

ITEM 4

PAPER NO. WRWA 842

WESTERN RIVERSIDE WASTE AUTHORITY

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| MEETING | 21 st November 2017 |
| REPORT AUTHOR/DATE | General Manager <i>(Contact Mark Broxup - Tel. 020 8871 2788)</i> 13 th November 2017 |
| SUBJECT | Various matters associated with Recycling performance. |
| CONTENTS | Page 1 Introduction Pages 2 to 12 Items reported on Page 12 Recommendations Pages 14-16 Appendix A - Draft Tender Brief – Consultancy Advice Pages 17-19 Appendix B - Draft Tender Brief - Pages 20 -22 Appendix C - Draft Tender Brief – Waste Composition Analysis Pages 23 – 29 Appendix D - Authority's response to the government's consultation document on a 'Deposit or Reward and Return Scheme' (DRRS) for drinks containers |
| STATUS | Open |

| | |
|------------------------------|------|
| BACKGROUND PAPERS | None |
|------------------------------|------|

INTRODUCTION

1. In June 2017, the Authority considered a Recycling Performance report (Paper No. WRWA 832) which led to a seminar for Authority Members on 14th September 2017, the outcomes from which were discussed at the Authority's September 2017 meeting (Paper No. WRWA 838). Authority officers subsequently met with officers from the constituent councils on 4th October 2017 to discuss the matter further.
2. Authority officers feel that two key views have come to the fore during this process which need to be considered when planning new initiatives:
 - “convenience is everything” which is likely to be a barrier to behavioural change and persuading residents to reduce their waste;
 - a perception that waste minimisation initiatives such as using real nappies or reducing food waste are generally more attractive to residents who are more concerned about environmental issues and are better off financially and therefore such initiatives may not be relevant to a large number of residents.
3. This report recommends introducing, or exploring further, a number of new initiatives and interventions which have been chosen because officers believe that they will add value and have measurable outcomes. Value is measured not only by tonnage directly moving up the waste hierarchy, but also in terms of increased public awareness. The report also recommends that improved data and a greater understanding on how best to communicate messages be acquired to further assist the Authority. It is intended that these new initiatives, interventions and information gathering would generally be in addition to the current work programmes.
4. If Members agree to pursue any of these proposals then, where applicable, they will be presented for approval at the February 2018 meeting as part of the process to agree the overall Recycle Western Riverside budget for 2018/19.
5. This report also provides an update on the current RWR programme and asks the Authority to formally endorse the Authority's response to the Government's call for evidence on a 'Deposit or Reward and Return Scheme' (DRRS) for drinks containers in England.

CONSULTANCY ADVICE

6. In June 2017, following discussion of Paper No. WRWA 832, the Authority agreed that:
 - a) a tender brief be developed, in consultation with officers from the Constituent Councils, for approval at the November 2017 meeting of the Authority, with the aim to then appoint a consultant at the February 2018 meeting of the Authority with a view to them advising on:
 - i. the accuracy of the data used to prepare this report and the reasonableness of the conclusions drawn from it;
 - ii. any differences in performance between the constituent councils on different waste types;
 - iii. the suitability of having a range of performance targets, as opposed to the current 'one size fits all' weight based recycling target;
 - iv. the enhancement of the current recycling programme with a new focus on a number of waste minimisation initiatives; and
 - v. how the Authority might best communicate agreed policies and measures to the public.
7. Two tender briefs have been developed and are attached as Appendices A and B to this report. The first covers items i) to iv) and the second covers item v) described above. The reason for two briefs is that officers believe that consultants with different skill sets may be better suited to the communication aspect.
8. The Authority produced a Joint Waste Strategy in 2006 and updated this with a joint waste policy document in July 2013. Building on the work detailed in i) to iv) above, it is further proposed that the consultants be asked to continue to develop this work stream and help draft a new joint waste policy and delivery strategy document for the Authority and its constituent councils. An additional element to the brief has therefore been drafted to allow for this if the Authority agrees.
9. A third tender brief has also been produced for consultants to carry out further waste compositional analysis. This draft brief has been attached as Appendix B to this report.

10. The Authority is asked to approve the tender briefs and prices will be obtained for approval to proceed at the next Authority meeting.

NEW INITIATIVES

11. Officers have taken on board ideas and suggestions from all the meetings described in paragraph 1 above and a list of new initiatives has been developed as described below.

Waste Composition Analysis

12. The Authority's most recent compositional analysis survey was carried out in October 2014 by Resource Futures on the kerbside collected residual waste and dry recycling streams (and food waste in Lambeth). As far as was practically possible this mirrored a similar survey carried out in October 2009 by MEL. It is therefore proposed that a new survey, to be carried out in October 2018, will be costed for approval by the Authority at its February 2018 meeting.

Encouraging the use of Real Nappies

13. The current 'Real Nappy for London' initiative that operates in seven London Boroughs, including Lambeth, offers a £50 start up voucher to incentivise parents to try reusable nappies. However, a complete Real Nappy kit (from birth to potty training) will involve an upfront cost of around £200. This means that the start up voucher only makes a 25% or less contribution to the total cost and is less likely to persuade parents on low incomes to try Real Nappies, hence the belief that parents who are better off financially and are concerned about environmental issues are more likely to take up the voucher offer (and, if knowledgeable, may have opted for real nappies anyway without the £50 incentive).
14. It is proposed therefore to inspire ten volunteer parents to use Real Nappies by providing them with either a complete Real Nappy kit (birth to potty training) or a voucher to cover the cost; this will depend on the results of a procurement process and the determination of the most cost effective method. The volunteer parents will, in turn, be required to use social media to detail their experience of using the Real Nappies (the good and the bad) for an agreed period of time, requesting that they provide a truthful account detailing the money they have saved, the waste they have not generated, the "convenience factor" and the environmental benefits. They will be given a target of attempting to persuade

ten expectant parents who live in the Authority area to use Real Nappies by demonstrating how much money can be saved when compared to using disposable nappies. If they manage to achieve their target they will be awarded £300. The initiative will be open to all, but will be targeted at parents on lower incomes.

15. It is also proposed to ask the constituent council registrar offices to make available literature to new parents advertising the constituent councils' work in this area.

Estates Trial – Test the use of Carrier Bags

16. This proposal was formulated after an idea was tabled by an officer from Hammersmith & Fulham. Currently, residents who live on estates, or who use communal recycling bins, are not issued with "one use" clear recycling sacks, but can request free reusable recycling bags to transport recyclables to the recycling banks.
17. The disadvantage of using the reusable bags is that, if the resident is not returning home after disposing of their recyclables, they need to carry the reusable sacks with them and, after several uses, the bags can become sticky from liquid and food spills. It is felt by officers that reusable bags do not have the "convenience factor" and do not therefore motivate residents to recycle.
18. Cory have agreed to trial receiving supermarket carrier bags filled with mixed recycling in the MRF which will be sampled frequently to check the quality of the material delivered. This proposal is to implement a trial in one poor performing estate in Hammersmith & Fulham (estate trials have previously been conducted in the other three boroughs), where residents will be encouraged to use supermarket carrier bags as "one use" bags to dispose of their mixed recycling.
19. This trial will also be coupled with the relocation of the recycling bin, if necessary, to ensure it is not the first bin that residents encounter so that residents who do not recycle are less likely to contaminate the bin. The installation of new bin enclosures will also be investigated, depending on cost.

Food Waste Reduction

20. It was evident from the meetings with constituent council officers that there is a view that campaigns such as 'Love Food Hate Waste' and the associated engagement work is likely to be speaking to the converted, or those already

well-informed about food waste. Officers feel that, in order to reach other less receptive residents, more emphasis needs to be placed on more down-to-earth and practical advice, such as how much their food waste is costing them, advice about storing and freezing food, portion sizes and quick and easy recipes to use up leftovers. This information can be produced by the Recycle Western Riverside (RWR) programme and be made available on the Authority and constituent council websites, as well as being promoted in council publications and other advertising.

21. Another way to get these messages out is by enlisting the help of local restaurants in the Authority area to convey these messages through demonstrations and, in turn, constituent councils could promote the events and the restaurant.
22. An additional proposal is to establish a competition for community groups to come up with a Food Waste Reduction idea. A financial prize would be given to the best community group idea to fund the community group to implement a trial.

Waste Reduction and Recycling – Council Offices

23. An additional topic that came out of the constituent council officer discussions related to the internal separation of recycling in all council offices. It appears that there may be a wide variance of performance across different offices. Constituent council officers felt strongly that the constituent councils should lead by example if they are expecting residents to reduce waste and recycle.
24. Constituent council officers believe that their internal performance should be exemplary and that a top down approach from senior management was essential to assist with the conformity of schemes. Suggestions included the introduction of a league table between councils or individual council offices, and/or the introduction of a compulsory system with an expectation that employees and contractors based in council accommodation must reduce waste and recycle and this could form part of employee job and contractor contract specifications.
25. It is proposed to consult each constituent council concerning their internal recycling systems and report back to the February meeting with recommendations.

Garden Waste

26. Home composting is the best way to deal with garden waste generated within individual properties, both environmentally and economically. A straightforward initiative to encourage home composting is to subsidise home composting bins and sell them to residents at a discounted rate. However, once the bin is delivered, there is no further communication with the resident and it is very difficult to know if the discounted bin is being used. It is felt the decision to operate a subsidised home composting scheme should be made by the constituent councils as they are in a better position to control the scheme.
27. It is proposed to work with Community Groups to explore the potential for community composting.

The Household Waste and Recycling Centre (HWRC)

28. The HWRC currently has an annual reuse and recycling rate of 62% and this has been achieved by encouraging residents to separate their waste through the use of signage on the site and by providing information on the Authority's website. The site operatives working on the HWRC also encourage residents to separate their waste using the various recycling containers on site.
29. A HWRC user satisfaction survey was carried out in September 2017 and the following additional question was added (not included in the September 2014 survey): "The Authority is keen to adopt a more proactive approach in getting residents to reuse and recycle the waste they deliver to the Centre. What is your view about this idea?" Detailed feedback about the survey is provided elsewhere on this agenda, Paper No. WRWA 845. However the response from residents was very positive, with 95% fully supporting or supporting a more proactive response.
30. It is therefore proposed to change the tone of the information, from the encouraging message to an expectancy message that requires residents to separate their waste for reuse and recycling, as it is their civic responsibility and the right thing to do financially and environmentally.

Planning Conditions/Controls for New Builds and Renovations

31. The provision of sufficient internal storage to house two bins within the home is essential to enable the separation of recycling. Imposing conditions or controls

early on during the planning process would ensure that sufficient storage is provided for during the design stage. It is proposed to work with the constituent councils and review the current conditions/controls for internal waste and recycling storage and develop a mandatory condition and, where necessary, encourage the constituent councils to impose it as a planning condition.

CURRENT WORK STREAMS

Recycle for London

32. On Monday 6th November 2017, Recycle for London launched its new campaign called 'One bin is rubbish'. The campaign focuses on in-home storage and encouraging residents to sort out another recycling bin (or equivalent) in their home.
33. The reasons why Recycle for London have taken this approach include:
 - Research from 2016 with 18-34 year olds in London showed that 'lack of a recycling bin in their home' was the most commonly cited reason for not recycling.
 - A recent survey showed that over a third of Londoners said they would recycle more if they had a second bin in their home.
 - This approach enables a consistent London-wide campaign as it does not require service-specific information, this has been a difficulty in the past, given the differences between borough services.
34. The campaign will include adverts on bus sides across London, adverts in the Evening Standard, Metro and Time Out, digital adverts on social media.
35. Recycle for London are finalising a toolkit for boroughs and waste disposal authorities to use and, when available, the Authority will adopt the 'One bin is Rubbish' campaign, as approved by Members at the January 2017 Committee meeting..

Education Programme

36. Since the last Authority meeting, the Education Team has added three new primary workshops to its programme for this year. These are based on food waste, reusing old items instead of throwing things away and a new Recycle Races version for younger children, to reinforce their knowledge of what can and

cannot go in the recycling bin. The Education Team is also offering a special Christmas story, song and recycled decoration making workshop for December bookings.

37. Attempts to attract new schools to the education programme have been successful, with bookings already having been taken from five new schools. The first half of the Autumn term is always the quietest in terms of schools bookings, as classes are settling into the new academic year, however the calendar is filling up fast and bookings for this term, to date, are 17 Smugglers Way Visits and 36 in-school workshops. The team also has high demand for MRF tours from residents and community groups and has run ten MRF tours, a family tour and two Brownie group visits this term so far.
38. To date, the vast majority of the Education Team capacity has involved work with primary-aged schoolchildren, but the Team has now developed a new classroom session for Key Stage 3 pupils and has written to all secondary schools to highlight this session.

DEPOSIT RETURN AND REWARD SCHEME CALL FOR EVIDENCE

39. On 2nd October 2017 the Government invited views on how a 'Deposit or Reward and Return Scheme' (DRRS) for drinks containers could work in England by issuing a call for evidence, with views to be submitted by 31st October 2017, later extended to 20th November 2017.
40. The Government believes that more than eight million tonnes of plastic are discarded into the world's oceans each year, putting marine wildlife under serious threat. Up to 80% of this is estimated to have been originally lost or discarded on land before washing out to sea, and plastic bottles are a particular concern – with figures showing that just 57% of those sold in the UK in 2016 were collected for recycling. This compares to a record 90% of deposit-marked cans and bottles that were returned to dedicated recycling facilities in Denmark, and a return rate of almost 80% of beverage containers in South Australia, both of which have a form of deposit return scheme.
41. The table overleaf, from Paper No. WRWA 832 (June 2017), shows that currently the Authority estimates that it is recycling 63% of all glass, 24% of the all dense plastics and 22% of all non-ferrous metals within its household waste.

| 2014/15 | Residual Waste | | Co-Mingled Recycling | | Other Recycling | | Household Waste Stream | | Recycled | Recycled |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| | Percentage | Tonnes | Percentage | Tonnes | Percentage | Tonnes | Tonnes | Percentage | Tonnes | Percentage |
| Paper/Card | 14.0% | 32,432 | 64.6% | 43,665 | N/A | 871 | 76,968 | 24.4% | 44,536 | 57.9% |
| Plastic Film | 7.4% | 17,143 | | | N/A | | 17,143 | 5.4% | - | 0.0% |
| Dense Plastic | 7.1% | 16,448 | 7.8% | 5,272 | N/A | | 21,720 | 6.9% | 5,272 | 24.3% |
| Textiles | 3.1% | 7,181 | | | N/A | 178 | 7,359 | 2.3% | 178 | 2.4% |
| Misc Comb | 12.1% | 28,081 | | | N/A | | 28,081 | 8.9% | - | 0.0% |
| Misc non Comb | 1.5% | 3,475 | | | N/A | | 3,475 | 1.1% | - | 0.0% |
| Glass | 4.2% | 9,730 | 24.5% | 16,560 | N/A | 3 | 26,293 | 8.3% | 16,563 | 63.0% |
| Putrescibles | 44.9% | 104,015 | | | N/A | 4,784 | 108,800 | 34.4% | 4,784 | 4.4% |
| Ferrous Metal | 1.5% | 3,475 | 1.7% | 1,149 | N/A | 607 | 5,231 | 1.7% | 1,756 | 33.6% |
| Non Ferrous Metal | 1.0% | 2,317 | 1.0% | 676 | N/A | | 2,993 | 0.9% | 676 | 22.6% |
| WEEE | 1.2% | 2,780 | 0.4% | 270 | N/A | 1,569 | 4,619 | 1.5% | 1,839 | 39.8% |
| Pot Hazard | 0.9% | 2,085 | | | N/A | | 2,085 | 0.7% | | |
| Fines | 1.1% | 2,548 | | | N/A | | 2,548 | 0.8% | | |
| Other Materials | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 8,741 | 8,741 | 2.8% | 8,741 | |
| Totals | 100.00% | 231,660 | 100.00% | 67,593 | | 16,752 | 316,005 | 100.0% | 84,345 | 26.7% |

42. Not all of that material will be from drinks cans. Applying the estimates overleaf of the percentage of drinks containers within each waste type gives the tonnages and recycling performance overleaf.

| | Percentage Drinks Containers | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|------------|-------|
| | Residual | Co-Mingled | Other |
| Glass | 60% | 92% | 92% |
| Plastic | 15% | 33% | 33% |
| Metals | 42% | 47% | 47% |

| | WRWA Drinks Container Tonnes - Current | | | Total | % Recyced |
|--------------|--|---------------|----------|---------------|------------------|
| | Residual | Co-Mingled | Other | | |
| Glass | 5,838 | 15,235 | 3 | 21,076 | 72% |
| Plastic | 2,467 | 1,740 | - | 4,207 | 41% |
| Metals | 973 | 318 | - | 1,291 | 25% |
| Total | 9,278 | 17,293 | 3 | 26,574 | 65% |

43. A report in October 2017 by Eunomia estimates that around 82% of glass, 12% of plastic and 3% of aluminium drinks containers could be diverted from the waste stream as a result of introducing a Deposit Return Scheme (DRRS).

44. The Authority's waste costs are currently around £150/tonne for residual waste and a £50/tonne net cost for glass recycled through its Materials Recycling Facility (MRF). Plastic bottles and aluminium cans, recycled through the MRF, generate a net income of around £100 and £700/tonne respectively. Plastic milk bottles, which are made from more valuable HDPE (currently worth over £400 per tonne), are usually excluded from DRRS schemes and it is therefore reasonable to assume that local authorities would still continue to collect and recycle them with other materials.

45. Using these costs and values, and ignoring any collection costs incurred by the constituent councils, if a DRRS achieved the diversion rates estimated by Eunomia above, from both the residual and recycling waste streams, the Authority would save around £1.4 million a year.

46. The biggest factor in this is the cost of glass. A 1% of diversion achieved from either the residual, or the recycling waste stream, saves the Authority around £8,000. An 82% diversion rate from both would therefore save around £1.3million a year.
47. With plastics, a 1% diversion rate would give a net saving to the Authority of around £2,000 per annum – a £3,500 saving in residual waste costs being mitigated by a net loss of £1,500 in recycling income. A 12% diversion rate from both would therefore save the Authority around £24,000 per annum.
48. A 1% diversion rate of aluminium cans would result in a net cost to the Authority of around £800 per annum – a £1,700 saving in residual waste costs being offset by a £2,500 loss of recycling income. A 4% diversion rate from both would therefore lose the Authority around £3,200 per annum.
49. The potential gains and losses with respect to plastic bottles and aluminium cans respectively are therefore relatively small and, given the fact that residual waste prices are likely to increase and commodity values may decrease – particularly for plastics in the short term if China stops imports and oil prices remain low.
50. In economic terms, the Authority and therefore its constituent councils and all their council tax payers would be better off from the introduction of a DRRS.
51. Indeed, the same must be true for taxpayers in other two-tier areas, where both the district (collection) and county (disposal) council levy charges directly on the council tax payer. Any potential loss of recycling income (including any recycling credits) for a district council ought to be outweighed by significantly greater savings for the county council.
52. A DRRS scheme ought to divert material from the residual waste stream, as well as current recycling schemes, and this will result in environmental savings as more material is moved up the waste hierarchy. The corresponding improvement in the quality of the material collected will also help ensure the viability of the recycling process itself.
53. The removal of broken glass from local authority co-mingled recycling collections will also enable other materials, notably Textiles (which is another carbon intensive material), to be collected along with paper, cardboard and plastics and ought to reduce the residual waste stream even further. In addition, glass is a highly abrasive material and MRF operational costs should also reduce significantly if this material transfers to a DRRS.

54. It has been argued that the introduction of a DRRS would lead to the cost of drinks rising by more than the deposit fee, in order to pay for the new collection infrastructure. However, this additional cost will be recovered directly by the individual consumer, not all council tax payers, and this better aligns with the “polluter pays” principle. Natural market factors should also ensure that any additional costs of this type are minimised.
55. Collection cost savings have not been factored into this analysis, but the reduced tonnage will result in reduced fuel costs for local authorities and, conceivably, through a corresponding reduction in the volume of material (perhaps as much as 30%) it could also lead to reductions in vehicle numbers and staff.
56. A DRRS should also give rise to a significant reduction in littering, as people would be directly incentivised not to throw their drinks containers away and to pick up any that have been. Again, this ought to translate into an economic saving for local authorities and an environmental saving for everyone. There is an argument that a DRRS would encourage scavenging for drinks containers from litter bins and result in more litter as a consequence, but this has not been a problem in countries which have a DRRS already.
57. The introduction of a DRRS will have many wider environmental benefits, including raising environmental awareness and helping with behaviour change. Reusing glass containers as opposed to recycling them will use significantly less energy and help reduce the carbon impact on the environment.
58. The points expressed above have been translated into the Authority’s response to the government’s consultation document (only questions that are concerned with the Authority’s sphere of operations were answered), as set out in Appendix D to this report, which incorporates comments on an earlier draft received by email from Members. The Authority is asked to formally endorse the response.

RECOMMENDATIONS

59. The Authority is asked to:
- a) approve the draft tender briefs attached as Appendices A, B and C to this report;
 - b) endorse the Authority’s response to the government’s consultation on a ‘Deposit or Reward and Return Scheme’ (DRRS) for drinks containers; and

- c) otherwise receive this report as information.
-

M. Broxup
GENERAL MANAGER

Western Riverside Transfer Station
Smugglers Way
Wandsworth
SW18 1JS.

13th November2017



Executive Summary

Western Riverside Waste Authority, “the Authority”, was established in 1986 as an autonomous statutory local government body to undertake the waste disposal functions prescribed by the Local Government Act 1985 and the Waste Disposal (Authorities) Order 1985, for the London boroughs of Hammersmith & Fulham, Lambeth, Wandsworth and the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.

Background

The Authority’s first Joint Waste Management Strategy was produced in 2006 and was revised in July 2013. It is hoped that the final outcome of the work specified in this document will ultimately lead to the development of a new Joint Waste Policy for the Authority and the constituent councils during 2018.

In June 2017, the Authority considered a report on recycling performance (Paper No. WRWA 832) attached as Appendix A, which led to a seminar taking place for Authority Members in September 2017. The outcomes from the seminar were discussed at the Authority’s September 2017 Committee meeting (Paper No. WRWA 837) and this Paper is attached as Appendix B to this brief.

Authority officers subsequently held a meeting with officers from the constituent councils to further discuss the matter. Following on from these meetings a number of proposed waste minimisation initiatives were developed to focus on reducing the waste types in the waste stream that make up the largest proportion of constituent councils’ disposal budgets. These proposals are detailed in Appendix C, attached as background information.

Scope

Building on the work detailed above this tender request seeks to commission a suitably experienced consultant to continue to develop this work stream, specifically as follows:

- i. examine the accuracy of the data used to prepare Appendix A and the reasonableness of the conclusions drawn from it;
- ii. identify any differences in performance between the constituent councils on different waste types;
- iii. the suitability of having a range of performance targets, as opposed to the current ‘one size fits all’ weight based recycling target;

- iv. the enhancement of the current recycling programme with a new focus on the proposed waste minimisation initiatives; and
- v. draft a new joint waste policy document for the Authority and its constituent councils.

Time schedule

| Date | Event |
|------|---|
| | Request for Tender Proposals sent out to Consultants. |
| | Deadline for proposal submission. |
| | Shortlisted Consultants invited for interview. |
| | Successful Consultant Appointed. |
| | Draft Report submitted for comment. |
| | Final Report Submitted. |

Proposal requirements

Consultants are requested to:

1. Provide a detailed project plan detailing the full scope of the work they propose to carry out.
2. Confirm that the timeline for completing the work is achievable and acceptable.
3. Provide a fixed price, including a full breakdown of costs with separate pricing for the additional work requested by the boroughs.
4. Provide details of the personnel who will manage the project and produce the report, including details of their previous relevant experience and a named principal contact person.
5. Confirm availability of key personnel.

Proposal submission

Proposals are due before 4pm on XXXXXXXX. Please send to Sharon Ross, Deputy General Manager, WRWA Smugglers Way, London SW18 1JS or by email to: Sharon@wrwa.gov.uk

Evaluation of proposals

Proposals will be assessed on the basis of information provided by the Consultant at the time of the proposal submission. Proposals will be evaluated with specific regards to:

- A demonstration of an understanding of the project and identification of the key issues.
- A demonstration of a commitment to timelines and ability to meet objectives set out.

- Competitive price and suitable budgeting. The percentage weighting for quality/experience versus price will be 60/40.
- Personnel expertise in project management of similar work and effective reporting.

The Authority and the Council reserve the right to not accept all proposals submitted and to not proceed with the project.

Questions regarding this request for proposal should be directed to Sharon Ross by phone on 020 8871 2788 or by email to sharon@wrwa.gov.uk. All questions and responses will be copied to all shortlisted consultants.

DRAFT



Executive Summary

Western Riverside Waste Authority, “the Authority”, was established in 1986 as an autonomous statutory local government body to undertake the waste disposal functions prescribed by the Local Government Act 1985 and the Waste Disposal (Authorities) Order 1985, for the London boroughs of Hammersmith and Fulham, Lambeth, Wandsworth and the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.

Background

Recycle Western Riverside (RWR) is an outreach campaign which encourages residents to Reduce, Reuse and Recycle their rubbish (the three R's). The campaign has been running since 2002. RWR runs communication campaigns to promote the three R's using Borough Publications, local newspapers, borough waste and recycling collection vehicles, bus shelter advertising, Facebook, Twitter as well as the Authority and partner websites. Various themes are communicated, from recycling at Christmas to reducing contamination in the recycling stream.

In June 2017, the Authority considered a report on recycling performance (Paper No. WRWA 832) attached as Appendix A, which led to a seminar taking place for Authority Members in September 2017. The outcomes from the seminar were discussed at the Authority's September 2017 Committee meeting (Paper No. WRWA 837). The Paper is attached as Appendix B to this tender request.

Authority officers subsequently held a meeting with officers from the constituent councils to further discuss the matter. Following on from these meetings a number of proposed waste minimisation initiatives were developed to focus primarily on reducing the waste types in the waste stream that make up the largest proportion of constituent councils disposal budgets. These proposals are detailed in Appendix C to this tender request.

Communications and Marketing Expertise

Building on the work detailed above this tender request seeks to commission a suitably experienced consultant to work with officers to develop communications messages to the target audiences. It is anticipated that this will involve a range of channels designed to reach different target groups and we will look to the consultant to identify the best channels/ media to communicate and promote the proposed waste minimisation initiatives to residents. Some of the proposed initiatives will need to target certain groups, e.g. a real nappy campaign will

need to target prospective parents/carers. The Authority currently makes limited use of Facebook and Twitter and is particularly interested in exploring advanced use of social media in order to target specific groups.

Time schedule

| Date | Event |
|------|---|
| | Request for Tender Proposals sent out to Consultants. |
| | Deadline for proposal submission. |
| | Shortlisted Consultants invited for interview. |
| | Successful Consultant Appointed. |
| | Draft Report submitted for comment. |
| | Final Report Submitted. |

Proposal requirements

Consultants are requested to:

1. Provide a detailed project plan detailing the full scope of the work they propose to carry out.
2. Confirm that the timeline for completing the work is achievable and acceptable.
3. Provide a fixed price, including a full breakdown of costs with separate pricing for the additional work requested by the boroughs.
4. Provide details of the personnel who will manage the project and produce the report, including details of their previous relevant experience and a named principal contact person.
5. Confirm availability of key personnel.

Proposal submission

Proposals are due before 4pm on XXXXXXXX. Please send to Sharon Ross, Deputy General Manager, WRWA Smugglers Way, London SW18 1JS or by email to: Sharon@wrwa.gov.uk

Evaluation of proposals

Proposals will be assessed on the basis of information provided by the Consultant at the time of the proposal submission. Proposals will be evaluated with specific regards to:

- A demonstration of an understanding of the project and identification of the key issues.

- A demonstration of a commitment to timelines and ability to meet objectives set out.
- Competitive price and suitable budgeting. The percentage weighting for quality/experience versus price will be 60/40.
- Personnel expertise in project management of similar work and effective reporting.

The Authority and the Council reserve the right to not accept all proposals submitted and to not proceed with the project.

Questions regarding this request for proposal should be directed to Sharon Ross by phone on 020 8871 2788 or by email to sharon@wrwa.gov.uk . All questions and responses will be copied to all shortlisted consultants.



Executive Summary

Western Riverside Waste Authority was established in 1986 as an autonomous statutory local government body to undertake the waste disposal functions prescribed by the Local Government Act 1985 and the Waste Disposal (Authorities) Order 1985. The Authority invite suitably qualified and experienced consultants to submit a fixed price proposal to carry out a **Waste Composition Analysis** across the Authority's area namely the London Boroughs of Hammersmith & Fulham, Lambeth, Wandsworth and the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea.

Background

Residents in the London Boroughs of Hammersmith & Fulham, Lambeth and Wandsworth receive a weekly collection of residual waste and dry recycling (although some properties in Hammersmith and Fulham receive twice weekly collections). Lambeth residents also receive a weekly collection of food and garden waste. The residents in Kensington and Chelsea receive twice weekly collections for both residual waste and recycling.

Waste Composition Surveys are an effective means for local authorities to evaluate the performance of waste and recycling services and to provide comprehensive information about the composition of the waste and recycling streams.

Waste Composition Surveys were carried out in September 2009 and October 2014 when representative residue waste and recycling samples were collected from various residences within the WRWA area. Households from certain socio-demographic groups were used as a basis for sampling in each Borough.

In 2010 WRWA opened a brand new Materials Recycling Facility at Smugglers Way in Wandsworth. Previously all the co-mingled material collected by the four constituent boroughs was processed by a third party MRF, but since 2011 the majority of co-mingled material has been processed at the Smugglers Way MRF. A sampling system was also established in 2011 which revealed a considerable higher level of contamination when compared to the levels reported by the third party MRF.

Scope

The 2014 survey will be the baseline measurement for the new survey; the new survey must therefore, replicate the 2014 survey to ensure that a direct comparison can be made. {Detail service changes}. The Western Riverside Waste Composition Analysis 2014 Final Report is attached as Appendix A.

One of the main objectives of the survey is to determine how much recycling material remains in the residual waste stream.

This should include:

- a breakdown of the types of paper and card, i.e. newspaper, magazines and other common categories,
- targeted bottles & jar,
- targeted metals, cans and tins or e.g. pots & pans.
- In addition the survey should detail the amount of food waste contained in the putrescible residual waste.
- The proportion of nappies in the residual waste.

The final report should include a comparison with the findings of the 2014 survey and should be produced by XX November 2018.

An area of the tipping hall floor at the Smugglers Way Waste Transfer Station will be sectioned off for the sorting and separation to be carried out. The successful contractor must provide all the necessary protective clothing for their staff and any other necessary equipment. WRWA will also require a copy of the appropriate risk assessments for the staff deployed.

Time schedule

| Date | Event |
|------|--|
| | Request for Tender Proposals sent out to Consultants |
| | Deadline for proposal submission |
| | Consultants notified of decision |
| | Work to commence |
| | Work to be completed |

Proposal requirements

Consultants are requested to:

1. Provide a detailed project plan detailing the full scope of the work including the methodology for sampling and information on how the project team will collect the samples without interruption to the collection rounds (bearing in mind the previous survey must be replicated).
2. Explain the methodology behind sample sizes where whole bins are not being surveyed.
3. Explain how sensitivities around “bin snooping” and confidentiality concerning personal information found in the waste.

4. Confirm that the timeline for completing the work is achievable and acceptable.
5. A health and safety method statement relating to the collection and sorting of the samples.
6. How the data will be recorded.
7. Provide a fixed price, including a full breakdown of costs with separate pricing for the additional work requested by the boroughs.
8. Provide details of the personnel who will manage the campaign and produce the report, including details of their previous relevant experience and a named principal contact person.
9. Confirm availability of key personnel.

Proposal submission

Proposals are due before 4pm on XXXXX Please send to Sharon Ross, Deputy General Manager WRWA Smugglers Way, London SW18 1JS or by email to: sharon@wrwa.gov.uk

Evaluation of proposals

Proposals will be assessed on the basis of information provided by the Consultant at the time of the proposal submission. Proposals will be evaluated with specific regards to:

- A demonstration of an understanding of the project and identification of the key issues.
- A demonstration of a commitment to timelines and ability to meet objectives set out.
- Competitive price and suitable budgeting.
- Personnel expertise in project management of similar work and effective reporting.

Questions regarding this request for proposal should be directed to Sharon Ross by email to sharon@wrwa.gov.uk. All questions and responses will be copied to all shortlisted consultants.

**Response by the Western Riverside Waste Authority to the Call for evidence
on voluntary and economic incentives to reduce littering of drinks containers
and promote recycling**

Introduction

The Western Riverside Waste Authority was established in 1986 as an autonomous statutory local government body to undertake the waste disposal functions prescribed by the Local Government Act 1985 and the Waste Regulation and Disposal (Authorities) Order 1985.

The Authority assumed responsibility for post collection waste treatment on behalf of four London Boroughs; Hammersmith & Fulham, Lambeth, Wandsworth and the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea. It is managed by a Committee made up of two elected Councillors from each of these four borough councils.

The Authority manages around 400,000 tonnes of waste and recyclables per year, in a safe and cost effective manner. Most of this is household waste generated by a population of nearly 1,000,000 residents within its four constituent boroughs. The borough councils have the duty to arrange for the collection of this waste.

Q15. Would you support the carry on 'as normal' approach? If so, what elements of continuing 'as normal' make you think this is the best approach?

No.

If you answered no to the question above, why do you feel further action is needed?

Waste management needs to more closely follow the "Polluter Pays" principle. Producers, Packers and Retailers need to be directly responsible for whole lifecycle of the goods and packaging that they put into the market place. The cost of a 'Deposit or Reward and Return Scheme' (DRRS), will be factored into the retail price just like any other and it will ultimately fall to the individual consumer.

The current system absolves the Producers, Packers and Retailers and their customers from any responsibility post the point of sale and society as a whole is paying the economic and environmental cost.

- Q16. **What aspects do you value in the current approach that you would not want to lose?**

There is no reason to suppose that existing local authority recycling schemes cannot continue to operate in addition to a DRRS as other recyclables will still need to be collected by local authorities.

- Q17. **What impacts might a deposit or reward and return scheme have on:**

Littering Rates?

These ought to reduce as people become directly incentivised not to discard drinks containers and to pick up any that have been.

Recycling Rates?

Local Authority recycling performance will decrease as material moves across to a Deposit or Reward and Return Scheme (DRRS) but overall there will be an increase in municipal recycling rates across England as the DRRS moves more material out of the residual waste stream.

Local Authority Household Collections and associated costs (and revenues)?

Street sweeping and park cleaning costs (and revenues)?

Wider environmental impacts? For instance, as evidenced through Life Cycle Assessments (energy, carbon, water etc.)

The table below shows that the Authority currently estimates that it is recycling 63% of all the glass, 24% of the all dense plastics and 22% of all non-ferrous metals within its household waste stream.

Not all of that material will be from drinks cans. Applying the estimates overleaf of the percentage of drinks containers within each waste type gives the tonnages and recycling performance below.

| | Percentage Drinks Containers | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|------------|-------|
| | Residual | Co-Mingled | Other |
| Glass | 60% | 92% | 92% |
| Plastic | 15% | 33% | 33% |
| Metals | 42% | 47% | 47% |

| | WRWA Drinks Container Tonnes - Current | | | | % Recycled |
|---------|--|------------|-------|--------|------------|
| | Residual | Co-Mingled | Other | Total | |
| Glass | 5,838 | 15,235 | 3 | 21,076 | 72% |
| Plastic | 2,467 | 1,740 | - | 4,207 | 41% |
| Metals | 973 | 318 | - | 1,291 | 25% |
| Total | 9,278 | 17,293 | 3 | 26,574 | 65% |

A report in October 2017 by Eunomia estimates that around 82% of glass, 12% plastic and 3% of aluminium drinks containers could be diverted from the waste stream as a result of introducing a Deposit Return Scheme (DRRS).

The Authority's waste costs are currently around £150/tonne for residual waste and a £50/tonne net cost for glass recycled through its Materials Recycling Facility (MRF). Plastic bottles and aluminium cans, recycled through the MRF, generate a net income of around £100 and £700/tonne respectively. Plastic milk bottle, which are made from more valuable HDPE (currently worth over £400 per tonne) bottles, are usually excluded from DRRS schemes and it is therefore reasonable to assume that local authorities would still continue to collect and recycle them with other materials.

Using these costs and values, and ignoring any collection costs incurred by the constituent councils, if a DRRS achieved the diversion rates estimated by Eunomia above, from both the residual and recycling waste streams, the Authority would save around £1.4 million a year.

The biggest factor in this is the cost of glass. A 1% of diversion achieved from either the residual, or the recycling waste stream, saves the Authority around

£8,000. An 82% diversion rate from both would therefore save around £1.3million a year.

With plastics, a 1% diversion rate would give a net saving to the Authority of around £2,000 per annum - a £3,500 saving in residual waste costs being mitigated by a net loss of £1,500 in recycling income. A 12% diversion rate from both would therefore save the Authority around £24,000 per annum.

A 1% diversion rate of aluminium cans would result in a net cost to the Authority of around £800 per annum - a £1,700 saving in residual waste costs being offset by a £2,500 loss of recycling income. A 4% diversion rate from both would therefore lose the Authority around £3,200 per annum.

The potential gains and losses with respect to plastic bottles and aluminium cans respectively are therefore relatively small and given the fact that residual waste prices are likely to increase and commodity values may decrease - particularly for plastics in the short term if China stops imports and oil prices remain low.

In economic terms, the Authority and therefore its constituent councils and all their council tax payers would be better off from the introduction of a DRRS.

Indeed, the same must be true for taxpayers in other two tier areas, where both the district (collection) and county (disposal) council levy charges directly on the council tax payer. Any potential loss of recycling income (including any recycling credits) for a district council ought to be outweighed by significantly greater savings for the county council.

A DRRS scheme ought to divert material from the residual waste stream as well as current recycling schemes and this will result in environmental savings as more material is moved up the waste hierarchy. The corresponding improvement in the quality of the material collected will also help ensure the viability of the recycling process itself.

The removal of broken glass from local authority co-mingled recycling collections will also enable other materials, notably Textiles (which is another carbon intensive material), to be collected along with paper, cardboard and plastics and ought to reduce the residual waste stream even further. Glass is also a highly abrasive material and MRF operational costs should also reduce significantly if this material transfers to a DRRS.

It has been argued that the introduction of a DRRS would lead to the cost of drinks rising by more than the deposit fee, in order to pay for the new collection infrastructure. However, this additional cost will be recovered directly by the individual consumer and not all council tax payers and this better aligns with the “polluter pays” principle. Natural market factors should also ensure that any additional costs of this type are minimised.

Collection cost savings have not been factored into this analysis but the reduced tonnage will result in reduced fuel costs for local authorities and conceivably, through a corresponding reduction in the volume of material (perhaps as much as 30%), it could also lead to reductions in vehicle numbers and staff.

A DRRS should give rise to a significant reduction in littering as people would be directly incentivised not to throw their drinks containers away and to pick up any that have. Again this ought to translate into an economic saving for local authorities and an environmental saving for everyone. There is an argument that a DRRS would encourage scavenging for drinks containers from litter bins and result in more litter as a consequence but this has not been a problem in countries which have a DRRS already.

The introduction of a DRRS will have many wider environmental benefits, including raising environmental awareness and helping with behaviour change. Reusing glass containers as opposed to recycling them will use significantly less energy and help reduce the carbon impact on the environment.

In countries such as Germany, Denmark and Norway a higher rate of reuse/recycling for glass, cans and plastic bottles is achieved at over 90% compared to 57% that is currently being achieved in England.

A DRRS could also help to reduce the 8,000,000 tonnes of plastic that enters the oceans every year with 80% coming from land. DRRS's are a tried-and-tested ways of dramatically increasing reuse/recycling rates while reducing plastic pollution on our beaches, in our streets and across the countryside.

- 18. What evidence is there that a deposit return or reward and return scheme may enhance or otherwise affect the value or quality of materials sent for recycling?**

Collecting any material in a controlled environment will always improve its quality. Local authority household collection systems are not controlled environments and contamination is a problem.

Glass is very abrasive and a major maintenance factor at MRFs. Reducing the glass content in co-mingled recycling collections will reduce improve MRF performance and plant availability due to reduced maintenance outages.

19. What other benefits may accrue from a well-designed and well run deposit scheme

Having glass containers within a DRRS will greatly increase the opportunity not just to recycle glass bottles but to reuse them and therefore recoup even greater environmental benefits.

24. What evidence is there that a deposit or reward and return scheme could sit successfully alongside existing waste management systems and regulations?

For instance, what evidence is there that such schemes could sit successfully alongside Local Authority waste collection arrangements, Packaging Regulations and the Packaging Waste Recovery Note (PRN) system, etc.)?

What mitigating arrangements would be needed to ensure such schemes would not reduce the effectiveness or increase the costs of existing waste management systems and regulations in England?

Experience in other countries and the fact that other waste streams are currently managed by multiple players in both the private and public sector would suggest that a DRRS could sit successfully alongside existing waste management systems.

It is difficult to see how, in practice, the Producer Responsibility Obligations (Packaging Waste) Regulations have assisted local authorities in their duty to collect household waste. A DRRS would be a transparent and direct “polluter pays” model.

In our answer to Question 17 we have demonstrated how the introduction of a DRRS will significantly reduce local authority costs – not increase them.

Reducing glass tonnages within co-mingled recycling streams will also increase the effectiveness of MRFs and improve the quality of other materials.

26. If a well-designed and well run deposit system were introduced how do you think this intervention should be introduced in England to optimise its effectiveness and cost / benefit (e.g. direct regulation, co-regulation, voluntary agreement, etc.)?

Who would be the key players be in implementing the intervention?
What governance arrangements would need to be in place?

Who would be responsible for the cost, management and collection aspects of the scheme to make it self-sustaining? If relevant, please list known examples in other countries where your suggested operational model is in use.

The Authority believes that a DRRS scheme should be introduced via direct regulation and the responsibility for implementing managing and paying for such a scheme should be in line with other producer compliance schemes such as those for End of Life vehicles and Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE).
