Towards an Efficient

Waste Prevention 'Network'

A Scoping Study

Mike Read Associates
July 2007
Updated 15 August 2007

Contents

Copies of this report are available to download from
www.beyondrecycling.net/scopingstudy/

Executive Summary

This report presents the outcomes of a scoping study for a possible waste prevention 'network'. The study comprised a consultation exercise, workshops and discussions held between January and July 2007.

The study explored how a dedicated municipal waste *prevention* network could be an important and valuable component of developing waste management policy and practice in the UK, especially now prevention has been highlighted as a key priority in the Waste Strategy for England 2007, as well as the Household Waste Prevention Action Plan (Scotland), etc.

The consultation exercise was well supported and detailed views were received from 46 stakeholders spanning government departments and agencies, local authorities, academic institutes, NGOs and consultancies. As summary of headline responses to the consultation follows the Executive Summary and a full analysis of responses is provided at the end of this report.

In addition to highlighting the need to raise awareness of waste prevention, and of how it differs from and is a higher priority than recycling, respondents to the consultation indicated a strong preference for an initiative that provided opportunities for sharing ideas, information and best practice. A network that took a more active role in shaping policy, strategy, projects, and monitoring was also suggested by many respondents.

The recommendations, summarised below, are not for a conventional 'network', but for a pro-active '**evidence network**' (designed in part to complement Defra's Wastenet), running in parallel to a waste prevention '**development alliance**'. This structure reflects (a) the rapidly evolving nature of the subject and (b) the important and urgent nature of waste prevention in achieving policy goals not just related to waste management but also of tackling climate change, and achieving 'One Planet Living', while retaining commercial competitiveness for UK business.

Based on the consultation it is recommended for a two-year period to:

1. **Provide a 'supra-network' information system for harvesting news, information and case studies from the many existing sources that have relevance to waste prevention. Then assessing, sifting and summarising relevant information through carefully prepared regular email newsletters, with a linked, layered approach allowing access to further details as required by participants.**
2. **Provide national annual conferences on waste prevention.**
3. **Provide a dedicated website with a web forum.**
4. **Carry out an outreach programme to diverse sectors and stakeholder groups.**
5. **Establish objectives, targets and participant expectations for an innovative waste prevention development alliance.**

Although in the first instance the primary focus would be *municipal* waste prevention, liaison with industrial and retail sectors would prove mutually beneficial in many

aspects, and these would be included insofar as this *enables* municipal waste prevention. It is not recommended at this stage for the network to cover composting.

Many organisations and networks already cover waste prevention to a limited extent. However, research for this report has shown that no single network covers more than a fraction of the interested stakeholders, and existing relevant organisations focus heavily on recycling. As a result it has been strongly expressed by workshop participants and consultation respondents that a widely inclusive initiative is required with a fresh and distinct focus on waste prevention. The question of how 'waste prevention' relates to resource efficiency has been raised. They are in some ways the same thing viewed simply from a different angle. Indeed a waste prevention 'network' could valuably help to bridge gaps between the conventional waste management sector and debates on sustainable consumption and production.

Indications are given of the resources that would be needed to deliver the core recommendations, and it is also recommended to explore further the funding options suggested by respondents. The estimated total resource requirements for the Waste Prevention Evidence Network are 1.3 FTE plus £14,750/year for two years. The estimated total resource requirements for the Waste Prevention Development Alliance are 0.4 FTE plus £1,500 for three months then 0.6 FTE plus £16,000 over 21 months.

Mike Read Associates

www.mikeread.org   www.beyondrecycling.net

Headline Responses to the Consultation

The points listed below are the most frequent **answers given by respondents** to the consultation questions.

Waste Prevention

Challenges for waste prevention
- Behaviour change and awareness-raising, especially awareness of the link between consumption and waste, and that waste prevention is important, and different from recycling
- Adequate regulation and taxation structures
- Well-considered, clear and specific messages

Opportunities for waste prevention
- Cost saving
- Assisting in reaching other targets (such as diversion, recycling and composting), LATS performance and achieving BVPI 84
- Reduced need for new facilities

Major priorities for waste prevention
(A) objectives and responsibilities
- Linking waste generation with design, production and retailing
- Behaviour change and raising awareness

(B) materials and products
- Materials produced in higher quantities or posing greater environmental burden
- Items not so easily recycled, e.g. composite packaging and disposable nappies

A Waste Prevention Network

Most useful from a waste prevention 'network'
- Sharing ideas, information and best practice
- Contacts
- Co-operative work

Organisations are prepared to contribute
- Case studies, data sets, skills and experience
- Contacts
- Policy input
- Facilities

Differences a waste prevention 'network' should make in two years
- Government buy-in as a policy 'owner'
- Auditable figures for waste prevention
- Widespread understanding of waste prevention
- Cross-sectoral awareness, partnerships and co-operative approaches

How it Might Work

Most efficient ways to harvest and disseminate information
* Email newsletter
* Conferences
* Website
* Web forum

Membership of relevant networks, etc.
* 50 networks, etc. referred to
* At most 23% of respondents belong to any one of these existing networks

Essential ingredients for a network
* Clear terms of reference
* Common purpose among participants
* Energetic leader and/or co-ordinator
* Good communication

To be avoided
* Information overload
* Duplication

What a waste prevention 'network' should do differently
* Cross-sectoral working with a wider range of stakeholders than elsewhere

Suggestions for funding
* Government funding in one form or another, primarily from Defra
* Sponsorship

Scope

Should home or community composting be included?
* No clear conclusion

What disciplines, sectors and organisations should be included?
* A very wide range of suggestions, please refer to report for more detail

Other comments and suggestions
* No additional questions were suggested, and few additional comments made, indicating consultation questions had allowed respondents to adequately present their views and ideas

Rationale for the Scoping Study

It is increasingly acknowledged by those involved professionally in municipal waste management that waste *prevention* needs greater prominence. This is not only to achieve more sustainable waste management, but also as a significant contribution to climate change mitigation, resource efficiency, and 'One Planet Living'. This has recently been highlighted in the Waste Strategy for England 2007. There is also growing interest in the notion that enhanced recycling services and promotion may in the future - or already - sanction unsustainable levels of consumption.

There are indications that waste prevention offers considerable economic, social and environmental benefits that have yet to be fully explored and exploited. Yet while its potential role is considerable, as a discipline it is in many ways in its infancy. In recent years, despite the theoretical priority given to prevention over recycling and waste disposal (e.g. in the government's Waste Strategy for England and Wales 2000), the greater part of resources allocated to 'sustainable waste management' has been directed at recycling.

A national *Beyond Recycling 2006* conference was held in Dorchester on November 2, 2006 as part of Defra research contract WRT264. At this conference, attended by over 100 experts in various aspects of waste management and behaviour change, over 80% of delegates expressed support, often strongly, for a proposal for a multi-disciplinary *waste prevention network* in the UK. A number of delegates indicated that such a network was urgently needed. The enthusiasm with which the idea was received underlined a need for something fresh and additional to what is already present. Strong support for a separate and distinct focus on waste prevention was also expressed at Recycle North's conference in Nottingham in January 2007 and the National Resource and Waste Forum meeting in Reading in March 2007. This support was largely based on four observations:

- Waste prevention needs to be given significantly greater **prominence** in policy and strategy, in order to allow waste prevention activity to reach a level commensurate with its importance.

- **Diverse and distinct expertise and skills are required** to plan, implement and monitor waste prevention.

- **Different behaviour change techniques** are likely to be required to promote waste prevention.

- While many organisations theoretically cover both recycling and waste prevention, **in practice recycling continues to take the major share of attention and resources**.

Following *Beyond Recycling 2006* and further discussions with stakeholders, a proposal was developed to carry out a scoping study for a possible Waste Prevention 'Network'. In order to explore options for such a 'network', Defra have funded this scoping study, which to a large extent has been based on a detailed consultation process.

> ### *Assumptions*
>
> Within the context of the scoping study it has been assumed that:
>
> - A 'network' would have the objective*: to make a significant and cost-effective contribution to sustainable waste management policy and practice in the UK through facilitating sharing of information, understanding and expertise in waste prevention between all those with a role to play in its implementation and evaluation.*
>
> - Behaviour change needs to be included alongside practical waste prevention activities, as well as monitoring and evaluation of both.
>
> - Although in the first instance the primary focus of a network would be *municipal* waste prevention, liaison with industrial and retail sectors may prove mutually beneficial in many aspects, and these sectors would be included insofar as this *enables* municipal and domestic waste prevention.
>
> - 'Waste prevention' is interpreted in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) sense as *a subset of waste minimisation, i.e. prevention being avoidance, reduction at source and reuse of products, as distinct from recovery (including recycling) and disposal*. This is essentially a beginning-of-pipe approach and includes issues such as design, efficient production and use, and levels of consumption.
>
> - It remains to be determined whether home and community composting would be considered to fall within the definition of waste prevention in the context of a network.
>
> - A network should cover England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.
>
> - Although local authorities might have a major role, given the increasing recognition of other players in waste prevention and behaviour change, a network would not be exclusively focused on local authorities.

Waste Prevention in UK National Strategies

The *Waste Strategy for England 2007*[1] was released after the consultation process for this report had been carried out and while this report was being prepared. It indicated that a significantly greater emphasis will be placed on waste prevention in coming years.

Waste prevention in *Waste Strategy for England 2007*

- First key objective: *"Decouple waste growth in all sectors from economic growth and put more emphasis on **waste prevention and re-use**".*

- *"A greater focus on waste prevention will be recognised through **a new target to reduce the amount of household waste not re-used, recycled or composted** from over 22.2 million tonnes in 2000 by **29% to 15.8 million tones with an aspiration to reduce it to 12.2 million tones in 2020 – a reduction of 45%".***

- *"The Government is…to develop, in due course, **eco-design requirements** which will consider waste impacts as part of the wider life-cycle assessment of energy using products…".*

- *"The Government will…[make] greater use of **third sector expertise**, particularly to prevent waste…".*

- *"There has been little focus on waste prevention and the traditional methods of dealing with our waste did not require a wide range of organisations and individuals to be actively involved in waste. For the future much more active participation will be needed from businesses, including retailers, from public sector producers of waste, from the third sector, and from members of the public".*

- (Referring to information and awareness) *"The **Government will** extend existing approaches into waste prevention".*

(All with original emphasis)

During the course of this scoping study the *Household Waste Prevention Action Plan (Scotland)*[2] was also released. This contains 20 detailed Action Points for waste prevention. These make a very useful contribution to structures for implementing waste prevention, and are reproduced for information in an Appendix to this report.

The *Northern Ireland Waste Management Strategy 2006-2020*[3] also places greater emphasis through a separate policy strand on waste prevention, and sets out a range on initiatives to be applied across all sectors.

The *Waste Strategy for Wales*[4] was produced in 2002, and contains relatively little specifically on waste prevention, perhaps reflecting its age, and much of what is present is based on encouragement and voluntary measures. There are some

---

[1] www.defra.gov.uk/environment/waste/strategy/
[2] www.sepa.org.uk/nws/prevention/action_plan.html
[3] www.ehsni.gov.uk/wms.17.pdf
[4]new.wales.gov.uk/topics/environmentcountryside/epq/waste_recycling/wise_about_waste_strategy?lang=en

targets for minimisation, *viz*. a target for the public sector to achieve by 2005 a reduction in waste produced equivalent to at least 5% of the 1998 arisings figure and 10% by 2010. Businesses are also encouraged to adopt the targets. It is understood that the Welsh Assembly is now seeking new powers to set stronger legislation on recycling and waste management independently from the rest of the UK.

Scoping Study Methods, Schedule and Respondents

A draft set of consultation questions on a possible waste prevention 'network' was developed during January and February 2007, along with a candidate list of consultees. The consultation questions were refined into four groups, and the consultee list refined and expanded by a core team of AEA Energy & Environment, Dorset County Council, Mike Read Associates, the Social Marketing Practice and the University of Northampton.

The questions were then sent to consultees who were given the choice of replying by email or online via www.beyondrecycling.net during March and April 2007. Consultees were also asked to suggest further consultees and many did so. A list of those who responded is provided below and a full list of those consulted is available from Mike Read Associates. This report presents the outcomes of that consultation and has also been informed by workshops on the subject held in Dorchester in November 2006, Nottingham in January 2007 and Reading in March 2007.

In collating all the responses received, Mike Read Associates have endeavoured to present responses objectively and neutrally, and have not themselves contributed a response to the consultation. Copies of all responses have been retained by Mike Read Associates as an open research resource. The views of all respondents have been given equal weight, and individual responses are not attributed in this report. It was initially intended to distinguish between responses received from different sectors, however there was strong overlap between responses from different sectors and it was decided that this approach was unnecessary. However, the commonality of responses is of itself noteworthy.

The responses received inevitably reflect the type of organisations that responded. Efforts were made to consult with sectors and stakeholders outside the traditional waste management sector. However responses from sectors such as design, retailing and consumer organisations were relatively limited, perhaps reflecting that they do not yet widely recognise the roles they have to play, and the emphasis that will need to be placed on gaining their involvement.

Although referred to throughout as a waste prevention 'network' it was made clear through the scoping study that the final name and structure of any initiative would be guided by the outcomes of the consultation. It was referred to in inverted commas as a 'network' throughout to emphasise this as a working title for a developing idea. However it is almost certainly the case that the term led respondents to think in a particular way about possible initiatives.

Respondents

The following organisations contributed their thoughts and ideas to the consultation:

1. AEA Energy & Environment
2. BAN Waste
3. Biffa
4. BREW Centre for Local Authorities
5. Brook Lyndhurst
6. Brussels Institute for Management of the Environment
7. Cambridgeshire County Council
8. Community Composting Network
9. Centre for Sustainable Design, Sheffield Hallam
10. Chartered Institute of Water & Environmental Management
11. Composting Association

Mike Read Associates

www.mikeread.org   www.beyondrecycling.net

12. Convention of Scottish Local Authorities
13. Community Recycling Network
14. Dorset County Council
15. Department of Trade and Industry
16. East Riding of Yorkshire Council
17. Enfield Borough Council
18. Environment Agency
19. Environment Council
20. Envirowise
21. Friends of the Earth (England and Wales)
22. Friends of the Earth Scotland
23. Green Alliance
24. Hampshire County Council
25. Irish Environmental Protection Agency
26. Local Authority Recycling Advisory Committee
27. Local Government Association
28. London Borough of Richmond on Thames
29. National Association of Waste Disposal Officers
30. North London Waste Authority
31. Recycling Action Yorkshire
32. Resource Efficiency Knowledge Transfer Network
33. Resources for Change
34. Resource Futures
35. Scottish Environment Protection Agency
36. Scottish Executive
37. SITA Centre, University of Northampton
38. Social Enterprise and Waste Research Network / BRASS
39. Social Marketing Practice
40. Sustainable Development Commission
41. University of Paisley
42. Viridor
43. Wastewatch
44. Welsh LGA (Waste Awareness Wales)
45. Wiltshire Wildlife Trust
46. WRAP

Existing Structures and Organisations

A number of consultees have discussed the extent to which existing structures and organisations might be appropriate to develop waste prevention, and specifically a waste prevention 'network'. While there are those who question whether 'another network' is necessary, others express dissatisfaction with the nature and remit of existing organisations that might take on this role. In this context WRAP has been mentioned by several respondents as a potential focal point for this work, yet others have indicated that they do not believe this to be a wise move or one they could support.

It may be valuable to restate the reasons (that have emerged from several national events in recent months) that argue in favour of a distinct approach with a new focal point, *viz.* the need for prevention to be given prominence, the distinct expertise and skills required, the distinct behaviour change approaches that will be needed, and the perception that in organisations that cover both approaches, recycling can and invariably does draw attention away from waste prevention.

It may also be noteworthy that delegates at the closing meeting of the National Resources and Waste Forum in March 2007 expressed unanimous support for a separate initiative taking a fresh approach to waste prevention. It was also the view of many who attended workshops at the Community Recycling Network national conference in Birmingham in May 2007 that some of the keys to developing waste prevention lie more or less wholly outside the conventional waste management world.

As will be seen from the responses to Q8, respondents refer to their membership of or involvement in no fewer than 50 different relevant networks and comparable initiatives, and even this is not the full list of networks with a more or less direct relevance to waste prevention in the UK. This remarkable number of relevant networks, forums, etc., can be seen as both a challenge and an opportunity. It clearly indicates that no one network is presently able to communicate with more than a small fraction of those potentially interested. On the other hand they provide a potential structure for collection and dissemination of information. This report proposes below, *inter alia*, what might be called a 'supranetwork' for waste prevention which would harvest relevant waste prevention news, data and links to further information from these networks and other sources, and then disseminates it *via the existing mosaic of initiatives*. This might be a powerful approach, not only to raise the profile of waste prevention and the values it offers, but also to ensure the availability of key information, contacts, links, case studies, etc. to a wide audience.

Outline Recommended Options, Costs and Funding

Mike Read Associates make the following recommendations, based on the scoping study.

Two distinct sets of activities are requested by respondents.

> A) Sharing of information, ideas, and opportunities for partnership working, through what might be called an '**evidence network**'.

> B) A more active role in developing policy, strategy, programmes, projects, monitoring protocols, etc. through what might be called a '**solutions development alliance**'.

It is recommended immediately to pursue the first while further exploring the second for implementation later in 2007. It is not intended that any activities be open-ended, rather that specific objectives should be set over a specific period. This reflects the rapidly evolving nature of policy and initiatives in this area, and ensures so far as possible a 'task and finish' approach.

A) An *Evidence Network*: sharing information, ideas, and opportunities for partnership working.

Recommendations

Four initial steps are recommended. These are covered in more detail on the following pages and are suggested as the essential ingredients. For any or all of these initial steps it will be necessary to secure sufficient and appropriate financial and human resources for a period of two years to allow the developments listed below. The initial steps are to:

1. Establish a **'supra-network'** information system for waste prevention.

2. Establish a waste prevention **website** (or develop an existing website), probably to include a **web forum**.

3. Establish **stronger cross-sectoral links** with stakeholder groups that lie outside mainstream waste management but that are important for waste prevention.

4. Organise focussed **conferences and/or meetings**.

It is recommended to retain the proposed objective for an evidence network as established in *Proposal for a Waste Prevention 'Network'* in this report, namely:

To make a significant and cost-effective contribution to sustainable waste management policy and practice in the UK through facilitating sharing of information, understanding and expertise in waste prevention between all those with a role to play in its implementation and evaluation.

1. 'Supra-network'

To complement existing systems and networks it is recommended to harvest news, information and case studies from the many existing networks and organisations referred to in this study, as well as popular and academic publications and many other potential sources. This information should be 'sifted' for relevance to waste prevention, and presented to network participants by way of **email headline newsletters**. It is further recommended that these newsletters be provided on a fortnightly basis. Information sources would not be restricted to the UK.

It will be essential to ensure easy access to information at different levels of detail, appropriate to different stakeholders. It is recommended to achieve this by a formalised layered information approach. Each 'news' item should have a clear title, followed by a brief description, with a link to more detailed information on the website, which would wherever appropriate provide a second link to the full information from the original source. This would allow stakeholders and participants to access information at an appropriate level with the minimum of effort, while avoiding providing too detailed information to those for whom it is not appropriate or of interest.

A waste prevention evidence network would *proactively* engage in searching for and disseminating relevant evidence specific to waste prevention in a summarised, linked format, alongside promotion of debate, innovation and problem-solving. A waste prevention evidence network would thus complement Defra's Wastenet very well. Moreover a waste prevention evidence network would draw stakeholders attention to Wastenet and encourage them to contribute to and draw on Wastenet's resources.

2. Website

A central web-based knowledge source for waste prevention is recommended. This should contain a frequently updated news section, providing information harvested via the supra-network, a themed set of briefings and case studies, pages for each sector or stakeholder group, material or product group, with well-maintained links to reports and other relevant sites. The website would need to be updated on a very regular basis, at least weekly.

Many respondents indicate a desire for a web forum. While not perhaps of value to all, it is recommended that appropriately maintained and moderated, such a forum would nonetheless provide a valuable meeting ground of ideas and debate. Techniques can be used to stimulate and maintain use and development of such a forum, which can of itself reduce the resource implications of meetings.

3. Stronger links with sectors and stakeholder groups

An outreach programme is necessary to engage with critical stakeholder groups such as, but not restricted to, designers, planners, economists, the third sector and Regional Development Agencies, as well as retailers, distributors and manufacturers. Engagement would

be both at a generic, developmental level and guided by specific emerging product, process and behaviour/lifestyle-related topics.

The pro-active outreach programme would include presentations at stakeholders' seminars and conferences, offering articles in sector-specific publications, and invitations to key stakeholders to present at the annual conferences referred to below.

4. Conferences and meetings

A low frequency of high-quality conferences and meetings is recommended. An annual conference in each of 2008 and 2009 is suggested, along the lines of the successful Beyond Recycling national conferences, each with two objectives: (a) to explore contemporary and future waste prevention issues and (b) to reach out and engage with other sectors.

Schedule and Resource Requirements

It is recommended for there to be an annual review after 12 months (e.g. in October 2008) and a further information needs evaluation approximately three months prior to the end of the two-year period. During the review, the evaluation, and at the second annual conference the issue of a succession strategy would be considered and a proposal developed if appropriate.

Resources

Table 1: Estimated Resource Requirements, Evidence Network[5]					
	Supra-network	Confer-ences & meetings	Website	Web Forum	Outreach
Human resources (FTE[6] / months)	0.5 / 24	0.2 / 24	0.25 / 24	0.25 / 24	0.1 / 24
Professional costs[7] (£)	1,000	2,000	1,500	1,500	0
Ancillary costs[8] (£)	2,000	18,000	1,000	500	2,000
Proposed schedule	Oct '07 - Oct '09	May '08; May '09	Oct '07 - Oct '09	Oct '07 - Oct '09	Oct '07 - Oct '09

It is suggested that the FTE human resources required be provided by a combination of a Waste Prevention Evidence Network Director, and a Waste Prevention Evidence Network Co-ordinator. The estimated total resource requirements are 1.3 FTE plus £14,750/year for two years.

Hosting

As indicated in this report, it is felt that a distinct and separate undertaking is required for waste prevention. Mike Read Associates, in association with

---

[5] Please note these are only indicative cost and resource requirements.
[6] Full-time equivalent.
[7] E.g. design, web-hosting, membership costs of other networks
[8] E.g. travel and accommodation expenses, facilities, venues, catering, IT, etc.

Resources for Change (www.r4c.org.uk) would be pleased to offer hosting of the initiative, maybe under the aegis of Beyond Recycling and www.beyondrecycling.net.

Composting

Given the rather different features of composting, the mixed views expressed by respondents and the progress already made in this area by WRAP, it is recommended that, at least in the first instance, a waste prevention evidence network does not cover the issue of composting.

Funding

Respondents suggested a number of potential funding sources (refer to Q11 in **Consultation Responses**) and it is recommended to explore these options further, as well as other potential sources (such as research councils) over the next 1-2 months.

B) A **Development Alliance**: guiding policy, strategy, programmes, projects and monitoring protocols.

Recommendations

The next step would be to:

Develop a set of detailed **objectives and targets** for a Waste Prevention Development Alliance alongside a vision for the alliance that participants would be expected to support.

A development alliance would take a dynamic and innovative approach to waste prevention, reflecting the important and rapidly-developing nature of the subject matter. It would take the form of an evolving series of task-and-finish groups discussing and innovating, developing and solving difficult issues. This would be managed by a Project Officer tasked by a High-level Working Group.

Issues would be identified and selected by the working group, guided by information from the evidence network, discussions on the web forum and via the outreach programme. The working group, which would include cross-sectoral representation, would decide how to take each topic forward, seek resources, etc.

Task-and-finish groups would be responsible for providing shortlists of practical, imaginative, costed solutions to the issues identified. The Project Officer's *modus operandi* would be to bring such groups together around each discussion issue, carry out additional research and feedback emerging issues and potential solutions to the working group. The Project Officer would also be expected to contribute briefings to the Evidence Network's website and web forum.

Although the specific topics the development alliance would deal with would not be defined in advance, the alliance should nonetheless have set targets and objectives and it is proposed that targets should be set with the following

parameters. The initial work focus for the development alliance would be strongly guided by many of the suggestions provided by respondents to the 'network' consultation exercise.

Participants would be required to indicate a degree of commitment to the alliance. The exact nature of this would need to be explored with potential participants but might include provision of regular information to the evidence network on how they and their organisations are developing waste prevention, the challenges, opportunities and successes they perceive, involvement in reviewing progress, and with individual representatives responsible for reporting on how such information is harvested and disseminated within their own organisation or institution.

Table 2: Possible targets for a waste prevention development alliance	
Parameter	**Indicators**
Central government policy buy-in	Introduction and enhancement of regulations.
Local government policy buy-in	Number of authorities with monitored waste prevention strategies.
Understanding and awareness	To be determined depending on resource availability. By public research questionnaire?
Partnership approaches	New co-operative initiatives. Diversity of active stakeholders.

It has been noted on a number of occasions that the words in the phrase 'waste prevention' have, to some extent, negative connotations, which may act as a hurdle to development and awareness-raising. Some element of 'rebranding' may be worth considering as a phrase may well be required to drive public campaigns.

Schedule

The schedule shown in the table below is dependent on the availability of funding but is centred on a three-month period to crystallise agreement on objectives and targets followed by a 21-month period for implementation. It is also recommended for there to be a review after 12 months (e.g. in January 2009). During the review and at the second annual conference the issue of a succession strategy for the alliance would be considered and a proposal developed if appropriate.

Table 3: Estimated Resource Requirements, Waste Prevention Development Alliance[9]		
	Development Phase	**Operational Phase**
Human resources (FTE / months)	0.4 / 3	0.6 / 21
Professional costs (£)	0	1,000
Ancillary costs (£)	1,500	15,000
Proposed schedule	Aug '07 – Oct '07	Nov '07 – Oct '09

---

[9] Please note these are only indicative cost and resource requirements.

It is suggested that the FTE human resources required initially be provided by the Waste Prevention Evidence Network Director in the development phase, then by a dedicate Development Alliance Project Manager. The estimated total resource requirements are 0.4 FTE plus £1,500 for three months then 0.6 FTE plus £16,000 over 21 months.

Consultation Responses

The **major themes** for each question attempt to summarise views expressed by a third or more of respondents. The word 'most' is used to refer to views expressed by a majority of respondents, 'many' refers to views expressed by a quarter to a half, 'a number' to those presented by less than a quarter but more than one respondent, and finally for each question a list is provided of opinions or suggestions made by just one respondent.

The consultation is divided into four sections:
- Waste prevention
- A waste prevention 'network'
- How it might work
- Scope

Although primarily intended to shed light on the optimum approaches and objectives for a waste prevention 'network', the consultation exercise provided a surprising number of insights into policy, practice and perspectives on waste prevention. A great many ideas and suggestions were proffered; only occasionally were these contradictory or opposed to one another, this perhaps helping to identify areas for future debate and development.

Waste Prevention

1. **What challenges** *does waste prevention provide your organisation?*

2. **What opportunities** *does waste prevention provide your organisation?*

3. **What are the priorities** *for waste prevention?*
    (A) Strategic Objectives and Responsibilities
    (B) Materials and Products

1. *What* challenges *does waste prevention provide your organisation?*

Major Themes

Behaviour change and the **awareness-raising** required are suggested by many respondents: the awareness that waste prevention is important, different from recycling, and not a negative message. Respondents suggest this is necessary right **across government including its delivery agencies, the commercial sector and among the public**. It is considered that this will need time, energy and resources over an extended period, reflecting the scale of the cultural change required, as waste production is entrenched in modern life.

Raising awareness of the **link between consumption and waste** is considered important, likewise the link between waste prevention and sustainable consumption.

Changing individual behaviour is considered to be difficult in the absence of **adequate regulation and taxation structures**. Existing systems are considered to have locked local authorities and public into patterns of behaviour and decision making that do not promote waste prevention.

The need for **well-considered, clear and specific messages** is suggested (and appropriate means for their delivery), to improve understanding of waste prevention, not only with the general public, but also with all waste industry stakeholders. For business it is suggested that the challenge is first to help achieve an understanding of resource efficiency rather than just recycling.

Other Challenges

A number of respondents also refer to the following:

1. **Access to data** and **opportunities for sharing best practice**.

2. **Monitoring and measurement** of waste prevention policies and initiatives, and difficulty in setting targets and demonstrating benefits.

3. Developing **in-house waste prevention** initiatives.

Mike Read Associates

4. The need for extra skills and resources, and securing **sufficient funding** for waste prevention initiatives and making the most of opportunities and partnerships with government, businesses and the public.

5. Finding ways for local authorities to liaise with producers and retailers, with **local authorities not having control over generation of waste** by industries and organisations, especially with respect to packaging.

Other challenges are:

- Ensuring top-level buy-in
- Identifying effective policies
- Keeping the focus on waste prevention without attention being diverted to recycling
- Sustaining motivation amongst volunteers and householders
- Empowering communities, providing education and opportunities for action
- Making waste issues 'fun' and interactive
- Tackling packaging and resolving the costs and benefits of packaging
- Ensuring producer responsibility is meaningful through measurable and meaningful waste prevention principles that would be enforceable in law.
- Identifying how best to help clients and partners
- Logistics
- Getting the input of all stakeholders
- The multifaceted nature of waste prevention and its perception as too difficult by local and central government
- Population growth, increasing affluence, and the trend towards smaller households
- Engaging with the right local authority officers

Supplementary Notes and Comments

➢ These challenges give an indication of the scale and the scope of issues that a waste prevention 'network' would need to be aware of, to prioritise and to tackle.

➢ The Scottish Executive has produced a 20-point action plan setting out the challenges it perceives. http://www.scotland.gov.uk/166848

➢ For waste companies, waste prevention poses the challenge that without waste they could be out of business, unless – as has been the case with energy companies – they can develop structures within which to make profits from resource efficiency.

2. *What* opportunities *does waste prevention provide your organisation?*

<div style="border: 2px solid blue; background: lightblue;">

Major Themes

Many respondents refer to opportunities for **cost saving** and efficient resource use, with the prospect for business to cut costs and for local authorities to divert precious resources to other ends.

For local authorities, waste prevention is also considered to **make other targets easier to reach** (such as diversion, recycling and composting), and contributes to other objectives such as those related to climate change and sustainable development. Reduced pressure on existing waste collection services (both refuse and recycling) and **reduced need for new facilities** and services are also considered opportunities, as well as contributing to **Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme** (LATS) performance and achieving the **Best Value Performance Indicator** for kilograms of household waste collected per head of population (BVPI 84).

</div>

Other Opportunities

A number of respondents also refer to opportunities with the following:

1. Contributing to **climate change action**, reduced waste growth and moving towards a closed loop economy

2. Providing **services to clients**, including data gathering, modelling, specific waste prevention initiatives, and community engagement.

3. Establishing and showing **leadership**.

4. Building on existing awareness, **engaging the public and developing knowledge** and understanding.

5. Developing **new skills and services**, and acquiring new resources.

6. Academic institutions referred to diverse **opportunities for research** in the industrial sector and at household level, including links with sustainable consumption and production issues and ecological footprinting.

7. NGOs referred to increased scope for forging **community links**, development of local groups, dedicated volunteers, and increased potential to engage the public.

Other opportunities are:

- Contributing to lower council tax
- Influencing policy
- Contributing to biodiversity conservation
- Stimulus to rethinking IT systems
- Developing of new social enterprises
- Co-operation with local businesses
- Community sector opportunities
- Working with trade associations that are tackling producer responsibility

- Bringing together diverse stakeholder groups on a common issue
- Implementing initiatives on the ground
- Working to prevent commercial organic materials becoming waste in the first place
- Formalising into schematic strategies work that is already underway in local authorities

Supplementary Notes and Comments

➢ Respondents report a great diversity of opportunities.

➢ While some see challenges in raising awareness of the distinction between waste prevention and recycling, a number of respondents see great opportunities to expand the waste story from recycling to reduction, and to try new media approaches.

Mike Read Associates

www.mikeread.org   www.beyondrecycling.net

3. What are the priorities *for waste prevention?*

(A) Strategic Objectives and Responsibilities

> *Note:* For ease of consideration, the priorities suggested have been separated into (A) strategic objectives and responsibilities, and (B) specific materials or products.

Major Themes

Linking waste generation with design, production and retailing. Producer responsibility, retailer responsibility and sustainable consumption links are suggested by many respondents. Eco-design and promoting longer-lasting household products are prioritised along with looking at waste prevention at the production and retailing phases, and close interaction with the business community and public sector organisations, aiming at high level sectoral approaches.

A mix of **behaviour change and awareness-raising** priorities are suggested at a variety of levels. These include raising general awareness of what 'prevention' is (and that it is 'much more than just home composting'), the message that waste prevention is very different from recycling, and that although very worthy recycling should be a secondary thought after prevention has been achieved. Highlighting links with climate change and clarifying the differences between the behaviour change messages for waste prevention and recycling are also considered priorities.

Other Priorities

A number of respondents refer to priorities with the following:

1. Establishing policies and a **co-ordinated approach** across central government, international agencies and manufacturers, including adequate regulation at UK and EU level, such as robust legislation and taxation structures to promote producer responsibility and to cover more waste streams. A cross-sectoral approach is considered to lead to synergies, including ensuring an understanding across *all* stakeholders, improving awareness of the benefits to all and identification of key drivers for different sectors, and incentives for public behaviour change.

Mike Read Associates

2. **Sharing best practice**, information, awareness and knowledge at UK and EU level, and making sure initiatives are **monitored, analysed** and knowledge effectively transferred.

3. Awareness in the **public sector** of the **roles** they have to play (such as demonstrating good practice internally, promotion of good practice, working with retailers, public engagement, and adoption of specific objectives and SMART targets).

4. Demonstrating cost savings to organisations and enterprises and **proving the business case** for cost savings and efficiencies.

5. **Ensuring clarity** in the distinction between prevention and minimisation and between prevention and reduction.

6. Promoting **reuse.**

Other priorities are:

- Supporting the third sector
- Research into engaging the public and establishing 'self-satisfaction' in individuals about their personal contributions
- Engaging with designers, manufacturers and the packaging industry to gain commitment to eco-design principles
- Research and development into development methods for waste prevention
- Integration with recycling in a cost-saving context
- Identifying practical means for waste prevention
- Prioritising easy/big hits (especially in businesses that can identify cost benefits)

- A transparent carbon accounting system
- An integrated data collection network for material flows in the economy to allow measurements and permit trading
- Ensuring sufficient expertise and budget at WRAP to formalise a national campaign with sufficient 'clout' to negotiate with the retail sector.
- A 'live' evidence base (continuously updated) providing information on who is doing what
- Categorising waste prevention activities into meaningful and practical information.

And specifically for local authorities:

- Providing the resources needed to deliver European Directive obligations
- Using powers to charge householders directly for waste management
- Full recompense for recovering packaging/WEEE/batteries to

ensure better implementation of producer responsibility and further incentivising waste prevention in producers
- Certificated training of employees to develop internal capacity and capability

What are the priorities *for waste prevention?*

(B) Materials and Products

Major Themes

Respondents feel priority should be given to materials produced in **higher quantities** or that pose more of an **environmental burden**, those **items that are not so easily recycled** such as composite packaging and disposable nappies, and **food waste, home and community composting** (although see also Q12).

Other Priorities

A number of respondents refer to the following as priorities:

1. Single use and **disposable items**.

2. **Packaging and plastic bags**.

3. **Unwanted mail and unwanted fliers**.

4. **Re-use** of non-electrical household goods and furniture.

Other priorities referred to are:

- Providing information to householders so they can be encouraged to select and purchase resource efficient goods
- The automotive sector
- Biotechnology and nanotechnology sectors
- Duplex printing
- Inappropriate use of household waste facilities by commercial and industrial waste producers

---

Supplementary Notes and Comments

➢ Respondents report a great diversity of priorities, perhaps reflecting in some ways the culturally unfamiliar approach that is required for waste prevention, and the relative novelty of the concept.

➢ More respondents referred to strategic priorities than to those for particular materials or products, again perhaps revealing that waste prevention is at an early stage of development.

A Waste Prevention 'Network'

4.   **What would your organisation find** most useful *from a waste prevention 'network'?*

5.   **What might your organisation be able to** contribute*?*

6.   **What specific** differences *should a waste prevention 'network' seek to deliver in the next 2 years?*

4. What would your organisation find most useful from a waste prevention 'network'?

<div style="border:2px solid blue; background:#ccffff;">

Major Themes

Much the most frequent value is **sharing ideas, information and best practice,** and 'what works', not solely within the UK but from the EU and beyond.

The next two most frequent responses are **contacts** (e.g. with businesses, producers, consumer organisations, potential partners, clients, and funding opportunities), and the opportunity for **co-operative work** including new research partnerships.

</div>

Other useful attributes

Also referred to by a number of respondents are:

1. An information and **knowledge centre** with regular updates.

2. The opportunity to **discuss solutions** to common problems, and develop new ideas.

3. An influential, co-ordinated, **national voice**.

4. Developing relationships with **international networks**, and easy-to-digest information on EU approaches, progress and efficacy.

5. **Policy** consultations.

Other suggestions are:

- Opportunity for developing regional partnerships
- Developing priorities
- Developing common approaches
- Practical advice
- Enhanced opportunity to disseminate research findings
- UK-wide consideration of issues

- Linking of national initiatives with local initiatives
- Seminars showcasing best practice
- Publicity for waste prevention
- Links with packaging manufacturers
- Agreeing acceptable measurement methods

5. What might your organisation be able to contribute (e.g. experience, case studies, policy input, facilities, funding, contacts)?

<div>

Major Themes

Most respondents suggested they would be willing to contribute **case studies, data sets, skills and experience** (ranging from overseas experience to working with communities, schools and the public), **contacts** (such as with communities, trade associations and businesses), and **policy input** and briefings. Many also offered **facilities** (e.g. venues and catering).

</div>

Other contributions

The following are also offered by a number of respondents

1. **Dissemination** of information via websites or throughout particular sectors.

2. **Time and enthusiasm**.

3. Potentially some funding, or pointers to **funding opportunities**.

4. Facilitation of workshops and network events

Also offered are:

- Working in co-operation to access appropriate funding
- Contributing to development of good practice for monitoring and evaluation
- Internet tools
- Training resources and materials
- Campaign ideas
- Different perspectives

- Being prepared to act as trial area for initiatives
- Social marketing
- Strategic thinking
- Prioritisation of actions
- Scenario modelling and simulation
- Speakers for events
- Signposting to services

<div>

Supplementary Notes and Comments

➢ Generally respondents were remarkably forthcoming with what they might be able to contribute to a waste prevention 'network'.

</div>

6. *What specific* differences *should a waste prevention 'network' seek to deliver in* the next 2 years?

Notes:

Not all the suggestions received were for 'specific' differences, thus a number of suggestions would be hard to assess in practice. Nonetheless all suggestions made are recorded here.

It is not always possible to determine whether, when referring to 'government', respondents are meaning the UK, or more specifically England, Wales, Scotland or Northern Ireland. Significant differences are now evident between the regions, for instance with specific waste prevention policy and targets in Scotland.

Major Themes

Four major themes for suggested differences emerge from responses.

Tangible evidence of policy shift, with waste prevention higher up the public policy agenda, i.e. recognition and **government buy-in as a policy 'owner'**, with a policy framework, associated budget, alignment with EU policy, improved regulations and improved, joined-up key policies.

Significant, **auditable figures for waste prevention**, such as a measurable decrease in unnecessary packaging, or reduction in household waste arisings.

Widespread understanding of what waste prevention is (e.g. not recycling or volume reduction of waste, but prevention of resources from becoming wastes), how it is different from and better than recycling, and how it may be achieved.

Cross-sectoral awareness, partnerships and co-operative approaches. Such partnerships might include manufacturers, designers, retailers (including supermarkets), the packaging sector, local authorities and industry.

Other suggested differences

Mike Read Associates

The following differences over two years were also suggested by a number of respondents.

1. Developing **strategic approaches and priorities**.

2. **Agreeing standards and techniques** for waste prevention, such as sound measurement and monitoring protocols.

3. **Changing 'hearts and minds'** measured by a change in attitudes and behaviour (e.g. with regards to consumer purchasing of packaged goods, plastic bags, etc.) compared with established baselines.

Other suggested specific differences are:

- Comprehensive range of waste prevention targets for a range of materials
- A centrally-organised email/web news service on practice and thinking, sharing effective tools and experiences and a core of knowledge (see also Q7)
- An 'informal' route for LA officers to disseminate activities and knowledge
- Expert working groups
- Waste prevention and reuse credits
- Stakeholders who take responsibility
- Input from *all* key stakeholders
- Clarification of opportunities and the priority areas and then develop a costed plan for implementation
- Established connection between waste prevention and sustainable consumption and production
- Action on single-use, disposable products

- A menu of innovative approaches
- Production of ratios of waste production with respect to economic measures (if a material flow data system is in place)
- Projects within or catalysed by the network
- Case studies with full monitoring and knowledge transfer by peer reviewed output
- Added value to what is already happening
- A Factor 4 reduction in industrial resource use
- Developing effective models of waste prevention - along the supply chain for different industrial sectors
- Sustainable consumption models within the home - especially in sectors / products that have received relatively little focus (e.g. paints and varnishes)
- Change in behaviour based upon more rigorous use of models.

Supplementary Notes and Comments

➢ In addition to suggested outcomes that a 'network' might be able to deliver, many respondents provided more aspirational goals for waste prevention generally. These would need further elaboration into specific, measurable outcomes.

➢ The great many suggested priorities perhaps indicates the breadth of work that is now required in this field.

Mike Read Associates

How it Might Work

7.   **What, for your organisation, would be the most efficient way to
(A)** harvest *waste prevention information and understanding?*
(B) provide *dialogue and dissemination?*

8.   **Does your organisation belong to any related, relevant networks, forums or think-tanks?**

9.   **From experience with comparable networks and forums,
(A)** what ingredients are **essential** *for a 'network'?*
(B) what should be avoided?

10. **What should this 'network' do** differently *from existing initiatives to best help waste prevention?*

11. **What suggestions do you have for the** funding *of such a 'network' over a 2-year period?*

7. What, for your organisation, would be the most efficient *way to...*

> **Note:** *The distinction between Questions 7a and 7b was not fully appreciated by all respondents. 7a was intended to consider means for harvesting information from organisations and 7b how to provide it to organisations. However sufficient did distinguish between the two to give a fair representation in the answers received, and for some the answer would be the same anyway.*

(A) harvest *waste prevention information and understanding?*

A number of respondents suggest

1. Face to face or telephone **interviews** and consultations.

2. **Email** (having established a clear specification for the information required).

3. **Desk based research** syntheses and analysis based on existing knowledge, best practice papers, case studies and surveys and academic publications and web searches.

4. **New research**, including market research and surveys including large-scale surveys of households (maybe with diary logs) and other stakeholders.

5. Using existing networks and working with existing waste groups / organisations.

Other suggested means for harvesting are:

- A conference/seminar followed by a tasked information gathering period

- An extension to waste data flow for each local authorities, collated against influencing factors

What, for your organisation, would be the most efficient *way to...*

(B) provide *dialogue and dissemination (e.g. conferences, email news, online forums etc.)?*

> ### *Major Themes*
>
> Four strong themes emerge – most respondents suggest many or all of the following.
>
> A regular (maybe monthly) **email newsletter** with good links to more information, with participants asked occasionally for news contributions.
>
> Regular seminars and/or **conferences**, either annually or six-monthly.
>
> A good **website** with a webmaster (maybe full-time) who understands the subject and can provide news, links, etc., maybe with a page for each sector and issue, and with links to case studies and reports on progress.
>
> A **web forum** with suitable moderation. Although a number of respondents noted that forums are difficult to get going and may effectively exclude those with limited time, many others were very positive about a web forum.

Other means for dialogue and dissemination

A number of respondents suggest the following:

1. **Themed workshops** and/or working group meetings of relevant organisations on individual issues set to 'task and finish'.

2. **Online conferences**.

3. **Regional sub-networks** communicating with the central network.

4. Dissemination and dialogue via existing websites or **participants' own websites** (e.g. KTN, WRAP, NISP, SDC), advisory panels, etc. Use links with **existing networks**.

Other suggestions for dialogue and dissemination are:

- Regional events
- Webinars on specific topics
- Campaigns, events and promotions
- Press releases
- Community workshops and events
- Online training
- Building on the Envirowise approach to waste communications
- Producing a draft report for consultation with a final report thereafter, including overview and analysis of information gathered to give a picture of the current situation
- Get waste prevention into training courses
- 'Piggyback' on other events, e.g. World Environment Day
- Face to face communications
- A wiki with clear identification of editors
- Blogs
- Providing information on achievements not intention

Supplementary Notes and Comments

➢ Particularly for this question it should be borne in mind that reported responses are from a somewhat self-selected sample. Arguably community groups and stakeholders such as designers, economists and marketers are insufficiently represented. How best to communicate with these stakeholder groups deserves further consideration.

8. Does your organisation belong to any related, relevant networks, forums or think-tanks?

Although not all strictly networks, forums and think-tanks, the following national initiatives are mentioned (in order of frequency).

Resource Recovery Forum (11)
Local Authority Recycling Advisory Committee (9)
Chartered Institution of Wastes Management (6)
Resource Efficiency Knowledge Transfer Network (6)
Community Recycling Network (5)
Waste and Resources Action Programme (4)
Business Resource Efficiency and Waste programme partner forum (4)
Community Composting Network (3)
National Association of Waste Disposal Officers (3)
Sustainable Development Research Network (3)
Association of Cities and Regions for Recycling and Sustainable Resource Management (2)
County Surveyors' Society (2)
Environmental Services Association (2)
Furniture Re-use Network (2)
National Household Hazardous Waste Forum (2)
Recycle Now (2)

The following regional initiatives are also referred to by respondents:

Community Recycling Network Scotland (2)
South West Community Recycling Network (2)
London Recycling Officers' Group (2)
Waste Action Forum (2)
Waste Research Action Group for Yorkshire and the Humber (2)
Local Government Association (2)

The following national initiatives are mentioned once each:

ALCO
ALDO
Commission for Environmental Markets and Performance
Community RePaint Composting Association
Eureka network
European Research Area Network
Groundwork
Institute for Public Policy Research
National Environment Officers Network
National Industrial Symbiosis Programme

Mike Read Associates
www.mikeread.org   www.beyondrecycling.net

Small Business Service
Sustainable Consumption and Production Network
Sustainable Design Network
Waste and Resources Research Advisory Group

And regionally:

Association of London Cleansing Officers
Cylch
Eastern Region Waste Technical Advisory Body
Eastern Region Waste Management Forum
London Community Recycling Network
North London Waste Prevention Officers Network
Recycle North
Regional Technical Advisory Board
Scottish Environment LINK
Scottish Parliament Cross Party Group on Waste
Scottish Waste Awareness Groups
Scottish Waste Prevention Expert Group
Yorkshire EMAS Group

Also referred to without specific examples were Regional Development Agency networks, business support networks, business advisory groups, government working groups, trade associations, local networks, and water industry forums.

Supplementary Notes and Comments

➢ Despite the great many networks, forums, etc., given by respondents there are still others that are relevant, such as the Network on Product Lifespans, Design for Durability Network, etc.

➢ The extraordinary number of relevant networks, forums and think-tanks suggested by respondents can be seen as both bad and good. It clearly indicates that no one network is presently able to communicate with more than a small fraction of those potentially interested. On the other hand they provide an existing potential structure for collection and dissemination. Means for harnessing this potential are discussed elsewhere in this scoping study.

➢ A number of respondents also referred to the National Resource and Waste Forum, perhaps indicating that they were unaware that the NRWF has closed.

9. *From experience with comparable networks and forums...*

(A) what ingredients are essential for a 'network'?

Major Themes

Clear terms of reference, i.e. objectives, vision, remit, strategy and structure, is suggested by most respondents. This may be set and reviewed annually, with key objectives in a defined time framework.

Members need to be enthusiastic, engaged and agree to the **common purpose** and objectives, as above, and commit to work towards them, seeking answers, action and collaboration.

An energetic **leader and/or co-ordinator** with the right skills (such as networking, webmaster, strong management) and resources (time and funding).

Good communication. This is also explored in Q7 but respondents refer to accurate and timely communication, easy use and access, comprehensive connections to all work in the field, stimulating and regular contacts, frequent short bulletins, regular focussed meetings and clear links with similar networks.

Other key ingredients referred to by a number of respondents are:

1. **Action**, and focus on outcomes.

2. A **balanced involvement of *all* key stakeholder groups**, with representatives with the status, skills, good will and energy required to take on actions or able to influence their organisations to take them on.

Respondents also mention:

- Mechanisms for checking progress
- Well structured clear, simple messages
- Emails with clear subject lines
- A steering group to identify needs and priorities and means to improve networking

- Links to government policy and business decision makers
- A single point of entry for database management
- Electronic conferencing (such as 'Interwise')
- Collaborative projects

Mike Read Associates

- Authority borne of access to and disseminating all relevant information
- Management by an 'honest broker', not a campaigning organisation or one seeking a particular view of waste prevention
- Frequent updating, keeping a website 'live'
- A blog
- Being kept informed of network progress and of any changes
- Frequent attendance by appropriate personnel
- Sufficient IT understanding and availability
- Sufficient contacts
- Distinctiveness, adding value
- A dynamic agenda

- Keeping to plain English
- Encouraging input from all partners and opportunity for all voices to be heard.
- Eye-catching information and use of innovative communication
- Variety of options and media for networking
- Workshops or working groups to be tightly focused
- Understanding what geographical area is covered
- A regional dimension
- Accessible venues
- Video conferencing for distant members
- Live discussion through a list server
- A wide remit

From experience with comparable networks and forums...

(B) what should be avoided?

> ### Major Themes
>
> **Information overload**, too much communication, lengthy reports and excessive emails.
>
> **Duplication**.

Other aspects to be avoided that are referred to by a number of respondents:

1. Being just **a talking shop**. It is also suggested to avoid extensive discussion about aims, and not to spend too much time on trying to answer questions that are too big for the time available.

2. **Unrealistic expectations**, setting out to achieve too much too soon, and allowing insufficient time for the 'network' to develop. It is suggested that too big a remit may lead to more talk and less action.

3. **Meetings with no clear focus** and meetings which just report on what has happened.

4. Having **progress blocked by individual members** with specific issues and inflexible agendas.

Also mentioned as worth avoiding are:

- Expectation that the forum will run itself
- Cumbersome logins
- Requiring individuals to regularly visit a website
- Very academic studies
- Unmoderated discussions (such as on a list server)
- Getting off the point – avoid 'hijacking' by recycling
- Rigid structures
- Uncoordinated action, e.g. repetitious activity / events / research / consultations
- Bureaucracy
- 'Conflict with government departments other than DEFRA'
- Temptation to act just as a pressure group
- Delivery without monitoring
- Old-fashioned ways of communicating
- Going over old ground
- Political agendas
- Not being radical
- Bulletin boards of unedited and indigestible material
- Too many organisations involved tenuously
- Treating waste prevention separately from recycling when engaging the public
- Shared responsibility across different organisations

Mike Read Associates

- Formal working groups – collaborations should be allowed to develop organically

- 'Failing to distinguish between conferences and workshops, both important are but require different participants'

Supplementary Notes and Commentary

➢ Avoiding duplication emerges as a major theme in responses to this question. However to some extent, avoiding duplication presents any network with an insuperable problem. To provide every member with precisely the information they wish - and have not received from elsewhere - requires a level of individual service that would prove extremely costly. However there are methods of 'layering' access to information, discussed elsewhere in this scoping study that may prevent waste of resources, time and enthusiasm.

➢ The emphasis clearly needs to be more on quality than quantity of communication and information, a principle appropriately in keeping with waste prevention.

10. What should this 'network' do differently *from existing initiatives to best help waste prevention?*

<div style="border:1px solid blue; background:#ccffff; padding:10px;">

Major Theme

Many respondents suggest more and deeper **cross-sectoral working** with a wider range of stakeholders across the whole supply chain. Going beyond the remit of the waste industry, suggested sectors are designers, marketing companies, businesses, local authorities, manufacturers, retailers, communities and consumers, producers, international agencies, the packaging industry, health, and education.

</div>

Other differences proposed by a number of respondents are:

1. Constantly clarifying and communicating the meaning of waste prevention to ensure the 'network' is not 'taken over' by recycling. **Staying focused on prevention** and bringing it to the fore.

2. Keeping a clear focus with all members agreeing to work together to **common purpose**.

3. Focussing on the **needs of specific groups** and providing tangible outputs for specific audiences, perhaps with small focussed groups tackling specific aspects.

4. **Networking into other networks**, partnering with existing research and systems and networks, and ensuring a waste prevention 'network' is complementary to existing networks and not in competition.

Also suggested are:

- Get public debate going
- Present a united cross-sectoral case to government for waste prevention legislation and financial incentives
- Provide practical suggestions
- Chart progress over time after formation
- Involve people in developing models that could be piloted on a small scale, maybe with a small number of households
- Scenario building activities as part of the approach
- Be proactive not reactive
- Look at cost benefits more than environmental benefits, and identify specific savings
- Approach the subject in its totality rather in a way that only pushes waste from one stream to another

Mike Read Associates

www.mikeread.org   www.beyondrecycling.net

- Not just focussing on best practice, but investigating regulatory and fiscal measures
- Provide market opportunities for market leaders to improve their brands
- Focus on consumer choices and product manufacturers
- Keep an open mind on new ideas
- Action
- Direct discussions with manufacturers
- A policy focus
- Bringing the right people together with a single point of contact for each organisation, responsible for reporting back on how they are communicating within their own organisation
- Ensure that devolved /reserved powers are taken into account

- when proposing legislative changes.
- Be a living presence
- Ensure academic input
- Effectively assess what is already being done and use that as a basis to inform a wider audience
- Promote the network as being there to help meet objectives in respect of waste prevention but in a more holistic (life cycle) fashion
- Concentrate on economic rather than behavioural blockages
- Just be a network, not a think-tank or a body with terms of reference
- Personal advice / helpline
- Seedcorn funding for generic initiatives in flagship companies

11. What suggestions do you have for the funding of such a network over a 2-year period?

<div style="border: 2px solid navy; background-color: lightcyan; padding: 10px;">

Major Theme

Most respondents suggested **government funding** in one form or another, primarily from Defra, maybe through a research and development budget, BREW, landfill tax or via WRAP, the Environment Agency or regional sources.

</div>

A number of respondents also proposed:

1. Subscriptions or membership fees, with a number commenting that such an approach must ensure no stakeholders were excluded through cost, maybe using a sliding scale. Figures suggested range from £100 to £500.

2. Sponsorship from commercial organisations such as manufacturers or retailers. Sony or Sainsbury's are both suggested.

3. Waste management companies.

4. The EU, maybe through EU LIFE, perhaps accessing funding for systematic harvesting of best practice from other EU states.

Also suggested are

- Local government
- Get members' funding officers together to provide ideas
- Charitable status
- The co-ordinator should be a government dept or a contactor thereto
- Service support, e.g. from BT

- Competitive tender to Defra research and development funds
- Using the Environment Agencies contacts on the British Retail Consortium
- Revenues from conferences and seminars

Scope

12. *Should* **home or community composting** *be included in the remit of a waste prevention 'network'?*

13. *What* **disciplines, sectors, organisations and individuals** *should be involved? Are there any relevant organisations missing from the consultation list?*

14. *Are these the right questions? Any other* **comments and suggestions***?*

12. Should home or community composting be included in the remit of a waste prevention 'network'?

Note: *This question was included in the consultation because some argue home and community composting should not be considered waste prevention. They are certainly rather different from other waste prevention initiatives, and by comparison are relatively well served. However the rationale for including this question was not perhaps apparent to many respondents and the answers given need to be interpreted in that light.*

23 respondents answered yes, 8 said no, and for 12 the answer depended on other factors. Particular reasons given are summarised below.

YES
- o Home composting is a first step to householders taking responsibility for their waste.
- o Provides a 'closed' loop message when linked to local food.
  It is a useful bridge in the public mind between recycling and waste prevention.
- o It can be seen as part of the whole household management of waste.
- o Even though waste is still 'produced', composting is a key measure to reduce the amount of waste collected by local authorities.
- o Food waste is climbing up the agenda and more broadly the role of biodegradable films and starch fill plastics as opposed to recycling is under debate. Home composting has a role to play in low carbon waste management.
- o Potential for encouraging community interaction and then related prevention activity.

NO
- o It is already covered by WRAP.
- o While composting does reduce volume, the issue for a waste prevention network should be elimination or reduction of waste at the start, hence composting should not be included.
- o There are other forums for composting.
- o It has a limited target audience.

IT DEPENDS
- o No, unless it can be a separate strand.
- o Either the new network should not cover this or it should do so in full collaboration with work being done by Garden Organic and the Community Composting Network and other relevant local partners.

- o It should not be main focus; the main focus should be products and services.
- o Yes, if climate change impacts are to be considered.
- o A smaller remit would make it easier to get things done.
- o Peripheral to core objectives.
- o Focus on commercial biodegradable waste.

13. *What* disciplines, sectors, organisations and individuals *should be involved? Are there any relevant organisations missing from the consultation list?*

A number of additional consultees were suggested by respondents. With very few exceptions these were all invited to respond to the consultation. A number of respondents suggested WRAP, being unaware that WRAP had already been invited to contribute (the original consultation list included WRAP as one of the 'NRWF members' all of whom were consulted.

In terms of additional stakeholder groups proposed these are:

- Social marketers
- Environmental economists
- Sociologists
- Sustainable Consumption and Production stakeholders
- Industry
- Electronics industry (Intellect)
- Food and Drink Federation
- Community sector
- Designers

- Marketing and Public Relations
- Multinational agencies
- Producers
- Packaging industry
- Waste industry
- Retail business industry
- Financial experts
- Trade bodies
- Other countries

14. *Are these the right questions?*
Any other comments and suggestions?

> **Note:** *No additional questions were suggested, and relatively few additional comments were made, hopefully indicating that the consultation questions had allowed respondents to fully present their views and ideas.*

Additional comments made are:

- Let the network start small and then grow
- Avoid overlaying existing networks – take them on board
- 'A personal preference for such networks to focus on the thinking/research rather than on trying to develop all-embracing solutions or 'guidance'. It's up to the network to get the best thinking into the wider world then for practitioners and researchers to develop their own solutions according to what works for them'.
- Must offer more than currently available networks.

- Don't duplicate the RRF.
- Need to bridge between municipal solid waste and commercial and industrial waste.
- 'Not sure a network is the right answer – an established organisation or government department is probably better placed to deliver'.
- Need to link to RDA network, and with the 'delivering the future' strand of SCP and scp.net
- WRAP to play a significant part.
- Use online computer mediated decision making.

Appendix

Action Points from *Household Waste Prevention Action Plan (Scotland)*

Action 1: SE / SEPA to publish a report by end 2007 on work being done to encourage sustainable design and sustainable products and the impact that work is having on household waste in Scotland.

Action 2: SWAG to work with Consumer Protection Bodies, Retailers and others to provide better information to consumers on the expected lifespan of key household products, product guarantees and availability of spare parts. Initial information to be on SWAG website by March 2008.

Action 3: SEPA to publish a report by Dec 2007 on potential to introduce further Producer Responsibility initiatives e.g. for disposable products where a reusable alternative exists. SEPA also to continue reporting on existing Producer Responsibility schemes e.g. packaging and those to be introduced e.g. batteries.

Action 4: SE will continue to work with WRAP, SWAG and others to reduce the amount of food waste from Scottish households by **10,000** tonnes by 2008 and **15,000** tonnes by 2010. This will be done by:-

- Piloting a new consumer-facing food use / waste campaign, which raises awareness of the environmental and economic significance of food waste and provides practical advice to householders on how to avoid wasting the food that they buy

- developing smarter packaging which may enable food to be kept for longer or which is more appropriate for particular types of households - e.g. better portioning of food for single occupancy households

- working with retailers to develop alternative marketing approaches which will reduce the risk of food being wasted

- working with the Food Standards Agency to improve consumer understanding of food labels and, in particular, "best before" and "use by" dates

Action 5: SE will continue to work with WRAP, SWAG and others to reduce the amount of packaging waste from Scottish households by **8,000** tonnes by 2008 and **34,000** tonnes by 2010. This will be done by:-

- developing lighter weight packaging or reusable packaging

- explaining the purpose of packaging to enable households to recognise what represents excessive packaging

- developing improved systems for consumers to complain to retailers and Trading Standards about excess packaging

- considering, after carrying out further promotion of packaging regulations, whether further action is required

Mike Read Associates

- developing improved packaging guidelines for adoption by retailers and their suppliers

Action 6: SWAG and others to further promote ways in which consumers can consider their purchasing decisions and prevent household waste. For example by:-

- promoting online waste exchanges e.g. Ebay, Freecycle

- promoting the use of charity shops and auctions for unwanted but reusable items

- promoting buying 'experiences' rather than gifts

- promoting borrowing / hiring of items

Action 7: SE to work with the British Retail Consortium, retailers, UK Government and plastics industry to agree a code of practice to reduce the environmental impact of plastic and paper carrier bags by 2008 (equating to **1,000** tonnes per year).

Action 8: SE / SEPA will take further action with SWAG and others to reduce the amount of unwanted mail delivered to householders by 10% by 2010. We will ensure any code of practice with the Direct Mailing Association extends to Scotland and is publicised.

Action 9: WRAP, SWAG and others to further encourage home composting to increase diversion rates from **8,500** in 2006-07 to **17,000** tonnes by 2007-08 and **24,000** tonnes by 2009-10 (see Annex B). WRAP, SWAG, community groups and others to support Master Composter schemes and to further encourage the use of home food digesters.

Action 10: SE / SEPA to continue to work with SWAG, Local authorities, manufacturers and Community sector groups to reduce the waste impact of nappies (to divert **3,000** tonnes per year).

Action 11: SE / SEPA will develop a 'Reuse Framework' with the Community Recycling Network for Scotland (CRNS) and local authorities by Dec 2007. This will include actions such as:-

- encouraging the establishment of local waste exchanges

- improving collection methods for large household items

- improving reuse facilities at recycling centres

- ensuring bulky uplift materials are put to good use

- running a campaign to discourage householders from putting reusable items in the residual waste bin

- consider whether further action can be taken to encourage repair and refurbishment (taking into account WEEE regulations).

- ensuring leftover paint is used e.g. through REPAINT schemes

- encouraging further reuse of goods such as furniture, carpets, mattresses etc

- learning from experience in other jurisdictions e.g. Flanders

- encouraging retailers and the community sector / social economy organisations to work together

- considering the establishment of skills training for refurbishment activities

Action 12: SE / SEPA will work with CRNS to encourage the establishment of a further 20 community compost schemes by 2008 diverting an additional **500** tonnes. This will be done in line with existing regulations and involve volunteers where possible (see Annex C). We will also consider what further work can be done in this area.

Action 13: SE will work with Momenta to monitor and report the success of projects funded by INCREASE (the Scottish Executive grant scheme for the community recycling sector) in 2006-07, 2007-08 which contribute to household waste prevention. Some of these projects relate to the provision of in-depth advice to householders on what they can do to minimise waste.

Action 14: SE / SEPA to ensure waste prevention messages are mainstreamed in the Ecoschools Programme and other waste awareness / education initiatives.

Action 15: SE will provide advice to local authorities on size of residual bins, frequency of residual collections and use of receptacles for recycling, taking into account local variations.

Action 16: SE, working with SEPA, will review annually the possibility of introducing further landfill bans on materials (Annex D).

Action 17: SE, working with SEPA, will review the existing regulations (the Controlled Waste Regulations 1992) which allow charges to be made by local authorities for the collection of specific types of household waste.

Action 18: SE will issue guidance to local authorities on mainstreaming waste prevention into Service Level Agreements / Contracts.

Action 19: SE will consider further with local authorities and others the role of incentives in recycling / waste prevention.

Action 20: SE will consider, as part of Spending Review 2007, if further resources should be allocated to waste prevention specifically and how resources should be allocated to ensure waste is prevented.