

PAPER NO. WRWA 22-13**WESTERN RIVERSIDE WASTE AUTHORITY**

MEETING	23 rd June 2022														
REPORT AUTHOR/DATE	General Manager (<i>Mark Broxup - Tel. 020 8871 2788</i>), 15 th June 2022														
SUBJECT	Proposed responses or progress regarding various Government, consultations.														
CONTENTS	<table><tr><td>Page 1</td><td>Executive Summary</td></tr><tr><td>Page 1</td><td>Recommendations</td></tr><tr><td>Pages 2– 12</td><td>Additional Information</td></tr><tr><td>Pages 13 - 23</td><td>Appendix A - Response to the consultation on the reform of waste carrier, broker, dealer registration in England</td></tr><tr><td>Pages 24– 40</td><td>Appendix B - Response to the consultation on the introduction of mandatory digital waste tracking</td></tr><tr><td>Pages 41 - 42</td><td>Appendix C - Response to the consultation on Environmental Targets</td></tr><tr><td>Pages 43 - 46</td><td>Appendix D - Response to the consultation on DIY waste charges and Booking Systems at household waste recycling centres</td></tr></table>	Page 1	Executive Summary	Page 1	Recommendations	Pages 2– 12	Additional Information	Pages 13 - 23	Appendix A - Response to the consultation on the reform of waste carrier, broker, dealer registration in England	Pages 24– 40	Appendix B - Response to the consultation on the introduction of mandatory digital waste tracking	Pages 41 - 42	Appendix C - Response to the consultation on Environmental Targets	Pages 43 - 46	Appendix D - Response to the consultation on DIY waste charges and Booking Systems at household waste recycling centres
Page 1	Executive Summary														
Page 1	Recommendations														
Pages 2– 12	Additional Information														
Pages 13 - 23	Appendix A - Response to the consultation on the reform of waste carrier, broker, dealer registration in England														
Pages 24– 40	Appendix B - Response to the consultation on the introduction of mandatory digital waste tracking														
Pages 41 - 42	Appendix C - Response to the consultation on Environmental Targets														
Pages 43 - 46	Appendix D - Response to the consultation on DIY waste charges and Booking Systems at household waste recycling centres														

STATUS	Open circulation – not restricted.
BACKGROUND PAPERS	Authority Waste Policy adopted July 2013, Paper No. WRWA 732.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

1. The purpose of this report is to inform Members of responses by the Authority to the various consultations set out below. Due to their timing some responses have already been submitted, but with riders saying that they are subject to approval at this meeting of the Authority.
 - The reform of waste carrier, broker, dealer registration in England;
 - The introduction of mandatory digital waste tracking;
 - Environmental Targets;
 - Developing the UK Emissions Trading Scheme; and
 - Booking systems and DIY waste charges at household waste recycling centres
2. Each of these consultations is described in more detail from paragraph 4 onwards.

RECOMMENDATIONS

3. The Authority is recommended to:
 - a. endorse the response submitted to the consultation on reform of waste carrier, broker, dealer registration in England (attached as Appendix A);
 - b. endorse the response to the consultation on the introduction of mandatory digital waste tracking (attached as Appendix B);
 - c. approve the response to the consultation on Environmental Targets (attached as Appendix C);
 - d. approve the response to the consultation on DIY waste charges and Booking Systems at household waste recycling centres (attached as Appendix D); and
 - e. otherwise receive this report as information.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Department for Environment Food & Rural Affairs consultation on the reform of waste carrier, broker, dealer registration in England

4. This is a technical consultation, which ran from 21st January 2022 to 15th April 2022, and the response attached at Appendix A was submitted on 14th April 2022, subject to endorsement at this meeting of the Authority. Details of the consultation can be found at:

<https://consult.defra.gov.uk/eq-resources-and-waste/consultation-on-cbd-reform/>

5. The Government's proposal would update key regulations for people and businesses involved in transporting and managing waste. It will modernise the approach and create a predominantly online system, making it easier to use and providing stronger powers to fight waste crime.
6. This consultation sought views on:
 - the move from a registration to a permit-based system and the types of permits available;
 - what activities should be covered by permits, what should be covered by registered exemptions and what activities should not require either a permit or registered exemption; and
 - the introduction of a technical competence element required for permits; the level required and how it can be demonstrated through the workforce.
7. The Government expects that the new regime, which they plan to introduce in 2023/24, will make it much easier and less time consuming for legitimate waste companies to comply with reporting requirements and much harder for rogue operators to compete in the industry and commit waste crime, including fly tipping, deliberate misclassification of waste, illegal waste exports and the operation of illegal waste sites.
8. The cost of waste crime to the English economy in the 2018/19 financial year has been estimated at £924 million, including the costs to local government of clearing abandoned waste sites and fly-tipping.

9. The Government is proposing to bring the regime under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 (“EPRs”). This has several benefits, including:
 - the EPRs have different tiers that provide risk based and proportionate regulation. Using these tiers for carrier, broker and dealer regulation would give the flexibility to apply the right level of regulation to different types of activity; and
 - the EPRs provide for a wider range of regulatory tools including conditions that can be placed on permits and more options for enforcement.
10. This consultation and themes within it are closely linked to the introduction of the mandatory digital waste tracking service, which was also consulted on and is described from paragraph 12 below.
11. The Authority’s response, attached at Appendix A, is generally supportive of the Government’s proposals but it does disagree that waste collection authorities, operating on a commercial basis, should be required to apply for the relevant standard rules permit. This is because there is a statutory duty for waste collection authorities to arrange for a commercial service if requested, as set out in Section 45 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

DEFRA consultation on the introduction of mandatory digital waste tracking

12. This is a technical consultation which ran from 21st January 2022 to 15th April 2022 and the response, attached at Appendix B, was submitted on 14th April 2022 subject to endorsement at this meeting of the Authority. Details of the consultation can be found at:

<https://consult.defra.gov.uk/environmental-quality/waste-tracking/>

13. Over 200 million tonnes of waste is produced in the UK each year, but there is currently no single or comprehensive way of tracking it. Large amounts of data are either not collected, or are not collated centrally. Multiple IT systems collect certain elements of waste tracking data. Some are paper-based, others digital, some are run by private contractors, others by the Government, and where use of existing central digital systems is non-mandatory, take up is very low. As a result, it

is very difficult to determine what happens to the UK's waste and to have a comprehensive understanding of whether it has been recycled, recovered, or disposed of.

14. The Government's proposal is to introduce a mandatory digital recording system for all waste movements, replacing these fragmented systems and making it much easier and less time consuming for legitimate waste companies to comply with reporting requirements, whilst making it much harder for rogue operators to compete in the industry and commit waste crime, including fly tipping, deliberate misclassification of waste, illegal waste exports and the operation of illegal waste sites.
15. The Environment Act 2021 allows for regulations to be introduced that require certain information relevant to waste tracking to be recorded onto the system and it contains provisions on several areas, including:
 - accessing the data on the waste tracking system
 - fees and charges
 - exemptions and alternative requirements for digitally excluded persons
 - offences and sanctions.
16. The Government believes its proposals will affect various sectors as follows:

a) Businesses

Businesses disposing of waste from their premises will have a digital record created on the waste tracking service, instead of paper-based records. Their waste carrier will be able to enter this record for them but, as now, they will need to check the details are correct. It will then be easier for them to see exactly what happens to their waste once it has been collected, making their duty of care responsibilities more straightforward. Where they have the same type of waste, regularly collected by the same carrier, the service will be designed in a way to save them even more time.

b) Householders

There will be no change to council bin collections. When residents get other waste collected, in a skip for example, either put there by themselves or by tradespeople working for them, the person or business collecting the waste will need to create a digital record. They will give the resident a unique identifier which allows them to

see what happens to their waste, giving them the reassurance that their waste has been disposed of properly, helping to reduce the risk of fly-tipping.

c) Local authorities

Waste collection authorities will not need to track waste from individual household collections. Waste will need to be recorded in the service when it arrives at a receiving site and then further tracked in the service as required from there.

However, if the council provides paid for waste collections for commercial businesses or industrial premises, then those waste movements from the producers' premises will need to be recorded.

Much of the information local authorities previously had to gather and report through WasteDataFlow will now be on the waste tracking service, so there will no longer be a need to report this separately.

Planning authorities should also have much more timely information as to what is happening to all the waste in their area, although the Authority's response highlights that, as currently drafted, waste planning authorities would only be able to see details of the local authority collected waste which is insufficient information for this purpose.

d) Waste site operators

Waste site operators accepting waste, such as Cory on the Authority's sites, will need to record details of the waste they receive on site and then what they do with it, digitally on the waste tracking service.

Through the digital service the Government intends to provide them with user-friendly and customisable summaries and reports about the waste they're handling, helping them comply with any waste permits, licences, or registrations they hold.

Given that much information is already collected electronically at their weighbridges, this ought not to be too much of an extension of the current arrangements.

e) Waste importers and exporters

Waste importers or exporters will need to record details of waste they intend to import or export under Green List Waste controls onto the waste tracking service.

They will also need to continue to use the existing International Waste Shipments online system to record any notifiable exports.

Those involved in transporting the waste for export within the UK will be adding their information to the waste tracking service, so will have a timely understanding of where any waste the exporter is managing is at any point in the movement, allowing them to comply with their duty of care responsibilities.

f) Environmental regulatory officers

Environmental regulatory officers will have access to comprehensive and timely information about all waste movements and activities within their area. This should help them to detect waste that 'disappears', or does not reach the next stage of the chain (which could indicate that it's been illegally dumped), and to provide evidence as to who may be responsible for it, such as:

- waste being stockpiled at sites
- waste descriptions that change unexpectedly (possible landfill tax avoidance)
- unusual patterns of waste transfers (indicating potential fraud schemes).

17. This consultation and themes within it are closely linked to the reform of waste carrier, broker and dealer registration in England which was also consulted on and is described in paragraphs 4 to 11 above.
18. The Authority's response, attached at Appendix B, is generally supportive of DEFRA's proposals, with the only real concern being the point about waste planning authorities (see paragraph 16c above) and the need/practicality of the system operating in 'real time', especially within the timeframe of the proposed 'go live' date of 2023/24.

DEFRA consultation on Environmental Targets

19. This is a technical consultation which runs from 16th March to 27th June 2022 and the response attached at Appendix D will be submitted subject to endorsement at this meeting of the Authority. Details of the consultation can be found at:

<https://consult.defra.gov.uk/natural-environment-policy/consultation-on-environmental-targets/>

20. The Environment Act 2021 requires the Government to always have an Environmental Improvement Plan in place setting out steps to improve the natural environment. The Act requires at least one target to be set in each of the Government's four priority areas: air; water; biodiversity; and resource efficiency and waste reduction.
21. The Government's proposal is to introduce a target for resource efficiency and waste reduction. This consultation seeks views on:
 - A proposed target to reduce residual waste (excluding major mineral wastes) by 50% by 2042 measured as kg per capita.
 - The possible future introduction of a target for resource productivity.
22. The consultation focusses on the proposed target to reduce the amount of residual waste produced in England, in line with the waste hierarchy. Residual waste is defined as material that is not reused or recycled including material that is too degraded or contaminated for these purposes.
23. Since 2000/01 there has been significant progress made in the amount of waste recycled. The amount of Local Authority Collected Waste (LACW) sent to landfill decreased from 79% in 2000/01 to 8% in 2020/21. However, the amount of residual waste sent for incineration with energy recovery increased from 9 to 48% within the same time period.
24. The proposed target is based on the amount of residual waste sent for treatment and disposal in 2019 in England, which amounted to 32 million tonnes, equivalent to 560kg per capita. The 50% reduction target aims to reduce residual waste to 280kg per capita.
25. The target will be measured at the end point treatment and these include:
 - Waste sent to landfill
 - Waste sent to incineration with or without energy recovery
 - Waste sent overseas for energy recovery
 - Waste used in energy recovery for transport fuel.
26. The target metric, 'kg per capita' takes into account population growth over time. The metric does not allow recycling of Incinerator Bottom Ash (IBA) metals to be

excluded as these are deemed to have been produced as a result of residual waste treatment, which is included in the target scope.

27. The Government believes the proposed target will reduce the environmental impacts of residual waste either by reducing arisings or increasing the amount of material being recycled.
28. The consultation states that the proposed target will be measured at the end point treatment, i.e. where waste is disposed e.g. landfill, incineration and not by collection route. Hence, it is not yet clear by how much this Authority will need to reduce its' residual waste beyond current performance and what its' apportionment will be in meeting the overall reduction target.
29. Information from Waste Data Flow shows that the Authority's residual municipal waste amounted to 384kg per capita in 2019. Although this is already less than Defra's baseline of 560kg per capita, the proposed target equates to 280kg per capita by 2042.
30. The proposed target encompasses all residual waste collectively i.e. that managed by this Authority and all other non-municipal residual waste such as commercial and industrial waste. These residual wastes will also need to be reduced to meet the 50% reduction target.
31. The Government's aims to have draft legislation laid before Parliament by 31st October 2022.
32. The Authority's proposed response is generally supportive of the Government's proposals as the target aligns with the waste hierarchy and other policy commitments set out in the Resources and Waste Strategy.
33. The consultation also asks which policy interventions 'described' will be most effective to meet a resource productivity target. Unfortunately, officers do not believe that the consultation documents provide sufficient information to provide an informed answer to this question and the Authority's proposed response makes that point.

DEFRA consultation on preventing charges for DIY waste at household waste recycling centres and call for evidence on booking systems at household waste recycling centres

34. On 11th April 2022 Defra published a consultation on Do-It-Yourself (“DIY”) waste charges and Booking Systems at Household Waste and Recycling Centres (“HWRCs”), details of the consultation can be found:

<https://consult.defra.gov.uk/waste-and-recycling/consultation-on-diy-waste-and-call-for-evidence/>

Background – DIY Waste Charging

35. This consultation follows on from the Government’s 2018 “[Resources and Waste Strategy](#)” in which it committed to ensuring that charging regimes are clear, and to ensuring that householders are not charged for depositing small-scale construction waste, i.e. DIY waste at Household Waste and Recycling Centres. Responses are due by 4th July 2022.
36. The Environmental Protection Act 1990 requires all Waste Disposal Authorities (“WDAs”), including this Authority, to provide HWRCs where residents can deposit their household waste free of charge. The Controlled Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2012 (the “**Regulations**”) define what is household, commercial and industrial waste, based generally on its source and “waste from construction or demolition works, including preparatory works” is defined as being industrial waste and not household waste.
37. The Government believes the definition in the Regulations should only be interpreted to mean waste from the professional construction of buildings and their demolition, not DIY works a householder might undertake to maintain and enhance their property, but many WDAs do not share the Government’s narrow interpretation of the definition and they charge residents to dispose of DIY waste at their HWRCs. The Government is therefore consulting on the technical detail of its proposal to amend legislation so that residents cannot be charged for disposing of DIY waste at their local HWRCs. Ministers at the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, have also deemed that the New Burdens Doctrine will not apply in this instance and that WDAs who currently charge householders to dispose of DIY waste will be required to absorb any associated costs.

Government Proposal – DIY Waste Charging

38. To clarify in legislation when construction waste should be treated as DIY waste and therefore be classified as household waste, the Government has set out a non-exhaustive list of the types of waste materials that might be included in DIY waste:

Waste types in scope	Products in scope
Plastic or fibreglass	Shower trays
	Bath – plastic
	Shower screen
	Guttering
	Drainage and sewer pipes
Other	Insulation material
	Roofing felt
	Carpet & linoleum
Rubble	
Bricks	
Hardcore	
Concrete	Breeze blocks
	Paving slabs
	Lintels
	Mortar and rendering
	Cement board
	Mixed or powder
Glass	Plate/sheet glass
	Shower screen
	Tiles
	Furniture shelving, table tops
Gravel	Construction or landscaping

	gravel or pebbles
Pottery, ceramic and porcelain	Bath
	Bidet
	Shower tray
	Sink or wash hand basin with pedestal
	Tiles (floor, wall)
	Toilet with cistern
	Drainage and sewer pipes
Sand	Sharp
	Play pit
	Sandbags (used flood defence by householders)
Slate	Roof/slate
Soil	Soil and clay
Stone	Flagstones
Tarmac	
Turf	
Tile	Floor/wall/roof
Plaster and gypsum-based items	

39. The Government considers DIY activities to include any construction work, such as building, decorating, or repairing activities carried out by householders themselves in their own homes. This would not include, for example, a whole house renovation, or any work done by a tradesperson, but it might include the householder tiling a kitchen, plumbing in a sink, plastering a room, building and installing shelving, or building a raised bed for a garden.

40. The Government then proposes that construction waste should be considered DIY Waste and classified as household waste in the 2012 Regulations when the construction waste meets the following criteria:

- It is produced by householders whilst carrying out construction works themselves at their home. Construction is defined in the 2012 Regulations as including improvement, repair or alteration.

- It is not produced as a result of commercial activities, or by a commercial contractor charging for work in a domestic premises.
- It is of a volume which is no greater than 300 litres (based on the approximate boot size of a family car).
- It is not produced on a regular basis requiring HWRC visits more frequently than once a week.

Current Authority Policy - DIY Waste Charging

41. The Authority's current policy is not to charge for DIY waste delivered in cars, i.e. small-scale works, and it has procedures to identify cars that make an excessive number of visits. Car visits account for around 95% of the HWRC tonnage currently received.
42. As well as vans themselves, the following vehicles are classified as vans for HWRC access purposes by the Authority:
 - any vehicle over two metres high (enforced by a height barrier at the HWRC entrance);
 - any vehicle towing a trailer;
 - any vehicle that has had seats removed in order to carry goods; and
 - light commercial vehicles (such as Toyota Hilux or Mercedes Vito)
43. The Authority does not accept DIY waste when it is delivered in a van (i.e. it is then deemed to be of a larger scale akin to that of professional works) and the resident is directed to use alternative commercial waste services, including Cory's onsite services. Consequently, many of the waste types on the Government's list (see paragraph 38 above) are currently not classified as household waste by the Authority if delivered in a van. The rule of thumb the Authority currently uses is that items which most people might reasonably take with them when moving house, or garden prunings, are household waste.

Authority Response – DIY Waste Charging

44. The Government's proposals are not fundamentally different from the Authority's existing policy and are supported overall. The only difference occurs in relation to vans, where the Government proposal is to restrict the amount delivered by volume, whereas the Authority currently restricts the amount by type. The

Authority's proposed response, attached at Appendix D, supports the Government's proposal but suggests that, as well as a volume limit, the Government should also stipulate a weight limit of 100kg, as this would assist those HWRCs that utilise weighbridges, particularly for vans.

45. The 100kg limit is based on the Environment Agency's published density factor for the European Waste Catalogue code for mixed construction waste (17 09 04) of 0.32 and the Government's 300 litre limit.

Background – Booking Systems

46. When the HWRC re-opened in May 2020, following the first Covid lockdown, the Authority operated a voluntary system of access on alternate days by "odds" and "evens" registration number to help spread demand and reduce queues. The public responded positively to the system and there was around 75% compliance each day, which helped the Authority to be one of the quickest in re-opening its services fully.
47. Some waste disposal authorities and unitary councils hastily introduced basic booking systems to control usage when reopening their HWRC's. Several were successful, whilst others found the booking system an administrative burden in terms of staff resources.
48. Section 51 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 requires WDAs to provide HWRCs which are "*available for the deposit of waste at all reasonable times*" and the Authority did identify that a well-designed and convenient booking system, which included the ability to make same day bookings, could offer significant advantages, including:
 - reducing queues (with the associated environmental benefits)
 - increased throughput by spreading visits evenly across the day;
 - improved enforcement of vehicles delivering non-household waste;
 - preventing use by non-residents (surveys estimated between 6 and 9%)
49. One key aspect identified by the Authority was the ability to make same day bookings, which was made possible by integrating the booking system with an Automatic Number Plate Recognition ("**ANPR**") system and, at the Authority meeting on 29th September 2020 (Paper No. WRWA 20-20), it was agreed to introduce a six-month Booking System trial at the HWRC. The trial commenced on 22nd March 2021.

50. The Smugglers Way HWRC is open seven days a week for at least seven hours a day and is one of the busiest in the UK, serving over half a million households. It sits within a busy, predominately residential, area with more residential developments currently being constructed, including one directly opposite. The HWRC can accommodate up to 84 vehicles onsite but, before the Booking System was introduced, queues could tail back over a quarter of a mile on the public highway at peak hours, causing frustration for the users of the site and neighbouring residents and businesses.
51. The two main objectives of the trial were met;
- firstly, queuing on the public highway has been eliminated and site neighbours have commented that *“it’s been an overwhelming success, with far less noise from cars on the road, less pollution, fewer queues blocking our entry/exit to the car park and much more perceived control. Thank you so much for trialling it and engaging with us.”*
 - secondly, non-residents are prevented from using the facility which has freed up more space and saved money for Authority residents and council tax payers.
52. Feedback from residents has been overwhelmingly positive, with 98% finding the booking system easy to use and only 12% wanting to return to the old system. Only 17 complaints were received during the trial which is a very small number, given that the total number of households able to access the site is around 518,000 and 155,000 bookings had been made at the time of the feedback.
53. The effectiveness of the Booking System at Smugglers Way also means that there is no need to restrict the number of visits a resident may make to the HWRC, although there are checks and procedures in place to identify and stop abuse. It also allows the Authority to communicate directly with consenting residents to highlight changes at the Centre, promote new initiatives and carry out satisfaction surveys.
54. The Booking System is designed to maximise throughput and it allows for 90 vehicles to arrive every half hour of the day, which equates to a vehicle arriving every 20 seconds. Recycling performance at the HWRC has increased by around 2% percentage points since the introduction of the booking system and quality has improved as residents feel less rushed whilst on site at peak times.

55. The Constituent Councils have not reported any increases in fly tipping as a direct consequence of the introduction of the Booking System and this would be consistent with a [June 2021 study](#) by WRAP on the relationship between fly-tipping rates and HWRC charging, which found no evidence of an association between fly-tipping and charging at HWRCs.
56. The trial ended on 29th September 2021 when the Authority approved the continuation of the Booking System on a permanent basis (Paper No. WRWA 21-20).

Government Call for Evidence – Booking Systems

57. The Government is concerned that in some cases (*my emphasis*) booking systems are discouraging HWRC use, with a risk of both increased residual waste and fly-tipping as a result. This is because other HWRC booking systems have a limited supply of appointments or seek to place additional burdens on residents using the sites.
58. The Government is seeking to understand the different approaches WDAs are taking on this issue and what rationale they have for maintaining the use of booking systems, and any evidence they have on the impact on recycling levels. The Government also wishes to know what other restrictions, if any, WDAs might impose on residents bringing waste to HWRCs, e.g. limits on size, or on vehicles type.

Authority Response – Booking Systems

59. The Authority's proposed response, attached at Appendix D, highlights the points made in paragraphs 41 to 43 and 46 to 56 above.

Western Riverside Administration Office
Smugglers Way
Wandsworth
SW18 1JS

Mark Broxup
General Manager

15th June 2022

RESPONSE BY THE WESTERN RIVERSIDE WASTE AUTHORITY
CONSULTATION ON THE REFORM OF WASTE CARRIER, BROKER, DEALER
REGISTRATION IN ENGLAND - 21 JANUARY 2022

Our Proposals

Q1 We think that assigning legal responsibilities for managing and transporting waste to ‘controllers’ and ‘transporters’ rather than ‘carriers, brokers and dealers’ better reflects the way the waste and resources industry works. Do you agree or disagree?

- a) **Agree**
- b) Disagree
- c) Don’t know/No opinion

Q2 We think that assigning legal responsibilities in this way will enable us to regulate the management and transport of waste more effectively. Do you agree or disagree?

- a) **Agree**
- b) Disagree
- c) Don’t know/No opinion

Q3 We believe assigning responsibilities in this way will help ensure that all waste handlers are held accountable for any mismanagement that occurs. Do you agree or disagree?

- a) **Agree**
- b) Disagree
- c) Don’t know/No opinion

Permit types: Transporter and Controller permits

Q4 Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to bring the current CBD regime under the environmental permitting regulations?

- a) **Agree**
- b) Disagree
- c) Don’t know/No opinion

Q5 Do you agree or disagree with our proposal to introduce three types of permit – controller only, transporter only and combined controller/transporter?

- a) **Agree**
- b) Disagree
- c) Don’t know/No opinion

Q6 Do you agree or disagree that standard rules permit types should be differentiated according to the activities to be carried out under the permit i.e. controller/transporter/both?

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree
- c) Don't know/No opinion

Q7 If you disagree with our proposal, how do you think the standard rules permits should be differentiated?

- a) by size/number of vehicles
- b) number of staff
- c) by type of waste
- d) they should not be differentiated – there should be a single type of permit
- e) don't know/no opinion
- f) other – please explain

Advertising

Q8 Do you agree or disagree that it should be a permit condition to show a permit number on advertising?

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree
- c) Don't know/No opinion

Agree, assuming the registration detail will be publicly available, this will assist customers in checking that the permit holder is legitimate when booking a service.

Q9 Do you agree or disagree that it should be a permit condition to clearly display permit numbers on any vehicle used for the collection and transport of waste?

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree
- c) Don't know/No opinion

Q10 Do you agree or disagree that these measures would help improve Duty of Care compliance?

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree
- c) Don't know/No opinion

Please briefly explain why you agree or disagree.

Renewal/reviews

Q11 Do you agree or disagree that a renewal element should be built into the transporter/controller permitting system?

- a) **Agree**
- b) Disagree
- c) Don't know/No opinion

Q12 Do you agree or disagree that with our proposal to implement permit renewal through self-declaration process?

- a) **Agree**
- b) Disagree
- c) Don't know/No opinion

Q13 If we introduce permit renewal, how frequently do you think permits should be renewed?

- a) annually
- b) **every 2 years**
- c) every 3 years
- d) every 5 years
- e) Some other frequency (please specify)
- f) Don't know/no **opinion**

Charging

Q14 Do you agree or disagree that subsistence charges should align with charges under the Environmental Permitting Regulations to fund the same range of regulatory activity?

- a) **Agree**
- b) Disagree
- c) Don't know/No opinion

Exemptions from a requirement to operate under a permit

Q15 Do you agree or disagree that charities/voluntary groups operating a non-profit service should be able to operate under a non-registered exemption?

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree – they should be required to operate under a permit
- c) **Disagree – they should be required to operate under a registered exemption**
- d) Disagree – they should be required to operate under some other control
- e) Don't know/no opinion

If you disagree, please explain why and, if possible, provide alternative options.

There needs to be the ability to ensure that the waste is from a genuine charity or any other non-profit organisation.

Q16 Do you agree or disagree that local authority waste collection and disposal authorities and regulatory authorities should be able to operate under a nonregistered exemption?

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree – they should be required to operate under a permit
- c) Disagree – they should be required to operate under a registered exemption
- d) Disagree – they should be required to operate under some other control
- e) Don't know/no opinion

Q17 Do you agree or disagree that charities operating a chargeable, commercial service should be required to apply for the relevant standard rules permit?

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree – they should be required to operate under a registered exemption
- c) Disagree – they should be required to operate under a non-registered exemption
- d) Disagree – they should be required to operate under some other control
- e) Don't know/no opinion

Q18 Do you agree or disagree that waste disposal and collection authorities operating on a commercial basis should be required to apply for the relevant standard rules permit?

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree – they should be required to operate under a registered exemption
- c) Disagree – they should be required to operate under a non-registered exemption
- d) Disagree – they should be required to operate under some other control
- e) Don't know/no opinion

Disagree, as there is a statutory duty for waste collection authorities to arrange for a commercial service if requested, as set out in Section 45 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

Q19 Do you agree or disagree that those who transport and/or control waste produced by themselves in the course of their business, and where that waste is construction/demolition waste and/or the waste is subject to a higher level of control should be required to apply for the relevant standard rules permit?

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree – they should be required to operate under a registered exemption
- c) Disagree – they should be required to operate under a non-registered exemption
- d) Disagree – they should be required to operate under some other control

e) Don't know/no opinion

Q20 Do you agree or disagree that those who only transport and/or control nonconstruction or demolition waste, produced by themselves in the course of their business, should be allowed to operate under a registered exemption?

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree – they should be required to operate under a permit
- c) Disagree – they should be required to operate under a non-registered exemption
- d) Disagree – they should be required to operate under some other control
- e) Don't know/no opinion

Q21 Do you agree or disagree that businesses removing third party waste produced in the course of their business should be required to apply for a permit?

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree – they should be required to operate under a registered exemption
- c) Disagree – they should be required to operate under a non-registered exemption
- d) Disagree – they should be required to operate under some other control
- e) Don't know/no opinion

Q22 Do you agree or disagree that the distinction and risks between scenarios (e) and (f) are sufficiently clear to require two different regulatory approaches?

- a) Agree- they should be treated different
- b) Disagree- they should be treated the same

If you disagree and believe they should be treated the same, do you believe they should be required to:

- a) Operate under a permit
- b) Operate under a registered exemption
- c) Operate under some other control
- d) Don't know/no opinion

Q23 Do you agree or disagree that those transporting/controlling waste from mines and quarries should be required to operate under a registered exemption?

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree – they should be required to operate under a permit
- c) Disagree – they should be required to operate under a non-registered exemption
- d) Disagree – they should be required to operate under some other control
- e) Don't know/no opinion

Q24 Do you agree or disagree that companies transporting/controlling agricultural waste should be required to apply for a permit?

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree – they should be required to operate under a registered exemption
- c) Disagree – they should be required to operate under a non-registered exemption
- d) Disagree – they should be required to operate under some other control
- e) Don't know/no opinion

Q25 Do you agree or disagree that farmers should be required to operate under a registered exemption if they are only transporting their own agricultural waste?

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree – they should be required to operate under a permit
- c) Disagree – they should be required to operate under a non-registered exemption
- d) Disagree – they should be required to operate under some other control
- e) Don't know/no opinion

Q26 Do you agree or disagree that those who transport/control only animal byproducts should operate under a non-registered exemption?

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree – they should be required to operate under a permit
- c) Disagree – they should be required to operate under a registered exemption
- d) Disagree – they should be required to operate under some other control
- e) Don't know/no opinion

For consistency, this activity should also be covered by the system.

Implementation

Q27 Do you agree or disagree that those who currently hold an upper tier registration should be required to apply for a permit at the time when this registration is due to be renewed?

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree
- c) Don't know/no opinion

If you disagree, please explain why and, if possible, provide alternative options.

Q28 Do you agree or disagree that 12 months is an appropriate length of time for those who currently have a lower tier registration to either register an exemption or apply for a permit when the system goes live?

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree
- c) Don't know/no opinion

If you disagree, please explain why and, if possible, suggest a time frame in which they must apply for a permit or register an exemption.

How would businesses demonstrate competency through the workforce

Q29 Do you agree or disagree with introducing technical competence as a controller/transporter permit requirement?

- a) Agree – but only for controller permits
- b) Agree – but only for transporter permits
- c) Agree – for both controller and transporter permits
- d) Disagree
- e) Don't know/no opinion

Q30 Do you agree or disagree that a regulatory approach to assuring technical competence is likely to be the most effective in achieving a good standard of competence in waste controllers and transporters?

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree
- c) Don't know/no opinion

If you disagree, please explain why and, if possible, provide alternative options that would meet our objectives.

Q31 If you are a business that handles waste, which of the following waste technical competence qualifications do you and/or your employees hold? (tick all that apply)

- a) CIWM and WAMITAB Level 1 Award/Certificate
- b) CIWM and WAMITAB Level 2 Award/Certificate
- c) CIWM and WAMITAB Level 3 Award/Certificate
- d) CIWM and WAMITAB Level 4 Award/Certificate
- e) Energy and Utility Skills Competence Management System
- f) Other – please specify
- g) We currently don't hold any technical competence qualifications
- f) Don't know/not applicable

Q32 Who do you think should be required to hold a full level of competence? (tick all that apply)

- a) The permit holder (this can be an individual or a legal entity)
- b) Nominated person(s)**
- c) All individuals in the business who handle/direct/transport waste
- d) Nobody
- e) Something else – please specify
- f) Not sure/no opinion

Q33 Do you agree or disagree that having a nominated person responsible for cascading competence through the workforce is a proportionate approach for companies to demonstrate that their staff are at a suitable level of competence?

- a) Agree**
- b) Disagree
- c) Don't know/no opinion

Q34 To what extent are you in favour of a workforce-based competence scheme, such as the existing Energy and Utilities Skills scheme, being considered as an approach for waste controllers and transporters?

- a) Strongly in favour
- a) Somewhat in favour
- b) Neither in favour not against/no opinion
- c) Somewhat against
- d) Strongly against
- e) I don't know enough about the Energy and Utilities Skills scheme to comment** Please explain your views.

Q35 Do you agree or disagree that an online 'assessment', which needs to be completed as part of the initial application process, should be introduced as a way of demonstrating competence when applying for a permit?

- a) Agree**
- b) Disagree
- c) Don't know/no opinion

Q36 Do you agree or disagree that those operating under a registered exemption should still be required to hold an appropriate level of transporter/controller technical competence?

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree
- c) Don't know/no opinion

If you disagree, please explain why and, if possible, provide alternative options that would meet our objectives.

Q37 If you agree, do you agree or disagree that some form of basic online assessment, possibly forming part of the registration process itself, would be a proportionate approach?

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree
- c) Don't know/no opinion

If you disagree, please explain why and, if possible, provide alternative options that would meet our objectives.

Transition period for the introduction of competence requirements

Q38 Do you agree or disagree that there should be a phased introduction of the competence requirements?

- a) Agree – there should be a phased approach
- b) Disagree – there should not be any competence requirements
- c) Disagree – there should be full competence from day one of implementation
- d) Don't know/no opinion

If you agree, how long do you think operators should have to provide evidence of full competence?

- a) Three months
- b) Six months
- c) 12 months
- d) Another time period – please specify

24 months would seem appropriate

Q39 Do you agree or disagree that those operators applying for a transporter/controller permit with no existing CBD registration should be required to provide evidence of full competence at application stage?

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree
- c) Don't know/no opinion

Ongoing competence

Q40 Do you agree or disagree that there should be a requirement to demonstrate continuing competence?

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree
- c) Don't know/no opinion

Q41 If we were to introduce a requirement for demonstrating continuing competence, how often do you think this should be undertaken?

- a) every year
- b) every 2 years
- c) every 3 years
- d) every 4 years
- e) every 5 years
- f) some other time period – please specify
- g) don't know/no opinion

Q42 Do you agree or disagree that an online module and assessment would be sufficient for demonstrating continued competence?

- a) Agree
- b) Disagree
- c) Don't know/no opinion

The benefits of introducing a permitting framework for waste exporters

Q43 Are you an exporter of waste, and are you currently registered as a broker or dealer in England or elsewhere?

- a) I am an exporter of waste and I am currently registered as a broker or dealer with the Environment Agency in England
- b) I am an exporter of waste. I am not currently registered as a broker or dealer with any of the UK regulatory agencies.

- c) I am an exporter of waste and I am currently registered with SEPA, NRW or NIEA but not with the Environment Agency in England
- d) **No, I am not an exporter of waste**

Q44 Do you agree or disagree with the proposal that operators exporting waste from England must hold a permit?

- a) **Agree with the proposal – all operators exporting waste must hold a permit**
- b) Partly agree with the proposal – most operators exporting waste must hold a permit, but some exemptions should also be allowed
- c) Disagree with the proposal – no operator exporting waste should have to hold a permit
- d) Don't know/no opinion

If you partly agree but think there should also be exemptions, what kinds of operations do you think should be exempt, either as a registered exemption or non-registered exemption?

Q45 If we were to require operators exporting waste from England to have a permit, do you agree or disagree that the permit should be time limited?

- a) **Agree**
- b) Disagree
- c) Don't know/no opinion

Q46 Do you agree or disagree with the principle of including a requirement for applicants to demonstrate technical competence as a requirement to hold an exporter of waste permit?

- a) **Agree**
- b) Disagree
- c) Don't know/no opinion

Please explain your views.

Without the appropriate technical competence anyone how will the exporter know that waste is being transported to an appropriate facility with the relevant permits. There should be no difference in the Duty of Care needed within the UK or abroad.

Q47 Do you have any other comments to make about our proposals to reform the law on waste carriers, brokers and dealers?

- a) Yes – please elaborate
- b) **No – thank you for your input**

RESPONSE BY WESTERN RIVERSIDE WASTE AUTHORITY

CONSULTATION ON THE INTRODUCTION OF MANDATORY DIGITAL WASTE TRACKING

January 2022

About you

Q1) Would you like your response to be confidential?

- yes
- no

If you answered 'Yes', please give your reason

Q2) What is your full name?

Mark Broxup

Q3) What is your email address?

mark@wrwa.gov.uk

Q4) Which of the following best describes who you are responding on behalf of?

Select one option only, if multiple categories apply, please choose the one which best describes the organisation you are representing in your response.

- business representative organisation or trade body
- waste site operator
- waste broker or dealer
- waste transportation company or waste carrier
- waste producer
- product manufacturer
- local authority
- community group
- non-governmental organisation
- charity or social enterprise
- consultancy
- academic or research organisation
- member of the public
- other

If you answered 'other', please provide details

If you are responding on behalf of an organisation or business, please provide the name of the organisation or business and an approximate number of staff (where applicable).

Q5) Considering who you are responding on behalf of, in what part of the UK would you say you are based or operate in? (tick all that apply)

- **England**
- Wales
- Scotland
- Northern Ireland

Q6) Would you be interested in joining our user panel? As part of the development of the digital waste tracking service we have formed a user panel of interested parties.

Members of the panel are invited to participate in user research (for example, surveys, workshops, and interviews) or to test digital services as they are designed and built.

- yes
- **no**
- already signed up

What will be tracked and what will it mean for you?

Q7) Do you agree or disagree with the waste types we are proposing to be tracked?

- **agree**
- disagree
- no opinion

Q8) Do you agree or disagree with our proposals for which waste activities will be recorded in the waste tracking service?

- **agree**
- disagree
- no opinion

Requirements for waste managed in other scenarios

Q9) Do you agree or disagree with our proposals for when waste tracking will not be required?

- **agree**
- disagree
- no opinion

Q10) Do you have any views about how we should incorporate waste activities conducted under Non-Waste Framework Directive exemptions, Low Risk Waste Positions and Regulatory Position Statements into the waste tracking service? Should we:

- a) require full details (as above in the 'Waste activities to be recorded in the waste tracking

service' section),

b) exempt them from the need to provide this further information, noting that this would present a gap in our overall waste picture,

c) have a mixture of a) and b), with some specified activities coming with a requirement to record these details and others that do not

d) do something else to incorporate them.

The level of risk, based on the type of material and tonnage, should determine the need to have the information recorded.

What reporting regimes will be included in the service?

Q11) Do you agree or disagree with our proposals to remove the requirement to submit information or waste data returns as listed, once the waste tracking service is live?

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

Information recorded on the waste tracking service

Q12) Do you agree or disagree with the information recording proposals in Table 1?

a) A system-generated unique identifier

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

b) Details of the person who classified the waste

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

c) Details about the destination for all waste movements, including the type of authorisation held

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

d) Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

e) Details of rejected or quarantined loads

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

f) Details of waste treatment

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

g) Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) identification

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

h) Details of end of waste products and materials produced

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

i) Information about onward destination of end of waste products or materials

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

j) Nation specific requirements for any existing or future requirements

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

Q13) Persistent Organic Pollutants – how much information about POPs do you think should be recorded in the service?

- a) basic level - indication that waste contains POPs only
- b) enhanced level - additional details on the specific POPS contained in the waste and the content level of the POPs
- c) other
- d) no opinion

Q14) Is there any other information related to waste management that you think should be recorded in a new digital waste tracking service?

- yes
- no
- no opinion

Controller, Transporter and Site License Details

Recording treatment and product details

Q15) Are you familiar with the existing D and R codes?

- yes
- no
- not applicable to you

Q16) Do you find D and R codes easy to apply?

- yes
- no
- not applicable to you

Q17) Do you have any suggestions as to how recovery or disposal activities should be recorded in the waste tracking service?

- yes
- no

Q18) End of waste products or materials - do you use any existing standard codes or descriptions to record end of waste products produced from waste?

- yes
- no

Dangerous goods regulations

Q19) Do you transport hazardous waste?

- yes
- no

Q20) How do you currently record dangerous goods information?

- paper record
- digital record
- both

- not applicable

Q21) Where do you think information demonstrating compliance with the Dangerous Goods Regulations with regards to the movement of waste should be recorded?

- in the new waste tracking service
- somewhere else
- no opinion

It would seem sensible to have all the information in one place.

Waste hierarchy

Q22) If you produce, manage or handle waste in any way, were you aware of your duty to apply the waste hierarchy prior to reading this consultation?

- yes
- no
- not applicable

Q23) Do you think waste holders including producers should record their compliance with the application of the waste hierarchy in the Waste Tracking service?

- yes
- no
- no opinion

Not sure what the proposal is trying to achieve, for what purpose would the information collected be used for?

Ways to enter information

Q24) If you are likely to need to enter data into the waste tracking service, which of the options would you use for the majority of your data entries?

- manual entry
- data upload from existing spreadsheet records onto a waste tracking service standard spreadsheet
- data upload from existing waste tracking software onto a waste tracking service standard spreadsheet
- direct data upload via an application programming interface (API)
- something else
- no opinion

If you answered, 'something else', please provide details

This would be a matter for our contractor.

Q25) When recording data in your current systems, do you use any form of data standard?

- yes
- no

But this bespoke to ourselves

When information must be recorded

Q26) Do you agree or disagree with our ambition for real time recording of waste movements and transfers?

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

In our experience, waste data is seldom needed in real time. However, for this system to work it is difficult to see how it can be otherwise. Waste movements are numerous and complex even on a single site if it is handling many different materials in and out and data errors are inevitable. A period to check data, before publication, is wise.

In truth, 'Realtime' data is probably as equally likely to be manipulated by those wishing to carrying out illegal activities.

Q27) For the following types of waste movements or transfers, how long do you think you would need to transition to real time recording?

Movements or transfers of...	Less than 1 year	1 to 3 years	More than 3 years	Not applicable
Hazardous Waste		✓		
Non-hazardous waste			✓	
Green List Waste imports or exports		✓		

Q28) What are the main barriers or motivators that will influence the time it takes you to transition to real time reporting?

The cost and availability of Authority and contractor staff plus any hardware and licensing costs. Without a staggered start, the availability of software engineers to link this with existing systems to avoid the need for double recording of information e.g. for invoicing purposes.

Q29) Do you agree or disagree with the overall proposed process set out in: Annex A for hazardous and non-hazardous waste movements?

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

Annex B for Green List Waste exports?

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

Annex C for Green List Waste imports?

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

Q30) How far in advance of a waste movement should the information listed under Step 1 in each of the processes be entered onto the waste tracking service?

Annex A hazardous and non-hazardous waste movements

- any time before the waste movement
- at least 1 day before
- at least 3 days before
- other (please provide details)

As with the existing Duty of Care system there would seem to be a need for annual transfer notes to be accommodated under Step1 for businesses that consistently produce the same types of waste such as shops and offices. The 'live' element only really starts once the waste is collected.

Annex B Green List Waste exports

- any time before the waste movement
- at least 1 day before
- at least 3 days before
- other (please provide details)

Annex C Green List Waste imports

- any time before the waste movement
- at least 1 day before
- at least 3 days before
- other (please provide details)

For enforcement purposes it is probably useful if the relevant authorities know days in advance about waste imports and exports.

Q31) Who should be responsible for entering the information listed under Step 1 in Annex A in advance of the movement of hazardous or non-hazardous waste?

- waste producer
- waste carrier
- waste broker or dealers
- any of the above
- other

Q32) Within what time frame should waste carriers enter the information as required in Step 2 Annex A and Step 4 for Annex B?

Annex A hazardous and non-hazardous waste movements

- 24 hours
- 48 hours
- 3 working days
- 1 week
- other

If you answered 'other', please provide details

Prior to delivery to the waste receiving site as otherwise how will the site be able to complete Step 3?

Annex B Green List Waste exports

- 24 hours
- 48 hours
- 3 working days
- 1 week
- other

If you answered 'other', please provide details

On imports, prior to delivery to the waste receiving site as otherwise how will the site be able to complete Step 3? On exports will Step 3 actually be completed?

Q33) Do you think there should be any difference in the requirements depending on whether hazardous or non-hazardous waste is being handled?

- yes
- **no**
- no opinion

**Q34) Within what time frame should waste receiving sites be required to provide this information?
information about the waste received at their sites:**

- **24 hours**
- 48 hours
- 3 working days
- 1 week
- other
- no opinion

**b) information about the disposal, recovery, preparation for re-use or treatment of waste,
including information about any end of waste products or materials:**

- **24 hours**
- 48 hours
- 3 working days
- 1 week
- other
- no opinion

Season Tickets

Q35) Do you have any comments to make about this proposal or how you would like to see these movements incorporated in the waste tracking service?

- yes
- **no**

If you answered 'Yes', please provide details

Roles and Responsibilities

Q36) Do you agree or disagree with the proposed requirements for each of the roles in Table 3?

a) Requirements common to all

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

b) Requirements common to waste producers, carriers, brokers, or dealers

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

If you answered 'disagree', please tell us why

c) Requirements applicable to waste producers only

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

d) Requirements applicable to waste carriers only

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

If you answered 'disagree', please tell us why

e) Requirements applicable to brokers or dealers only

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

If you answered 'disagree', please tell us why

f) Requirements applicable to operators of waste receiving sites only

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

If you answered 'disagree', please tell us why

Q37) How should waste producers be required to confirm the information recorded for their waste movements?

- **option 1 within the waste tracking service**
- option 2 through an emailed summary
- option 3 by exception
- another way
- no opinion

Digitally excluded requirements

Q38) Do you agree or disagree with the general principles as set out above regarding digitally excluded individuals subject to waste tracking requirements?

- agree
- disagree
- **no opinion**

Q39) Do you agree or disagree with the proposed alternative methods for digitally excluded individuals to provide the required information?

- agree
- disagree
- **no opinion**

Q40) How long should digitally excluded users be given to provide the information required via the postal service element of these provisions? For example, updated waste movement information or details of waste treatment or production of materials from waste.

- **7 Days**
- 14 days
- 1 month
- other
- no opinion

This should be as short a timescale as is reasonably feasible.

Data retention, access, and confidentiality

Q41) Do you agree or disagree with the proposed level of access to information for each of the different types of users as set out in Table 4?

a) Relevant Government officers & environmental regulators

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

b) Tax authorities

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

c) Waste scheme administrators

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

d) Local Authorities

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

Waste planning authorities will need access to all the data for their area not just information on the local authority collected waste

e) Businesses involved in waste movements

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

f) Producers and carriers

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

g) Waste receiving sites

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

h) Household waste producers

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

i) Wider public and interested parties

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

Q42) Do you agree or disagree that waste producers should be able to see information about the end fate of their waste?

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

Q43) Do you agree or disagree with our proposals on UK GDPR?

- Agree
- disagree
- no opinion

Q44) Do you agree or disagree with our proposals on managing sensitive information?

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

Q45) Do you have any comments about our proposals (or your needs) for data retention?

- yes
- no

Enforcement

Q46) Do you agree or disagree with the proposed offences and associated enforcement options as set out in Table 5?

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

Q47) Do you think there should be a maximum limit for variable monetary penalties set out in legislation?

- yes
- no
- no opinion

If you answered 'yes', please provide details of what you think this limit should be

Regulatory Functions

Q48) Do you agree or disagree with our proposed functions for environmental regulators?

- agree
- disagree
- no opinion

Q49) Do you think costs relating to the investigation of, and enforcement action taken against, those not complying with the requirements of waste tracking should be recoverable through the fees and charges for users of the waste tracking service? (please provide more information to support your answer if you wish)

- yes
- no
- no opinion

Charging

Q50) What is your preferred option for who should pay the IT service operation and maintenance costs?

- option A – the person or business who enters the preliminary waste tracking information
- option B – a specific user group
- option C – existing waste related fee payers
- other

Fundamentally the producer is always going to pay the cost anyway as under the other systems it will simply be built into the haulage and treatment cost and passed down the line.

Making the producer directly responsible for the cost will make it more transparent and potentially help in highlighting to producers' the advantages of waste reduction through better purchasing or material usage strategies.

Q51) What is your preferred option for what type of cost it should be?

- option 1 – a per record fee
- option 2 – a flat annual fee
- option 3 – an increase to existing fees
- other
- no opinion

A mix of options 1,2 or 3 dependent on the complexity of the administration and the potential risk potential and quantity of the waste in question.

Q52) What is your preferred option for how the costs should be collected?

- option X – on-submission payment facility
- option Y – credit system
- option Z – environmental regulators recover service costs through existing fees and harges
- other
- no opinion

Implementation**Q53) Which approach to getting all users onto the waste tracking service do you think we should adopt?**

- option 1 – everyone must use the service from the day it goes live
- option 2 – voluntary use for a specified length of time, then mandatory for all
- option 3 – mandating some waste holders use the service or certain types of waste movement must be recorded on the service first then on-boarding others over time
- something else
- no opinion

Q54) Considering your answer to question 24 in the 'Ways to enter information' section, how much do you think it will cost your organisation to transition to this way of working?

Unknown until more detail is available

Q55) Do you think your organisation would make any savings by transitioning to this way of working? Such as from:

- a reduction in data storage costs
- a reduction in time spent checking data quality
- savings in not having to complete and submit waste returns to regulators
- a reduction in time spent obtaining and providing waste information from or to customers
- other (please describe)

The staff time in collating and entering data into WasteDataflow.

Q56) Alongside this consultation we have published an impact assessment setting out the costs and benefits we foresee from the introduction of a mandatory digital waste tracking service, based on assumptions made from the evidence currently available.

Have we made any assumptions that you disagree with?

- yes
- no
- no opinion

[Consultee Feedback on the Online Survey](#)

Q57) Overall, how satisfied are you with our online consultation tool?

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Dis-satisfied
- Very dissatisfied
- Don't know

Please give us any comments you have on the tool, including suggestions on how we could improve it.

RESPONSE BY WESTERN RIVERSIDE WASTE AUTHORITY
CONSULTATION ON TARGET PROPOSALS FOR RESOURCE EFFICIENCY AND
WASTE REDUCTION

JUNE 2022

Would you like your response to be confidential?

- Yes
 No

If you answered 'Yes' above, please give your reason.

Name Rachel Espinosa

Email address rachel@wrwa.gov.uk

Organisation Western Riverside Waste Authority

Q1. Do you agree or disagree with the proposed scope of the residual waste target being 'all residual waste excluding major mineral wastes'? [Agree/Disagree/Don't know]

• **[If disagree] What reasons can you provide for why the government should consider a different target scope?**

Agree. However major mineral (CD&E) wastes are not insignificant by tonnage and although the levels of recycling are already very high, by excluding these wastes, the proposed target does not take account of the environmental impacts involved in the full lifecycle of these materials such as the transporting, transferring, processing and recycling of these wastes. In so doing, the target focusses on the impact on a per material basis and excludes the impact from the management of the material. A policy to reduce all wastes would set the direction of travel to reduce the environmental impacts from all residual wastes. The evidence base report suggest that CD&E wastes may be looked at in the future. Defra should commit to introducing a resource efficiency and waste reduction target for CD&E wastes.

Q2. Do you agree or disagree that our proposed method of measuring the target metric is appropriate? [Agree/Disagree/Don't know]

Agree

• **[If disagree] What reasons or potential unintended consequences can you provide or foresee for why the government should consider a different method?**

• **Do you agree or disagree that local authorities should have a legal requirement to report this waste data, similar to the previous legal requirement they had until 2020? [Agree/Disagree/Don't know]**

Agree

Q3. Do you agree or disagree with the level of ambition proposed for a waste reduction target? [Agree/Disagree/Don't know]

Agree. A residual waste reduction target is consistent with the waste hierarchy, however the proposed target relates to residual waste only and to comply with the waste hierarchy fully, all waste arisings should be reduced, including materials collected and sent for recycling. In addition, measures to divert waste from residual streams to recycling will go towards meeting the proposed target, however recycling itself is not a waste reduction measure and will not contribute to reducing total arisings.

- **[If disagree] What reasons can you provide for why the government should consider a different level of ambition?**

Q4. Do you agree or disagree with our proposed metric for considering resource productivity? [Agree/Disagree/Don't know]

Agree.

- **[If disagree] What reasons, or potential unintended consequences can you provide for why the government should consider a different metric and what data exists to enable reporting for this alternate metric?**

Q5. Of the possible policy interventions described, which do you think will be most effective to meet a resource productivity target? Please specify whether these policies would be most effective if implemented nationally or regionally, and whether measures should be product or sector-specific.

The consultation documents reference a number of supporting documents that are yet to be published and the results of these will inform further macro-economic analysis, hence there is insufficient information to make an informed judgement on policy interventions.

RESPONSE BY WESTERN RIVERSIDE WASTE AUTHORITY

**CONSULTATION ON PREVENTING CHARGES FOR DIY WASTE AT HOUSEHOLD
WASTE RECYCLING CENTRES AND CALL FOR EVIDENCE ON BOOKING SYSTEMS
AT HOUSEHOLD WASTE RECYCLING CENTRES**

JUNE 2022

Q1. Would you like your response to be confidential?

- Yes
- No

If you answered 'Yes' above, please give your reason.

Q2. What is your name?

Mark Broxup

Q3. What is your email address?

mark@wrwa.gov.uk

Q4. Which of the options below best describes you?

Please tick only one option. If multiple categories apply to you, please choose the one which **best describes you** and which you are representing in your response.

- Local authority
- Local householder
- Waste management company
- Business representative organisation/trade body
- Product designer
- Manufacturer
- Distributor
- Retailer
- Operator
- Reprocessor
- Community group
- Charity or social enterprise
- Consultancy
- Academic or research
- Individual
- Other (please provide details)

Q5. If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, what is its name?

Western Riverside Waste Authority

Q6. Do you agree or disagree with these technical principles when the government amends the 2012 regulations?

- Agree
 Disagree

If you answered 'Disagree' above, please give your reason.

The Authority does not disagree with the proposed 300 litre limit but believes there should be a corresponding weight limit of 100kg as well.

This weight is based on the Environment Agency's published density factor for the European Waste Catalogue code for mixed construction waste (17 09 04) of 0.32 and the Government's 300 litre limit.

(Government is not consulting on the broad intent that DIY household waste should be free to dispose of for local residents)

Q7. Given the government's stated policy, do you agree or disagree with these tests on whether construction waste should be treated as DIY waste and classified as household waste, and should not be charged for when disposed of at a HWRC, when:

	Agree – this should be included	Disagree – this should be excluded	Not sure / don't have an opinion / not applicable
The waste is produced by householders whilst carrying out small-scale construction or demolition works at their home	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
The waste does not arise from activities that generate an income for the person who carried them out	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
The waste is not produced on a regular basis requiring HWRC visits more frequently than once a week	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
The volume of waste is no greater than 300L (based on the approximate boot size of a family car)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

Q8: If you have disagreed with the inclusion of any of the above criteria, please state why, indicating which part of the criteria you are referring to in your response.

Please see answer to Question 6.

Q9: Do you have any other views on the technical circumstances in which construction waste should be considered DIY waste and classified as household waste?

Please see answer to Question 6.

Q10: Do you currently have a HWRC booking system in place?

- Yes
 No

Q11: What type of booking system do you operate?

- Residents contact us to book a specific slot
 Residents use sites at certain times based on address, number plate, etc.
 Other (please specify)

Q12: Please outline the key reasons why you do have a booking system in place.

The two main objectives were to eliminate queuing on the public highway and to prevent non-residents from using the HWRC.

The HWRC can accommodate 84 vehicles onsite but, before the Booking System was introduced, queues could still tail back over ¼ mile on the public highway at peak hours which was frustrating for both the users of the site and neighbouring residents and businesses. Offsite queueing has now been eliminated and consequently there is far less traffic noise and air pollution.

Surveys suggested that between 6% and 9% of HWRC usage was by residents from neighbouring boroughs. Preventing these users from using our HWRC has freed up more space and saved money for residents and council taxpayers in the Authority's area.

Additionally, the Booking System has:

- improved existing systems for the identification of traders abusing the HWRC by depositing commercial and industrial waste for free;
- allowed the Authority to better communicate with residents who use the service e.g. to advertise new recycling facilities;
- enabled annual usage and site satisfaction surveys to be conducted quickly, easily and cost-effectively; and
- enabled analysis of where residents, who access the HWRC, live within the Authority's area.

Q13: Please outline the key reasons why you do not have a booking system in place.

Not applicable.

14: What are your future plans for the booking system?

- Retain indefinitely
- Retain until some point in 2022
- Usure
- In the process of removing
- Will remove by a certain date
- Other (please specify)

Q15: Please outline any evidence you have on the impacts of booking systems on recycling levels in your area.

Recycling levels on the HWRC have remained broadly constant since the introduction of the booking system. It is believed that residents are recycling more material and more carefully (particularly at peak times when they now feel less pressurised) but this has been offset by a reduction in recyclable industrial waste (wood and timber in particular) due to the improved enforcement capability the booking system provides to identify traders.

Q16: Please outline what other restrictions, if any, you impose on residents bringing waste to your HWRC? For example, limits on size, or on vehicles type can use.

The Authority has separate booking systems for cars and vans as vans are required to use a different part of the site and go over a weighbridge. Vans are not charged if they are carrying household waste.

As well as actual vans themselves, the following vehicles are classified as vans for HWRC access purposes by the Authority:

- any vehicle over 2 metres high (enforced by a height barrier);
- any vehicle towing a trailer;
- any vehicle that has had seats removed in order to carry goods; and
- light commercial vehicles (such as Toyota Hilux or Mercedes Vito)

Q17: Do you use measures such as ANPR or similar approaches at your HWRCs?

Yes, our main site allows 90 vehicles to book every ½ hour (which equates to a vehicle every 20 seconds) and same day booking up to 35 minutes before a slot is permitted.

This volume of vehicles and flexibility on booking would not be administratively possible without use of an ANPR system.