that Borough Comms officers can embed the promotion of the events in their tweets to get maximum exposure and reach a bigger audience. **XX**

London Upcycling Show

It was noted that last year's event clashed with a LB Hackney sustainability event and north London sustainability month. These occasions should complement rather than clash with each other. Agreed the event is a good opportunity to capture messaging and imagery on the circle economy.

ACTION. Officers to come back with a series of proposals/suggestions. **XX**

Textiles.

X stated that there is a need to formalise calendars with a series of events sooner i.e. When is the next event in the year?

ACTION. Formalise activities in people's diaries. LB Hackney happy to help. **XX**

Community Fund.

Agreed to continue with this as it provides different elements to the programme.

Guidance documents/cascade training

XX noted that in relation to events, officers have had community groups asking for help to deliver similar events to NLWA's Give & Take days and Repair cafes themselves. We will develop guidelines for Community groups.

Real Nappies.

XX said that although traditionally we process 800 requests for subsidies a year; in 2019-20 we have already received 1,200 claims. One option would be to put a limit on the number of claims per year. X suggested a small review of real nappies best practice. LB Islington looking at recommending people swap for the first nappy change of the day. X requested a small review of what boroughs are doing and the uptake of real nappies between Boroughs. LB Hackney is keen to pursue this.

ACTION

Work to be done to see what all the Boroughs are doing and investigate the possibility of increasing the level of subsidy if people use the voucher to buy second-hand nappies. Encourage a circular event? Agreed officers should co-ordinate and bring back the outcome of the review to a future meeting. MC stated that if claims increase in the coming year we will be able to increase the budget allocated for the activity to cover the payments required.

ACTION XX

Policy responses.

More policy rather than a delivery.

ACTION

X requested that there is a standing item on the MRWG agenda showing a matrix of targets month by month and progress against the same. Colour coding month by month with a column on the overall budget for each workstream. **XX, XX and BH**

Myth busting – recycling videos

MC asked Members for their views. Agreed these were a priority.

ACTION

Bring back 2nd April meeting - **XX**

4.	<p>Environment Bill 2020 and associated consultations later in 2020 – recap on consultations and potential impact of extended producer responsibility, deposit return scheme and consistent collections on north London performance.</p> <p>Members had received a briefing note summarising that last year the Government issued 3 consultations containing proposals which would significantly affect waste management services and with the aim of leading to an increase in recycling. The consultations were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introducing a Deposit Return Scheme in England, Wales and Northern Ireland • Reforming the UK packaging producer responsibility system, and • Consistency in household and business recycling collections in England <p>BH noted that Government has reported back summarising the feedback from consultees – namely, significant levels of public support for a DRS and consistent collections, and with a wider range of views on EPR.</p> <p>Now draft Environment Bill – contains enabling powers for all of the above – expected to come out for consultation in the autumn. Opportunity to do some preparatory work between now and then.</p> <p>Deposit return scheme – XX modelled in 2018/19 to give NLWA £X /annum in savings and a +2.5% increase in recycling rate. Agreed to re-model with new MRF contract. Trial of reverse vending machines in Hackney – agreed LB Hackney should bring that back to MRWG and to feed this into NLWA’s consultation response.</p> <p>Discussion on this ensued. XX advised that the modelling assumption is an 80% return rate but that the costs and benefits vary by material. There is value in upcycling too. X advised that LB Hackney has these figures. XX said that the data is meaningful and as we might only get one shot to improve on any gaps.</p> <p>ACTION</p> <p>X stated that our data needs to be watertight. We need an annual process to capture data at the same time every year MC asked AOC if we could update this in time for the June meeting, alternatively in September. XX and AOC</p> <p>EPR – Agreed need for officers to keep abreast of developments – to make north London as attractive as possible for producers to partner with – when WEEE introduced NLWA was well placed, got an agreement in place between NLWA and the boroughs, we’d agreed what we would ask for, had budgeted contingency in case we had to continue to pay for a service rather than producers paying and we were quick off the blocks with implementation. BH advised that EPR implementation will be more complex as there are currently two established systems for recycling packaging; local authority collections and obligated producers take-back</p> <p>Consistent collections – less impact on NLWA – already collect all the materials required in north London more modelling required?</p>	
----	---	--

	<p>X spoke about calorific content of waste and the need to consider carbon – costs – carbon food points and producer responsibility in an environment where you have government carbon taxes.</p>	
5.	<p>Low Plastic Zones - verbal update on progress</p> <p>XX advised that four out of five north London boroughs had achieved a ‘Low Plastic Zone’ status. Barnet confirmed that they have an officer in post who will be working on the project and once the area has been identified, Authority Officers will focus working in Barnet. XX said that in Haringey 46% of businesses have achieved a ‘Low Plastic Shop’ status. The area needs 50% of businesses to achieve this target in order to be classified as a low plastic zone.</p> <p>X said that 26 Hackney businesses were signed up and Hackney officers are working with Ridley Road market to help them eliminate plastic bags. XX advised that LB Hackney is also doing some analysis.</p> <p>The media launch of the Islington Low Plastic Zone took place in Islington on 5 February and generated a lot of media interest. Authority officers shared a communications pack for other boroughs to facilitate their own launch events. All material produced for the launch in Islington is available for other boroughs to use.</p>	
6.	<p>London Waste and Recycling Board (LWARB) recycling in flats research – summary of findings - verbal report.</p> <p>BH reported on some research supported by LWARB. The work looked at how best to increase recycling in flats. An inventory of 132 flats was undertaken prior to the start of the work and a standard package of interventions was introduced supplemented by bespoke activity.</p> <p>XX said that there is a negative income in some cases and there was a discussion on penalties.</p> <p>X said that counter intuitively some of the changes required are structural changes. On one Hackney estate they have reached 25% recycling – all gave congratulations. The interventions included closure of chutes. X advised that LB Hackney had made capital/structural investment on estates.</p> <p>MC stated that flats recycling could be an agenda item at DoE meetings, suggesting areas of common interest and become part of the Borough Reduction and Reuse plans.</p> <p>ACTION</p> <p>MC advised that it was good to get an idea of the direction of travel for NLWA as a disposal authority. Draft a report on progress and share the information in order to keep up the pressure on borough progress.</p> <p>X suggested concentrating on single actions. Look at communal collections – experiments that others may have carried out. X stated that experimentation is important and to eliminate what doesn’t work.</p> <p>ACTION</p> <p>Agreed to keep flats recycling as a standing item on the agenda and MC agreed to discuss putting recycling in flats into the Work Plan. MC</p>	

	suggested that we all speak to opposite numbers in the Boroughs and bring back to either the June or September meeting what initiatives others are doing. ACTION AII	
7.	A.O.B. There was no other business	
8.	Date of next meeting – Before the Authority Meeting on 2 April 2020, 12:30 at the Crowndale Centre, Committee Room 4.	