

Response ID ANON-N7RC-R74N-5

Submitted to **Consultation on reforming the UK packaging producer responsibility system**

Submitted on 2019-05-13 14:03:17

About You

1 What is your name?

Name:

Q Durrani

2 What is your email address?

Email:

qduurrani@eppingforestdc.gov.uk

3 Please provide information about the organisation/business you represent

Which of the following best describes you?:

Local government

What is the name of the organisation/business you represent? (If you are responding on behalf of yourself please write 'Individual'):

district council

What is the approximate number of staff in your organisation? (if applicable):

If you answered 'Other' above, please provide details::

4 Please provide any further information about your organisation or business activities that you think might help us put your answers in context.

Please answer below:

5 Would you like your response to be confidential?

No

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

Background

6 Do you agree with the principles proposed for packaging EPR?

Yes

Please briefly state the reasons for your response. Specifically, if you respond No, please identify which principles you do not agree with and explain why.:

N/A

7 Do you agree with the outcomes that a packaging EPR should contribute to?

Yes

If you answered No, please state which outcomes you do not agree with.:

N/A

8 Do you think these types of items not currently legally considered as packaging should be in scope of the new packaging EPR system?

Yes

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

9 Which of these two classifications best fits with how your business categorises packaging?

Neither

If neither, please say why, and provide a description of how your business categorises packaging:

Part A: 1. Full net cost recovery

10 Do you agree with our definition of full net cost recovery?

Yes

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

n/a

11 Do you agree that producers should be required to fund the costs of collecting and managing household and household-like packaging waste? (i.e. all consumer facing packaging)

Yes

If No, please briefly state the reasons for your response and state what waste you think full net cost recovery should apply to.:

This is in line with the polluter pays principle and would move the burden from local authorities, where it currently predominantly sits, to the producers.

12 Do you agree that packaging for commercial/industrial applications should be out of scope for full net cost recovery?

Yes

If No, please briefly state the reasons for your response.:

13 We would welcome your views on whether or not producers subject to any DRS should also be obligated a under a packaging EPR system for the same packaging items.

Yes they should

Please briefly state the reasons for your response.:

DRS should not be introduced until EPR has been fully implemented and the benefits realised.

Part A: 2. Driving better design of packaging

14 Do you agree with the development of an 'approved list' of recyclable packaging to underpin the setting of either modulated fee rates or deposits?

I neither agree nor disagree

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

N/A

15 Do you think the payment of modulated fees or the payment of deposits with the prospect of losing some or all of the deposit would be more effective in changing producers' choices towards the use of easy to recycle packaging?

I don't know / I don't have enough information

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

N/A

16 Do you think there could be any unintended consequences in terms of packaging design and use arising from:

Do you think there could be any unintended consequences in terms of packaging design and use arising from: - Modulated fees:

I don't know / I don't have enough information

Do you think there could be any unintended consequences in terms of packaging design and use arising from: - Deposit (for recyclable packaging) and fee (for non-recyclable packaging):

I don't know / I don't have enough information

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

Industry could move from solid packaging to plastic air bubble packaging - companies need to develop moulded lightweight cardboard packaging.

17 Do you agree that the deposit approach should be designed to incentivise more closed loop recycling?

Yes

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

N/A

Part A: 3. Obligated producers

18 What do you consider to be the most appropriate approach to a single point of compliance, the Brand-owner or the Seller approach?

Brand-owner

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

The brand owner approach would be cheaper to administer as there would be less businesses, also the brand owner has a greater influence over packaging design than a seller has.

19 If a single point of compliance approach was adopted, do you think the de-minimis should be:

Don't know

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

N/A

20 Should small cafés and restaurants selling takeaway food and drinks whose packaging is disposed 'on the go' be exempt from being obligated?

No

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view:

N/A

21 If shared responsibility is retained, is Option A or Option B preferable for including smaller businesses or the packaging they handle in the system?

Option A (Lower or remove the de-minimis)

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

N/A

22 If you have stated a preference for A, do you think the de-minimis threshold should:

Be removed entirely

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

N/A

23 Overall, do you have a preference for maintaining a shared responsibility compliance approach, or moving to a single point of compliance?

Single point of compliance

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

N/A

24 Do you have a preference for how small businesses could comply?

Other

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

Don't mind provided the funding raised is sufficient to cover the costs in full.

25 Do you think that requiring operators of online marketplaces to take the legal responsibility for the packaging on products for which they facilitate the import would be effective in capturing more of the packaging that is brought into the UK through e-commerce sales?

Yes

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

N/A

Part A: 4. Supporting improved collections and infrastructure

26 Do you agree that payments to local authorities for collecting and managing household packaging waste should be based on:

Do you agree payments to local authorities for collecting and managing household packaging waste should be based on: - provision of collection services that meet any minimum standard requirements (by nation):

Yes

Do you agree payments to local authorities for collecting and managing household packaging waste should be based on: - quantity and quality of target packaging materials collected for recycling:

No

Do you agree payments to local authorities for collecting and managing household packaging waste should be based on: - cost of managing household packaging waste in residual waste:

No

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

(a) to include cost of collecting and disposing of packaging waste in residual waste

27 Do you think we have considered all of the costs to local authorities of managing packaging waste?

No

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

Transportation fuel costs or vehicle replacement funding.

28 Do you agree with our approach to making payments for the collection of household-like packaging waste for recycling?

Yes

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

(a) Yes but need also to take on board geographic costs, i.e. travelling costs to transfer stations, treatment facilities etc.

29 Should businesses producing household-like packaging receive a payment for the costs of household-like packaging waste in residual waste?

No

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view:

N/A

30 Are there other factors, including unintended consequences that should be considered in determining payments to:

Local authorities? Please explain the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view:

(a) Management and administration of the system

For the collection and recycling of household-like packaging waste? Please explain the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view:

(b) Management and administration of the system

31 Do you have any information that would help us to establish the costs incurred by local authorities and other organisations of cleaning up littered and fly-tipped packaging items?

Please provide any information below:

Breakdown of costs available for mechanical sweeping, litter picking and disposal.

Dumped commercial waste needs to be included.

32 How do you think producer fees could be used to improve the management of packaging waste generated on-the-go?

Please answer below:

Colour coding of packaging to make recycling easier to do. Communications campaigns, enhanced provision of litter/recycling bins.

33 Do you have any information that would help us to establish the costs of collection and disposal of increased on-the-go provision?

Please answer below:

More information would be required. Whilst some authorities have info on cost of emptying litter bins, more info is required in respect of the cost of picking up litter off the ground and the disposal cost for "on the go" litter.

34 Do you agree that provision for the take back of single-use disposable cups for recycling should continue to be developed a voluntary basis by business prior to a government decision on whether disposable cups are included under an EPR scheme or DRS?

No

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view:

It would be at odds with producer responsibility being implemented thoroughly in other areas of packaging not to include it here as well. EPR should be applied to disposable cups. Given that disposable cups are often consumed on the go they can easily end up as litter and so are a cost burden on local authorities.

35 Do you think the recycling of single-use disposable cups would be better managed through a DRS or EPR scheme?

EPR

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view:

N/A

36 Do you think a recycling target should be set for single-use disposable cups?

No

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

No, the emphasis should be on reducing the number of disposable cups used rather than the % recycled. If there is a recycling set, then the necessary infrastructure needs to be in place to support it.

Part A: 5. Helping consumers do the right thing – communications and labelling

37 Should producer fees be used to support local service related communications delivered by local authorities?

Yes

Please briefly state the reasons for your response. Where available, please share evidence to support your view.:

N/A

38 Should producer fees be used to support nationally-led communications campaigns in each nation?

Yes

Please briefly state the reasons for your response. Where available, please share evidence to support your view.:

N/A

39 Are there any circumstances where producers should be exempt from contributing to the cost of communications campaigns?

No

Please briefly state the reasons for your response. Where available, please share evidence to support your view.:

N/A

40 Do you agree it should be mandatory for producers to label their packaging as Recyclable/Not Recyclable?

Yes

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

N/A

41 Do you think that the percentage of recycled content should be stated on product packaging?

Yes

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view:

Encourages consumers to choose better products with higher recyclable contents.

42 If you responded yes to the previous question, how could recycled content information be provided to consumers?

Please describe briefly.:

% recyclable

43 Do you have any other proposals for a labelling system?

Please describe briefly.:

Keep it simple, colour coded.

44 Do you have experience to suggest an appropriate lead-in time for businesses to incorporate any mandatory labelling requirements?

Please describe briefly.:

N/A

Part B: 6. Packaging waste recycling targets to 2030

45 In your view, are the estimates made in the Material Flow reports for packaging waste arising the best available data?

Yes

Please briefly state the reasons for your responses and provide any information to support your view.:

The estimates made in the Materials Flow reports probably are the best data set available for packaging. The fact they are estimates and have such a wide band of assumptions show that a great deal of work needs to be done in this area to establish robust and reliable data for packaging waste. Greater efforts should be made to take this area forward and the governments should be prepared to impose a system if business does not provide acceptable solutions to this issue in a responsible timeframe.

So whilst we believe it is the best available data it is not good enough as a data set on which to base future policy and so work must be done to have a much more robust data set.

46 Are you aware of any other factors which may affect the estimates of packaging waste entering the waste stream?

I don't know / I don't have enough information

Please briefly state the reasons for your responses and provide any information to support your view.:

N/A

47 In your view, are there other factors which may affect the amounts of obligated tonnage reported?

I don't know / I don't have enough information

Please briefly state the reasons for your responses and provide any information to support your view.:

N/A

48 Do you agree with the packaging waste recycling targets proposed for 2025?

No

Please briefly state the reasons for your responses and provide any information to support your view:

Needs to be more ambitious.

49 Do you agree with the packaging waste recycling targets proposed for 2030?

No

Please briefly state the reasons for your responses and provide any information to support your view:

Needs to be increased if 2025 target is raised to keep the same differential.

50 Please provide your views on the policies and actions that could help us achieve an even higher overall packaging recycling rate, for example 75%, as well as your views on the costs associated with doing so.

Please answer below:

It will be difficult to achieve within the timescale but to do so the policy will need to be bold, ambitious and properly funded.

51 Do you foresee any issues with obtaining and managing nation specific data?

No

Please briefly state the reasons for your responses and provide any information to support your view.:

(b) No but delays in auditing/publishing data diminish the worth of the data.

52 Should a proportion of each material target be met by "closed loop" recycling, e.g. as is the case for glass recycling targets?

Yes

Please briefly state the reasons for your responses and provide any information to support your view.:

N/A

53 Should government set specific targets for individual formats of composite packaging?

Yes

If yes, what key categories of composite packaging should be considered?:

N/A

54 Do you agree with the proposed interim targets for 2021 and 2022 set out in Table 6?

Yes

Please briefly state the reasons for your responses and provide any information to support your view.:

It is right that the recycling target for plastics is increased more.

55 Do you agree with the proposal to increase the allocation method percentage to 35% for 2021 and 2022?

I neither agree nor disagree

Please briefly state the reasons for your responses and provide any information to support your view.:

More info required.

Part C: 7. Governance Models

56 Overall, which governance model for packaging EPR do you prefer?

Model 1

Please briefly explain your preference.:

- (a) build on existing scheme
- (b) not really preferable
- (c) not really preferable
- (d) not really preferable

57 If you had to modify any of the models in any way to make them better suited to achieve the principles and outcomes government has set for packaging EPR what changes would you suggest?

Please describe briefly.:

Don't know.

58 Do you have any concerns about the feasibility of implementing any of the proposed governance models?

No

If yes, please provide specific reasons and supporting information for each governance models that you have concerns about:

Don't know.

59 Do you think that any of the governance models better enable a UK-wide approach to packaging producer responsibility to be maintained whilst respecting devolved responsibilities?

Please describe briefly.:

Don't know.

60 Stakeholders have suggested that a compliance fee mechanism similar to the arrangements currently in place under the WEEE producer responsibility scheme should be introduced if a competitive evidence market continues to operate such as in Model 1. Do you agree?

Yes

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

N/A

61 Should a Packaging Advisory Board be established to oversee the functioning of the EPR system and the compliance schemes in the competitive compliance scheme model 1 or do you think other arrangements should be put in place?

Not Answered

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

Don't know.

62 Please let us know your thoughts as to whether the proposed single management organisation should be established on a not-for-profit basis or as a government Arm's Length Organisation.

Please answer below:

Don't know.

63 If such a management organisation is established as not-for-profit, one option is for government to invite proposals from potential operators and then issue a licence to operate for a defined period of time. Do you agree with this approach?

No

If no, would you like to suggest an alternative approach?:

Don't know.

64 Should a single scheme be established for household/household-like packaging and C&I packaging as described for model 2?

I don't know / I don't have enough information

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

Don't know.

65 Or, should there be a separate system for managing compliance for household/household-like packaging and C&I packaging as described for model 3?

No

If yes: could model 3 work as described? Or would additional mechanisms be required to make this approach work effectively? Please indicate what these might be.:

Don't know.

If no: do you have suggestions for an alternative approach?:

N/A

66 Under model 4 are producers more likely to:

Join a compliance scheme?

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

Don't know.

Part C: 8. Responsible management of packaging waste domestically and globally

67 Do you agree that government should seek to ensure export of packaging waste is undertaken in a transparent and environmentally responsible manner?

Yes

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

N/A

68 Do you agree that measures identified here would help ensure the export of packaging waste is undertaken in a transparent and environmentally responsible manner?

Yes

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

N/A

69 Have we missed potential measures that you believe need to be considered alongside those measures we have proposed?

No

If yes, please explain which potential measures should be considered.:

N/A

70 Do you have any concerns about the feasibility and / or costs of implementing any of the proposed measures?

Yes

If yes, please provide specific reasons and supporting information for each measure that you have concerns about:

Yes, needs to be adequately enforced and funded.

Part C: 9. A more transparent system

71 Do you agree that accredited reprocessors and exporters should be required to report their financial information?

Yes

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view. If you answered no, how would you suggest transparency is provided on how income from the sale of evidence has been used to support capacity building?:

N/A

72 Should accredited reprocessors and exporters be required to generate evidence for every tonne of packaging waste that they process?

Yes

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

N/A

73 Should accredited reprocessors and exporters be required to report on the packaging waste they handle monthly?

Yes

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

N/A

74 Do you think that any additional measures to those already described would be required to ensure transparent operating of the evidence market in model 4?

I don't know

If yes, please provide details:

N/A

75 Are there any additional requirements that should be placed on compliance schemes to ensure greater transparency of their operations and reporting?

I don't know

If Yes, please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

N/A

76 Under a reformed system do you think compliance schemes should continue to be approved by the existing regulators or do you think a different approach is required?

Other

Please explain below:

Don't know, more info required.

77 Are there any additional requirements of a single producer organisation to ensure transparency of its operation and reporting?

I don't know

If yes, please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

N/A

78 Do you think there is a need to make more information on packaging available to consumers?

Yes

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

N/A

Part C: 10. Compliance monitoring and enforcement

79 Are there other datasets that will be required in order to monitor producers in any of the proposed models?

No

If yes please explain which datasets will be needed:

N/A

80 Is there a specific material, packaging type or industry sector whereby producing accurate data is an issue?

Yes

If yes, please provide further information on where producing accurate data may be an issue. :

Polystyrene.

81 Do you think a single database, as opposed to the current range of methodologies available, would be an effective alternative?

Yes

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

N/A

82 Do you agree that compliance schemes (models 1 and 3), the producer management organisation (model 2) or the scheme administrator (model 4) should be responsible for carrying out audits of producers, which should be reportable to the regulators?

Yes

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

N/A

83 Do you support the broadening of legally enforceable notices to obtain required information?

Yes

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

N/A

84 Are there other enforcement mechanisms that should be considered which would be timely and effective to bring producers into compliance, for example in relation to free riders?

No

If yes, please explain which other enforcement mechanisms should be considered:

Don't know.

85 Are there any further data that should be required to be collated / collected via compliance schemes or a single management organisation?

Please provide brief details.:

Don't know

86 Do you think a penalty charge, as described, is the correct lever to ensure packaging recycling targets are met?

Yes

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

(a) Yes, subject to it incentivising compliance

87 Should stakeholders other than reprocessors or exporters be able to issue evidence of recycling?

Yes

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

Yes, provided doesn't result in double counting. System needs to be properly regulated and accountable.

88 Are there any additional enforcement powers that should be applied to waste sorters, MRFs and transfer stations handling packaging waste?

No

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

Don't know.

89 Do you agree with the proposed amendments to enforcement powers relating to reprocessors and exporters?

Yes

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

N/A

90 Do you have any evidence to indicate that under any of the proposed governance models the likelihood of waste packaging being imported and claimed as UK packaging waste might increase?

No

If yes, please provide information on any evidence you have:

N/A

91 Is the current requirement for a sampling and inspection plan and subsequent auditing by the regulator sufficient to address any misclassification of imported packaging waste?

No

Please briefly state the reasons for your response and provide any information to support your view.:

Don't know.

92 Are there other mechanisms that could be considered that would prevent imported UK packaging waste being claimed as UK packaging waste under the proposed governance models?

No

If yes, please explain which other mechanisms could prevent imported packaging waste being claimed as UK packaging waste:

Don't know.

11. Estimated costs and benefits

93 Do you have any additional data or information that will help us to further assess the costs and benefits (monetised or non-monetised) that these reforms will have?

Please answer below:

No

94 Do you have further comments on our impact assessment, including the evidence, data and assumptions used? Please be specific.

Please answer below:

No

12. Further comments

95 If you have any other views or evidence that you think we should be considering when reforming the packaging waste regulations, which you have not yet shared, please add them here.

Please answer below:

No further comments to add.