

Implementing the Municipal Waste Management Strategy

A review of the Mayor's Waste Implementation Plan
by the Environment Committee

April 2004

Environment

Environment

ASSEMBLY

Environment Committee
Enviro

Implementing the Municipal Waste Management Strategy

A review of the Mayor's Waste Implementation Plan
by the Environment Committee

April 2004

copyright

**Greater London Authority
April 2004**

Published by

Greater London Authority
City Hall
The Queen's Walk
London SE1 2AA

www.london.gov.uk

enquiries **020 7983 4000**

minicom **020 7983 4458**

ISBN 1 85261 638 5

This document is printed on recycled paper

Foreword



One of the London Assembly's principal functions is to scrutinise the development and implementation of Mayoral strategies – in short to hold to account on behalf of Londoners the Mayor's strategic policies, and to make sure they are of the calibre that the capital expects and requires.

How London tackles its waste is a critical issue not only for us but also for the London our children will live and work in. For the last four years, the Environment Committee has been carefully tracking the Mayor's emerging Municipal Waste Management Strategy. Last September, the Mayor published his final version of this strategy.

Buried in the back of this extensive document is an Implementation Plan, which sets out who is expected to do what in terms of delivering sustainable waste management for London.

We thought it would be a useful exercise to examine this in detail, and to test it by interviewing the key players – to establish whether they knew what was expected of them, to see if there were any gaps (where a responsibility was not being picked up) or overlaps (where players might be duplicating the work of others).

I am extremely grateful to David Fell, Lucy Jenkins and Jayne Cox of Brook Lyndhurst, our technical consultants, who carried out this significant piece of work with professionalism, due diligence and good humour, and to Shirley Rodriguez from the ALG, Katherine Higgins from the Mayor's waste team, and my Assembly colleague Samantha Heath from London Waste Action, who gave us careful comments on matters of fact and accuracy as the work progressed. Needless to say, the recommendations in the report are the Committee's own.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R Evans'.

Roger Evans
Deputy Chair of the Environment Committee

The Environment Committee

At the meeting of the Assembly on 7 May 2003, the membership and terms of reference of the Environment Committee was agreed as the following:

Committee membership

Samantha Heath (Chair)	Labour
Roger Evans (Deputy Chair)	Conservative
Brian Coleman	Conservative
Darren Johnson	Green
Diana Johnson	Labour
Graham Tope	Liberal Democrat

Committee terms of reference

1. To examine and report from time to time on –
 - the strategies, policies and actions of the Mayor and the Functional Bodies
 - matters of importance to Greater London
2. To examine and report to the Assembly from time to time on the Mayor's Air Quality, Biodiversity, Energy, Noise and Waste Strategies, in particular their implementation and revision.
3. To consider environmental matters on request from another standing committee and report its opinion to that standing committee.
4. To take into account in its deliberations the cross cutting themes of: the health of persons in Greater London; and the promotion of opportunity.
5. To respond on behalf of the Assembly to consultations and similar processes when within its terms of reference.

Assembly Secretariat Contacts

Richard Linton, Senior Scrutiny Manager
020 7983 4421 richard.linton@london.gov.uk

Sue Riley, Committee Co-ordinator
020 7983 4425 sue.riley@london.gov.uk

Kelly Flynn, Senior Media Officer
020 7983 4067 kelly.flynn@london.gov.uk

Contents

Foreword	1
The Environment Committee	2
Executive Summary	4
Chapter 1 Introduction	6
Chapter 2 Approach and method	8
Chapter 3 Background to waste management in London	9
Setting the scene	9
The Mayor's Waste Strategy and the Implementation Plan	9
Key drivers	10
Chapter 4 Review findings	13
4.1: Introduction	13
4.2: Players and partnerships	14
4.3: Mapping current waste activity in London	22
4.4: Financing municipal waste management in London	36
Chapter 5 Conclusions and recommendations	46
Overarching issues	47
Core activities	51
Annex A Recommendations	58
Annex B List of consultees	60
Annex C Topic Guide	61
Annex D Questionnaire	63
Annex E Orders and translations	66
Annex F Scrutiny principles	67

Executive Summary

In our report we review the Implementation Plan for the Mayor's Municipal Waste Management Strategy. We acknowledge that it is too soon to evaluate its effectiveness – after all, the Waste Strategy was published only six months ago – and focus instead on the extent to which current activities by London's major waste industry players:

- are influenced by the Mayoral Strategy, and
- seem likely to contribute to the achievement of London's 25% recycling target by 2005.

Research by our consultants reveals that for organisations in London charged with delivering the waste agenda, the three key drivers of waste 'behaviour' are European legislation, statutory recycling targets and borough level waste strategies. The Mayor's Waste Strategy has not gone unnoticed, but our survey confirms it is too soon for it to have made much of an impact. Potentially the most significant driver for recycled materials in the capital is the degree to which London is able to develop demand for such products – but detailed work on this issue is outside the scope of the scrutiny.

Chapter 4 of the report presents the findings of the research that our consultants carried out for the review. The results are presented in three main sections:

- 4.2: Players & Partnerships introduces the major players in the waste sector in London, summarises their roles and functions, highlights their major current waste-related activities, and identifies their principal waste-related funding.
- 4.3: Mapping Waste Activity gives more specific detail on the waste activities being undertaken by the various players.
- 4.4: Financing Waste Activity presents more detail on the funds supporting both the activities and players.

Our main conclusions and recommendations are set out in Chapter 5:

- Although the strong network of waste partnerships has served London well in recent years, we identify the need for active leadership if the current phase of extensive and intensive effort is not to be dissipated. We conclude that without such leadership London would not only miss the 2005 recycling targets but would be struggling perpetually thereafter. In our view, the Mayor should be supported in providing this leadership, working in constructive partnership with key players through London Waste Action.
- The consequences of failing to meet targets need to be spelt out.
- All parties should engage with the London Plan Sub-Regional Development Framework process to make sure that sufficient land is identified and safeguarded for strategic infrastructure to meet London's future waste management needs – for green waste collection and processing facilities in particular.
- In the short term, expenditure on waste management in London should be focused on waste minimisation, strategic infrastructure and the role of community and enterprise sector. Further work should be undertaken to understand how PFI operates in waste management.
- London must give waste minimisation the highest priority. We must devise and implement an auditable, systematic waste minimisation programme for the capital linked to the mayor's waste reduction and reuse plan.
- We support the proposed London Waste Reduction and Recycling Support Service.
- The Audit Commission should consider establishing best value indicators for waste minimisation and home composting initiatives.

- We applaud the work of the London Recycling Fund in supporting borough level recycling collection, and call for a secure financial future for such initiatives. We support the extension of collection to areas so far excluded – such as housing estates and parts of Inner London
- We believe the Mayor should set high targets for home composting in Outer London, but he should advocate the household collection of compostable waste in Inner London.
- We have identified a risk of duplication and overlap in the Londonwide collection and dissemination of best practice information. We call for better co-ordination from the Mayor and London Waste Action, and believe the proposed London Waste Reduction and Recycling Support Service may be able to help.
- We believe that training in soft skills (for example, procurement, project management, communication, PR and lobbying), where we have identified a gap in provision for waste management practitioners, could be achieved by tweaking and refocusing existing programmes. This could be co-ordinated by the proposed London Waste Reduction and Recycling Support Service.

1. Introduction

Assembly scrutiny of London waste issues and the Mayor's emerging Municipal Waste Management Strategy

- 1.1 Over the last four years, the London Assembly has been tracking waste issues in the capital on behalf of Londoners. The Assembly's *Rewarding Recycling: an investigation into barriers to greater recycling in London*¹ was published in June 2001. This study looked at the amount of waste being produced in London and expressed concern at how relatively little was being recycled. It examined what was preventing boroughs from achieving recycling targets, looked at the potential for increased rates of composting and recycling, and discussed what could be done to tackle projected waste growth.
- 1.2 A report on the Assembly's *Scrutiny of the Mayor's draft Waste Strategy*² was published in November 2001. This gave broad support to the principles behind the Mayor's draft strategy, but raised concerns in four areas:
- strategy implementation,
 - the failure to learn from other cities and regions,
 - measures to tackle waste growth, and
 - the Mayor's policy on incineration.
- 1.3 In December 2002, the Assembly published its *Response to the Public Consultation Draft of the Municipal Waste Strategy*³. The response called for the Mayor to:
- say more on waste minimisation,
 - revisit incentives for kerbside recycling, and
 - clarify his implementation plan.

The Mayor's Municipal Waste Management Strategy

- 1.4 Rethinking Rubbish in London: the Mayor's Municipal Waste Management Strategy was published in September 2003. Full details can be found here: <http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor/strategies/waste/index.jsp>
- 1.5 Chapter 5 of the mayor's Strategy contains an Implementation Plan⁴. This consists of a matrix which draws together the 101 proposals that the Strategy identifies, and plots them by timescale, responsible organisation(s), degree of priority and monitoring and evaluation indicators.

Rational for this scrutiny

- 1.6 The Environment Committee is keen to ensure that the Mayor's Municipal Waste Management Strategy is implemented effectively. This has been a constant thread running through our consideration of its preparation and development (see above).

¹ Rewarding Recycling: an Assembly investigation into barriers to greater recycling in London (Waste Recycling Investigative Committee, June 2001), available from <http://www.london.gov.uk/assembly/reports/environment.jsp>

² Scrutiny of the Mayor's draft Waste Strategy (Environmental Strategies Investigative Committee, November 2001), available from web link above.

³ Response to the Public Consultation Draft of the Mayor's Municipal Waste Management Strategy (Environment Committee, December 2002), available from web link above.

⁴ Mayors Municipal Waste Management Strategy, pp 296-319.

- 1.7 On 20 November 2003 we agreed⁵ to appoint technical consultants to undertake an analysis of current and proposed work on the Implementation Plan for the Mayor's Municipal Waste Management Strategy.

Terms of reference of the scrutiny

- 1.8 The scrutiny's terms of reference are to:
- for key organisations charged with implementing the Mayor's Municipal Waste Management Strategy, to map relevant activities (current, and/or planned to be undertaken) to identify any gaps and/or extent of overlap in Strategy proposal implementation;
 - to assess key organisations' strengths, weaknesses and ability to deliver the implementation of Strategy proposals; and
 - to make recommendations to the Mayor and other key organisations to improve the Strategy's implementation plan.
- 1.9 Following competitive tendering, the contract for technical consultant on this scrutiny was awarded to Brook Lyndhurst.

Further work of the London Assembly's Environment Committee

- 1.10 In addition to the three scrutiny reports mentioned above, the London Assembly, through the Environment Committee and its predecessor committees, has published the following scrutiny reports on environmental issues in London:
- Scrutiny of the Mayor's draft Air Quality Strategy (Environmental Strategies Investigative Committee, May 2001)
 - Scrutiny of the Mayor's draft Biodiversity Strategy (Environmental Strategies Investigative Committee, May 2001)
 - Scrutiny of the transportation of nuclear waste by train through London (Nuclear Waste Trains Investigative Committee, October 2001)
 - Scrutiny of Green Spaces in London (Green Spaces Investigative Committee, November 2001)
 - Graffiti in London (Graffiti Investigative Committee, May 2002)
 - Scrutiny of the Mayor's Energy Strategy (Assembly Draft) (Environment Committee, July 2002)
 - Scrutiny of the Mayor's draft Noise Strategy (Environment Committee, October 2002)
 - Flooding in London (Flooding Investigative Committee, November 2002)
 - Power in Partnership: response to the Public Consultation Draft of the Mayor's Energy Strategy (Environment Committee, April 2003)
 - Raising the Standard? Review of the Capital Standards Campaign on street cleanliness (Environment Committee, February 2004)
 - EU Directives affecting waste electrical and electronic equipment (Environment Committee, February 2004)
 - Young London speaks: young people's views on improving the street environment (Environment Committee, February 2004)
- 1.11 All of these scrutiny reports can be downloaded from:
<http://www.london.gov.uk/assembly/reports/environment.jsp>

⁵ The report can be found here: <http://www.london.gov.uk/assembly/envmtgs/2003/envnov20/envnov20item06.pdf>

2. Approach and method

- 2.1 Given the scope of the enquiry, our approach has been to concentrate on just a selection of key proposals in the Mayor's Implementation Plan⁶. These proposals were selected on the basis of whether they were an immediate priority for action, and whether the organisation(s) responsible for delivery was one of the 'core' organisations identified (see Chapter 4 of this report).
- 2.2 We agreed that since the final version of the Mayor's Waste Strategy was only published in September 2003, it would be too soon to analyse the *effectiveness* of the Implementation Plan and whether organisations were conducting activity as a *direct* result of the Strategy.
- 2.3 The focus of the work was therefore taken to be the extent to which current activities by London's major waste industry players seemed likely to be contributing to the achievement of the 25% recycling target by 2005⁷, and to what extent activity has been influenced by the Mayoral Strategy.
- 2.4 The research was conducted by Brook Lyndhurst, our technical consultants, during March 2004 and contained the following elements:
- Qualitative face-to-face and telephone consultations⁸ with representatives from key delivery agencies or their representative organisations, as highlighted in the Implementation Plan. The list of interviewees was agreed by the Scrutiny Manager. A total of 15 interviews were conducted and a full list can be found in Annex B. Brook Lyndhurst designed a topic guide for the interviews which was agreed by the Scrutiny Manager (Annex C).
 - An electronic survey of other stakeholders in London (the questionnaire for which is presented at Annex D), including recycling officers within joint disposal authorities and unitary authorities, individuals from the private sector (contractors and retailers), and membership organisations in London. Over 70 questionnaires were sent out to a targeted list developed by Brook Lyndhurst⁹, and from representative organisations such as the London Community Recycling Network and the Association of London Government to their members;
 - Desk-based research of waste funding streams in London using Local Authority spending data and BVPI data on waste management, and a review of annual budgets/reports for key organisations;
 - A process of analysis and report writing facilitated by brain storming sessions internally within Brook Lyndhurst and by consultative discussions with the Scrutiny Manager, and GLA Waste Team and ALG officers.

⁶ Rethinking Rubbish In London, the Mayor's Municipal Waste Management Strategy, September 2003, pp 296-318.

⁷ The target of 25% recycling by 2005 was proposed in Defra's Waste Strategy 2000 and endorsed by the Mayor's Waste Strategy.

⁸ Any comments made during consultations and repeated in this report are not always directly attributed to one particular organisation.

⁹ The questionnaire had a response rate of 28%

3. Background to waste management in London

3.1 In this section of the report, we briefly set out some of the background issues to the research:

- Setting the Scene – in which the broad European, national and London strategic context is set out
- The Mayor's Waste Strategy and Implementation Plan – which sets out more of the London-specific details
- Key Drivers – which positions the Mayoral strategy in the context of other factors influencing the waste sector in the capital.

Setting the Scene

3.2 In response to the demands of the EU Landfill Directive, and other European Directives on waste, the Government produced a National Waste Strategy¹⁰ in May 2000, which set out its views on the future of waste management in England and Wales. The Strategy set ambitious targets for the reduction of commercial, industrial and household waste.

3.3 Following on from this report, the Government's Strategy Unit conducted a review of the National Waste Strategy entitled "Waste Not Want Not"¹¹. The review report focused exclusively on municipal waste in England, and made 34 recommendations for action, relating to economic drivers, delivery and funding (to reduce waste) and the promotion of the 3 R's (reduce, reuse and recycle).

3.4 The review report made three key recommendations:-

- Increase landfill tax
- Provide more resources to Defra and WRAP to accelerate progress of waste reduction and recycling
- Reform the Landfill Tax Credit Scheme to make money available to fund new initiatives to reduce waste, boost recycling and develop alternatives to landfill

3.5 In London during 2000, the Mayor and the Assembly was established, restoring London wide strategic government for the first time since the abolition of the Greater London Council in 1986. The Mayor's Waste Strategy is one of four environmental strategies that the Mayor is required to produce¹². Framing these strategies is the London Plan¹³, which sets out the planning and development strategy for managing London over the next decade.

The Mayor's waste strategy and the Implementation Plan

3.6 At around the same time as the Strategy Unit report was published in 2002, the Mayor published a consultation draft of the Municipal Waste Management Strategy. Following consultation, the final version of the Strategy was published in September 2003 and it sets down an overarching framework of waste policy up until 2020. The Strategy contains an array of policies and proposals on how London can improve and manage its municipal waste. A set of 44 policies are

¹⁰ DETR, 2000, *Waste Strategy 2000*. The Stationery Office

¹¹ "Waste Not Want Not", A Strategy for tackling the waste problem in England, Strategy Unit, 2002,

¹² As well as these four strategies, the Mayor decided to produce an Energy Strategy - there have therefore been five environmental strategies in total.

¹³ "The London Plan", Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, Mayor of London, February 2004

presented in the Strategy, and these are further supported by another 101 proposals for action (the Implementation Plan).

- 3.7 The Mayor's Waste Strategy supports the targets set out in the Waste Strategy 2000, notably that 25% recycling by 2005 is both a reasonable and achievable target and policy 1 of the Strategy states that:
"London will aim to exceed the recycling and composting targets for household waste set by the government"
- 3.8 In fact, the Mayor's Strategy encourages Authorities in London to look towards a recycling rate of 60% by 2015, and it proposes to lobby central government to make the necessary legislative changes in order to reach such a target. To achieve the 25% recycling target, the Strategy gives details for action under the following key headings¹⁴:
- Waste reduction and reuse
 - Recycling collection
 - Recovery and residual waste treatment
 - Landfill
 - Reuse and recycling centres (CA sites)
 - Street cleansing and litter
 - Producer Responsibility – packaging, electrical and electronic equipment
 - Hazardous waste
 - Clinical waste
 - Education and promotion
 - Developing markets
 - Leading by example
 - Planning the waste infrastructure in London
 - Long – term structural changes
 - Transport of waste
 - Funding
 - Municipal waste contracts
 - Municipal waste management strategies.
- 3.9 The scope of the proposals in the Waste Strategy is such that this current piece of research draws attention only to those which have been identified as being either of 'high' or 'key' importance in the Implementation Plan and which are directed at a 'core' set of delivery organisations in London, i.e. those who appear with relative frequency in the Implementation Plan. That is not to say that other organisations and medium/long term priorities are not important, simply that they could not be prioritised within the confines of this particular project.

Key Drivers

- 3.10 Organisations in London who have a responsibility for delivering the waste agenda face a plethora of drivers and pressures. The results of the electronic questionnaire suggest that for the majority of stakeholders in London the three major drivers of waste 'behaviour' are:

¹⁴ "Rethinking Rubbish in London". The Mayor's Municipal Waste Management Strategy, September 2003, p300

- European legislation;
 - statutory recycling targets; and
 - Borough waste strategies.
- 3.11 The Mayor's Municipal Waste Strategy has not gone unnoticed, but the survey confirms that it is still too early to realise its full effect, having only been published in September 2003.
- 3.12 The National Waste Strategy (2000) set out a vision of sustainable waste management in England and Wales and offered an overview of waste policy. The Strategy established a series of national recycling targets – 25% recycling or composting of household waste by 2005 increasing to 30% by 2010 and 33% by 2015. In 2002, the Strategy Unit report, *Waste Not Want Not*, looked at how to take forward the targets which had been set out in the Strategy, and concluded that the targets should be increased to 35% recycling by 2010 and 45% by 2015.
- 3.13 To achieve the existing targets, Waste Collection and Disposal Authorities have been set statutory performance standards up until 2005/06¹⁵. The targets form part of the existing Best Value framework and will require substantial effort on the part of Local Authorities if London (and the UK as a whole) is to reach a recycling rate of 25%. As well as targets for composting and recycling, the Strategy 2000 set the objective of reducing the rate of municipal waste growth by 1% by 2006¹⁶. It is presently unclear whether the government is committed to setting statutory performance targets beyond 2005/06 although they have committed to reviewing the targets in 2004 in light of the progress made by Local Authorities
- 3.14 The EU landfill directive requires that by 2010, the amount of biodegradable waste going to landfill must be reduced to 75% of the total produced in 1995. By 2013, the amount must be reduced to 50% of the 1995 total, and by 2020 to 35%. Coupled with these targets, the cost of sending waste to landfill will increase by £3/tonne each year until £35/tonne is reached.
- 3.15 Defra will shortly produce a summary of the responses to its consultation regarding the proposed Landfill Allowance Trading Scheme. The idea behind the scheme is to reduce the amount of biodegradable waste going to landfill. The scheme, which will be the first of its kind in Europe, is scheduled to start in 2005 (although no specific date has yet been announced), and will allocate tradeable landfill allowances, which will set limits on the amount of biodegradable municipal waste which may be landfilled each year, to each waste disposal authority (WDA) in England. The WDAs will then be allowed to trade their allowances with other disposal authorities. For example, if a council with a 100 tonne allowance to landfill only needed to landfill 50 tonnes, it could sell the balance to another council that needed to landfill more than its allowance capacity.
- 3.16 The Mayor's Strategy proposes that the Mayor will act as a broker for tradeable allowances across London as part of his strategic responsibilities for waste

¹⁵ Authorities with a recycling/composting rate of 12-18% in 98/99 must reach 36% by 05/06, those with a rate of 5-12% have to treble their rate, and those with a rate below 6% must achieve a minimum of 18%.

¹⁶ This responsibility does not fall directly with Local Authorities – Defra have charged Wrap (Waste Resources and Action Plan) with the responsibility of reducing household waste through a programme of waste minimisation and reuse.

management in the capital.¹⁷ The Mayor would first focus on trading within London before considering trading nationally. We note that this proposal has yet to be accepted by the ALG on behalf of London boroughs.

- 3.17 Market demand for products made from recycled materials is, potentially at least, a key driver affecting recycling, and developing such demand is seen as crucial if London is to see a step change in levels of recycling and reprocessing. Research conducted by Bell Pottinger for London Remade in 2001 puts the case clearly:

“The government sector recognised that for recycling targets to be met, end markets have to be found...the business sector holds that recycling on a larger scale is not plausible until there is a market for recycled goods...the waste industry believes that it is not enough to just collect goods for recycling: “you have to close the loop” by stimulating demand for recycled goods from the consumer.. The local authorities argue that it is difficult, if not impossible, to meet the governments recycling targets if there is not a viable market for secondary materials”¹⁸

- 3.18 Although the market for some recyclates has grown steadily in the UK, many materials have been subject to both price fluctuations and market instability. Indeed, in many respects the price of recyclates mimics that of other basic commodities – with the added complication that, in most cases, they are competing with virgin alternatives. Price uncertainty seems set to continue for the foreseeable future, suggesting that generalised “market solutions” as a driver for recycling remain some way off.
- 3.19 A detailed investigation of this issue has not been undertaken for this current piece of research. Modelling work undertaken by Enviro for the GLA to assess the likely costs of the Mayor’s Municipal Waste Strategy includes reference to and assumptions about the price/cost of recyclates, but it would appear that more detailed work may still be required (see Chapter 5: Conclusions and recommendations).

¹⁷ “Rethinking Rubbish in London”, The Mayor’s Municipal Waste Management Strategy”, September 2003

¹⁸ “Stakeholder Analysis Report”, Bell Pottinger, August 2001, pg 16

4. Review findings

4.1 Introduction

- 4.1.1 In this, the main body of the report, we present the findings of the research that our consultants carried out for the review. The results are presented in three main sections:
- **Section 4.2: Players & Partnerships** – in which the major players in the waste sector in London are introduced, their roles and functions briefly summarised, their major current waste-related activities highlighted, and their principal waste-related funding identified.
 - **Section 4.3: Mapping Waste Activity** – in which is presented more specific detail on the various activities being undertaken by the various players.
 - **Section 4.4: Financing Waste Activity** – in which we present more detail on the funds supporting both the activities and players.
- 4.1.2 There is, inevitably, some overlap between these three sections, though we have endeavoured to keep this to a minimum. In general, for example, where reference to a funding source is made when discussing an individual organisation, the details of that funding source are presented in the relevant section.
- 4.1.3 The results draw on the qualitative discussions, the electronic questionnaire and the desk research. It is worth noting that although the electronic questionnaire elicited a reasonable response rate (about 28%), the survey sample is too small to make definitive statements. The results have therefore been used illustratively to further support or augment the qualitative evidence.
- 4.1.4 In general, given both the time allocated to this study, and the methodologies involved, these findings should not be taken as definitive: they are, however, sufficiently indicative to provide a sound basis for identifying broad gaps and overlaps.

4.2 Players and partnerships

- 4.2.1 The management and governance of waste in London involves an array of organisations, sectors and stakeholders, each with varying roles and responsibilities. This nexus has developed over time to form a complex network of relationships and partnerships. The electronic survey conducted for this research revealed, in particular, the *ad hoc* nature of many of the relationships that comprise this complexity.
- 4.2.2 Partnerships have, of course, become a ubiquitous feature of public policy delivery. The Mayor's Municipal Waste Strategy fully recognises that to achieve sustainable waste management, co-operative working will be both vital and mutually beneficial; and the government's Waste Minimisation & Recycling Fund actively encourages partnership bids by limiting the amount available to non-partnership applications.
- 4.2.3 Our research suggests that there are two distinct 'waste' networks operating in London. On the one hand, there is a broad network of players who operate at a macro- or strategic level, and for whom waste may be only one of the issues with which they are concerned. On the other, is a set of stakeholders whose activities are directly related to waste management, but who play more of a significant role in terms of delivery. Stakeholders within both of these 'tiers' have been highlighted in the Mayor's Waste Strategy as being important in helping deliver the activity necessary to hit the target of 25% recycling by 2005.
- 4.2.4 The next section presents, in alphabetical order, a brief summary of each of the key players who are drawn from both networks highlighted above: some operate at a national level, and others, explicitly within London. They play integrated but distinct roles in the delivery of waste management in London. Further details for each organisation are available from the relevant web-sites listed.

Association of London Government

www.alg.gov.uk

- 4.2.5 The Association of London Government is committed to fighting for more resources for London and getting the best possible deal for London's 33 councils. Part think-tank and part lobbying organisation, it also runs a range of services all designed to make life better for Londoners. As well as providing member authorities with a single powerful voice, the ALG lobbies for proper resources for the capital and leads the debate on key issues affecting Londoners. It also acts as the employers' organisation for the 33 London councils, providing advice, support and training and representing them in negotiations. The ALG runs the system of distributing £27 million in grants to cross-London voluntary groups each year, and provides or manages a range of transport-related services. These include the Freedom Pass, which allows more than a million older, disabled and blind people to travel free on London's buses, tubes and trains.
- 4.2.6 The ALG was formed in April 2000 from a merger of the five borough-funded London-wide bodies that remained outside of the new Greater London Authority. It represents all 32 London boroughs, and the Corporation of London, as well as the Metropolitan Police Authority and the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority. It is funded by subscriptions paid by member authorities and is run by a multi-party committee, comprising all the borough leaders.

4.2.7 The ALG is formally consulted by the Government about a wide range of issues relating to local government and other matters of concern to London and works closely with many other public, voluntary and corporate organisations, which reflect the diversity of the capital.

4.1.8 The ALG's main functions are to:

- provide a single voice for member authorities
- lobby for more resources and the best deal for the capital
- lead the debate on key issues affecting Londoners
- distribute grants to voluntary organisations working in more than one London borough
- provide a number of London-wide transport and traffic services
- act as the employers' organisation for the boroughs
- provide specialist housing advice and analysis.

4.2.9 The ALG undertake various activities which are specifically related to waste management such as:

- Co-founder and co-director (with London First) of London Waste Action established to allocate £12m Capital Challenge funding to the London boroughs in 1997 and then to promote sustainable waste management in London. Recently this has focused on securing and distributing the £21.3 million London Recycling Fund, and subsequent allocations of £3.6 million additional funding from government and funding in 2004/5 and 2005/6 of over £20m. In addition, through London Waste Action's subsidiary, promoting work on closing the recycling loop (the rollout of the Mayor's Green Procurement Code to all boroughs) and the Supply Infrastructure Project.
- Comment on behalf of member boroughs on the Mayor's Municipal Waste Management Strategy as well as other Mayor strategies where there were implication for waste (e.g. London Plan).
- Develop a 'consensus' position on behalf of the Boroughs in regard to a range of waste management issues and then use this position in order to lobby for further funding and changes in legislation where relevant.
- Undertake progress reports and research on a number of waste related issues. A major piece of research has been initiated by the ALG to develop a planning and decision making tool for effective and efficient waste management. The tool will allow authorities to understand the costs and logistics of delivering sustainable waste management in London. The ALG has secured funding from Shanks First and the project is to be carried out in conjunction with the GLA and London Remade., Mouchel Parkman and Cranfield University. Another key piece of research is the development of a planning toolkit and best practice guide to enable planners to plan for new waste management facilities in London.
- Examine changes in policy and legislation and their potential impact on boroughs, then disseminate this information to members, working with borough groupings such as ALCO and LROG as well as the WDAs.
- Run a seminar programme to disseminate best practice, promote the work of boroughs and improve performance. Recent conferences include those held jointly with LWA and ALG on the London Recycling Fund, the ALG's own

conferences such as London's Living Streets: Improving the Public Realm and, with the Environment Agency, on flytipping.

- With the GLA has worked in partnership to promote initiatives such as Capital Standards including the Street Enforcement Academy and the Recycle for London campaign.
- The ALG grant aids London wide community organisations. One such organisation is the LCRN.

Chartered Institute of Wastes Management

www.ciwm.co.uk

4.2.10 The CIWM is the leading professional body that represents waste professionals in the UK. It exists for members only and its key function is to set professional standards for individuals working within the waste sector. In terms of its core activities, CIWM:

- Comment on relevant strategies such as the Mayor's Municipal Waste Strategy.
- Offer a range of training courses and technical publications for members via its commercial subsidiary. The CIWM annual conference and exhibition is an internationally attended event.
- Inform members of any changes in waste policy and legislation.
- Run a separate environmental body, which administers funding for projects UK wide. Projects have included "Waste Collection – to charge or not?" and providing funding for the 'Best Value Waste Network'.
- The London and Southern Counties Centre meet 9-10 times a year to discuss issues of membership and decide a programme of events to promote education, training, and sharing best practice.

4.2.11 CIWM is funded through a mix of membership subscription and commercial income from events, training etc.

ECT Recycling

www.ectrecycling.co.uk

4.2.12 ECT recycling is a social enterprise, which started as a community transport organisation 25 years ago and has since expanded into environmental services through furniture recycling, white goods collection and now extensive kerbside recycling collections. ECT works in partnership with 16 local authorities across the UK, 8 of these being within London. Via partnership working with other social enterprises and community groups, such as London Remade and LCRN, ECT aims to develop best practice in terms of new technologies.

4.2.13 ECT is financed via contract payments from Local Authorities and also via the sale of recyclates in the UK.

Environmental Services Association

www.esauk.org

4.2.14 ESA is the national trade body for the UK waste management industry. It is a membership organisation which works with industry, Government and regulators to 'develop waste and secondary resource management that is more economically and environmentally sustainable'. ESA:

- Produce policy statements and briefings on issues that may affect members.

- Organise conferences, seminars and workshops of relevance in order to share best practice and disseminate information e.g. *'Maximising Recycling – the Ingredients of Success'*, organised in January 2004
- Provide information via its website and also produce *Resource Management and Recovery* magazine.
- Have established a training programme in partnership with CIWM.

Greater London Authority/Mayor of London

www.london.gov.uk

- 4.2.15 The Mayor published the Mayor's Municipal Waste Strategy as part of his duties under the GLA Act 1999. This Strategy contains the policies and proposals for the recovery, treatment and disposal of municipal waste in London.
- 4.2.16 The Mayor has a range of specific powers and duties, and a general power to do anything that will promote economic and social development and environmental improvement in London. In terms of waste, the Mayor has powers of direction when waste authorities in London tender waste contracts. The GLA have been working closely with authorities at an early stage in order to avoid conflict, provide advice and aid understanding, and in all recent cases changes to contracts have been made as a direct result of comments. It is only after this approach has failed that the Mayor will use his powers of direction and only after consultation with that authority and full consideration of the circumstances of that authority' as set out on the GLA Act 1999. These powers are to facilitate the implementation of the Waste Strategy.
- 4.2.17 In addition to the development and launch of the Municipal Waste Strategy, the GLA/Mayor is involved in a range of other initiatives including:
- London Recycling Fund (in partnership with the ALG and LWA) distributing around £50 million funding to London's waste authorities from 2002-2006, and securing £3.6 million additional funding from government, and further 'funding for waste' work developing a cost modelling tool in partnership with the ALG.
 - The development of www.capitalwastefacts.com to improve data on waste in London.
 - The rollout of the Mayor's Green Procurement Code to all boroughs and over 230 companies.
 - The development of the Capital Standard programme with the boroughs, to clean up London's streets, including training of 120 enforcement officers, the 'pick it up' song for schools, the launch of the London Schools Environment Award and other awareness and litter education initiatives
 - Recycle for London campaign - Londonwide waste education and awareness campaign (subject to funding application for 2004-6) including Doorstepping Guidance Manual
 - Wider Waste strategy development – proposed draft for consultation by end 2004
 - Supporting new and emerging waste technology including project on New Technology Procurement Guidance (Capital Solutions)
 - Single waste authority – environmental and business case
 - Waste reduction and reuse plan
 - Municipal waste management strategy monitoring and information scheme including comparative information on the cleanliness of London's street

environment, collating DEFRA Waste Management Survey returns for London and updating Captialwastefacts.com

- Waste composition – initial scoping study to be completed by end of April 2004
- Olympics, schools, campus and events recycling
- Waste aspects of Sub Regional Development Frameworks
- Provision of best practice guidance initially London Recycling Fund projects summary – sharing best practice
- Market development – including market taskforce, materials consortia investigation, the Mayor's Green Procurement Code – working with the LDA
- Review of borough waste strategies – due by September 2004
- Waste authority contracts review – as appropriate
- London borough UDP waste aspects review – as appropriate
- Responding to government, EU and other consultation documents as appropriate

4.2.18 GLA funding comes from a range of sources. A large percentage of GLA funding comes from the local government revenue support grant, and the police grant. Further funding comes from the GLA transport grant.

London Community Recycling Network

www.lcrn.org.uk

- 4.2.19 LCRN is a not for profit organisation that represents London's community recyclers and Local Authorities. Via its four key work programmes, it:
- Provides a range of support services including training and advice on areas such as legislation, fundraising, business development and management systems.
 - Lobbies central government and industry on issues of importance to members.

4.2.20 LCRN is a not-for-profit Company Limited by Guarantee whose staff are funded through core and project income from a range of organisations including the ALG, London Recycling Fund, London Remade, New Opportunities Fund, Bridge House Trust and EQUAL. LCRN also receives supplementary income via their consultancy work.

London Development Agency

www.lda.gov.uk

- 4.2.21 The LDA is the regional economic development agency for London, promoting economic renewal and development. The LDA produces London's Economic Development Strategy on behalf of the Mayor and this promotes economic growth, knowledge and learning, inclusion and renewal and sustainable development across London.
- 4.2.22 In terms of activity related to waste, the majority of the LDA's work is currently delivered by London Remade, although the LDA do have plans to undertake work on sustainable product design, business support to the reprocessing sector and taking a strategic approach to business efficiency (including resource efficiency).

- 4.2.23 The London Development has a role in delivering the Mayor's Waste Strategy and this relates predominantly to markets for recycle (via London Remade), offering business support to reprocessors in London (currently under development) and capital infrastructure (via London Remade).
- 4.2.24 The London Development Agency is part of the Mayoral family and, as such, is funded by central government.

London Remade Ltd

www.londonremade.com

- 4.2.25 London Remade is a strategic partnership between the public, private and community sectors. Its remit is to improve the supply of materials and identify demand for recycled content products, and working with manufacturers to increase the availability, range and value of these products. Remade's role spans four key areas:
- Creating demand for recycled products – in particular, London Remade runs the Mayor's Green Procurement Code.
 - Improving the supply of recycled materials.
 - Investing in reprocessing capacity – there are four eco-industrial sites in London at the moment, with more scheduled.
 - Small business support – offer loans and mentoring to start up enterprises and community organisations looking to establish themselves in the recycling sector.
- 4.2.26 London Remade was originally funded by an SRB6 grant, and while it still receives the majority of its income from the London Development Agency, Remade increasingly funds its activities via sponsorship and consultancy activity.

London Regional Technical Advisory Board (RTAB)

- 4.2.27 The London RTAB is a partnership involving the ALG, GLA, Environment Agency, ESA, LCRN, ALCO, Waste Watch, Government Office for London, London Waste Action, joint disposal authorities and industry representatives. The London RTAB is currently handing the post of chair from the ALG to the GLA¹⁹. In the other English regions the RTABs play a role in developing the regional strategies for waste management, as set out in Planning Policy Guidance Note 10. Within London however, the RTAB has no executive power, and functions instead as a formal network to promote discussion between key players in London.

London Waste Action

www.londonwasteaction.org

- 4.2.28 London Waste Action was set up in 1997 as a working partnership between the private, public and independent sectors²⁰. One of the first pieces of work undertaken by LWA was on market development and this fed into the establishment of London Remade via a Single Regeneration Budget bid. Although not identified explicitly in the Mayor's Strategy, London Waste Action comprises individuals and organisations who are charged with delivering the Implementation Plan.

¹⁹ It also rotates with the Environment Agency who held chair in 2001/2002

²⁰ LWA's board comprises individuals from London First, ALG, GLA, Environment Agency, ESA, Waste Watch, Cleanaway, CIWM.

- 4.2.29 Presently LWA's major role is in the management and delivery of the London Recycling Fund, the core funding for which is allocated by Defra from the Waste Minimisation and Recycling Fund for England, together with support from the Waste and Resource Action Programme (WRAP).
- 4.2.30 LWA is currently debating its future function and direction. Given the composition of the LWA Board (i.e. it includes many other waste-sector players) the debate is iterative, since it depends in part on the strategic decisions being taken by other bodies. At present, key elements of the debate include the relationship between London Waste Action and London Remade; and the idea of a London 'Centre of Excellence' or 'Centre of Improvement' – now to be known as the London Waste Reduction and Recycling Support Service. This Centre would potentially play a capacity building role to stakeholders in London, offering mentoring, interim project management, training, dissemination of best practice and signposting, particularly to boroughs who look like they may miss their statutory waste targets.
- 4.2.31 London Waste Action is an Environmental Body, a company limited by guarantee and a registered charity. The management of LWA and in turn the LRF is funded through Landfill Tax Credits and by Defra, together with smaller amounts from the GLA and ALG.

Waste Authorities

- 4.2.32 Within London, each of the 33 boroughs is responsible for the collection of their own waste. Twelve boroughs act as Unitary Authorities²¹ and are responsible for waste collection and disposal. The remaining boroughs carry out their disposal functions through the four statutory joint disposal authorities created by the Waste Regulation and Disposal (Authorities) Order 1985. The four joint disposal authorities are grouped as follows:
- East London Waste Authority (4 boroughs)
 - West London Waste Authority (6 boroughs)
 - North London Waste Authority (7 boroughs)
 - Western Riverside Waste Authority (4 boroughs)
- 4.2.33 Each of the four joint disposal authorities is required to produce one Strategy in partnership with their constituent boroughs. Any Strategy must set out a programme of work agreed by both the collection and disposal authorities and some of the disposal authorities e.g. North London have already produced a draft strategy. The Unitary Authorities currently operate independently although some of the southern London boroughs have been working together more recently.

Waste Implementation Programme (WIP)

www.defra.gov.uk/environment/waste/wip/

- 4.2.34 WIP was set up by Defra to meet the Strategy Unit's recommendation that a Task Force was required to deliver the landfill directive. Building on the Strategy Unit recommendations, WIP's programmes combine to drive waste management solutions up the waste hierarchy, improving the sustainability of waste management in England. There are 8 WIP programmes:
- Local Authority Support

²¹ The boroughs are Bexley, Bromley, Corporation of London, Croydon, Greenwich, Kingston, Lewisham, Merton, Southwark, Sutton, Tower Hamlets, Westminster.

- Local Authority Funding
- New Technologies
- Data
- Research
- Waste Minimisation
- Kerbside
- Waste Awareness

- 4.2.35 Three of these programmes - Waste Minimisation, Kerbside and Waste Awareness - are subcontracted to WRAP. WIP will be working alongside organisations and strategic authorities in the regions to deliver its remaining 5 programmes through the development of toolkits, case studies and best practice, all of which will be available through a centralised website.
- 4.2.36 WIP are not mentioned in the Mayor's Waste Strategy Implementation Plan because when the Strategy went out for consultation, WIP did not exist and when the final Strategy was published its role was still unclear. WIP is funded by Defra.

Waste Watch

www.wastewatch.org.uk

- 4.2.37 Waste Watch are an environmental organisation operating at national level that promotes sustainable waste management. It plays both a delivery and lobbying role across its five key work programmes:
- Policy, research and information – Waste Watch, in partnership with CIWM and the National Waste Awareness Initiative (NWA) and funded by the New Opportunities Fund, run 'Waste online'. The website contains an array of information on waste and recycling which users can search by various topics.
 - Marketing and communications (trading company) – Waste Watch offer help to Local Authorities to write their communications strategies, canvassing, as well as training boroughs in communications skills. In London, Waste Watch are heavily involved in the Western Riverside Rethink Rubbish campaign.
 - Education – Run the Schools Waste Action Clubs (SWAC) in eight areas across England and the Waste Education Support Programme which allows organisations to access waste education resources, support and training.
 - Business Environment Clubs
 - Environmental consultancy
- 4.2.38 Waste Watch is funded by individual, organisational and corporate supporters as well as charitable trusts, the national lottery, consultancy work and central government.

Waste Resources and Action Plan (WRAP)

www.wrap.org.uk

- 4.2.39 WRAP is a public/private sector hybrid, supported by Defra, DTI, Scottish Assembly and the Welsh Assembly. It was established in 2001 in response to the Waste Strategy 2000. Originally its responsibility focused on creating stable and efficient markets for recycled materials, but in 2003 its role was expanded to include waste awareness, waste minimisation and kerbside recycling devolved to WRAP via the Waste Implementation Programme.

4.3 Mapping current waste activity in London

- 4.3.1 This section looks in more detail at the many activities currently being undertaken or planned by the organisations listed above, in order to help identify any gaps and overlaps in current and planned activity.
- 4.3.2 The information presented has been obtained either via discussions with individuals representing an organisation, through desk based research conducted by Brook Lyndhurst or through the electronic survey conducted in the early part of the research.
- 4.3.3 Using the evidence gathered from the consultations and from the questionnaire, Brook Lyndhurst identified a set of ‘core’ activities. This list of core activities is a combination of direct activities listed in the Strategy Implementation Plan and used in the questionnaire, and more indirect ‘qualitative’ activities that emerged from the consultations as being important:
- Waste minimisation
 - Recycling collection
 - Composting & green waste
 - Awareness/education
 - Best practice
 - Training
 - Data monitoring and collection
 - Infrastructure (including CA sites)

Findings for these activities are presented below.

Waste Minimisation

- 4.3.4 The electronic survey suggests that London Boroughs are undertaking limited activity in relation to waste reduction and reuse – notably in terms of promoting waste reduction, promoting home composting and bins, and offering furniture reuse and recycling. Some Boroughs are promoting reusable nappy schemes and the Mailing Preference Service (tackling junk mail).
- 4.3.5 The Mayor’s Waste Strategy commits to developing a ‘Waste Reduction and Reuse Programme for London’. By 2004/05 there will be a fully developed Reduction and Reuse Plan which will aim to co-ordinate waste minimisation research, promote pilot projects, work with the LDA (see below), support the development of re-use and re-manufacturing schemes and lobby the government to consider economic instruments as a way of minimising waste.
- 4.3.6 The London Development Agency is not currently promoting waste reduction and reuse but intends to run a future programme of work on sustainable product design.²²
- 4.3.7 London Waste Action has prioritised waste reduction and reuse in their 2004-2006 Business Plan for years 3 and 4 of the London Recycling Fund²³. LWA have made an indicative allocation of funding for waste minimisation of £0.5m which works out at approximately 2.26% of the total core funds, but state:

²² Correspondence between Brook Lyndhurst and the London Development Agency, March 2004

²³ “Delivery Strategy and Business Plan, years 3 and 4”, The London Recycling Fund, London Waste Action Feb 2004

“The fund will, if necessary make additional funding available to this priority if the indicative amounts allocated prove to be insufficient”

- 4.3.8 The 2002/2004 allocations of the LRF show that out of 65 projects that received money from the LRF in rounds 1-7, only two were projects aimed specifically at waste minimisation²⁴, although this does not reflect where waste minimisation is included as part of larger projects such as the Recycle for London campaign (see Education section below).
- 4.3.9 As part of a new programme of work, the Waste Implementation Programme has appointed WRAP to tackle issues of waste reduction at a national level. Work is only just beginning and funding will be directed towards start up nappy services, the improvement of existing nappy services, and a Waste Minimisation Innovation Fund. This Fund will be targeted at retailers in an effort to get them to reduce supermarket waste. Approximately £0.8m has been made available for the nappy initiative and £0.2m for the innovation fund.²⁵
- 4.3.10 At a national, strategic level the National Resource and Waste Forum²⁶ have prioritised waste prevention as one of its core activities and are currently undertaking work intended to feed into regional Waste Prevention and Minimisation Strategies (themselves proposed in the National Waste Strategy). The NRWF seem keen to have a representative from London in order to avoid duplication of work and encourage practical local level waste minimisation strategies²⁷, but the nature of links between the NRWF work and that by, for example, the GLA, is not clear.
- 4.3.11 Waste Watch and Business Link run the Waste Exchange programme, an online matching resource service for boroughs and businesses in London. Waste Watch are hoping to expand the programme London-wide - access to the website is currently limited to members living in the London boroughs of Camden, Haringey, Islington, Barnet, Hillingdon and Harrow as well as the Heathrow Airport area and Waste Watch are currently in the process of estimating how much this will cost. Members of the Waste Exchange can access a password protected website where they can source useful second hand materials or find a home for unwanted materials. The idea behind the programme is to help companies save money both on purchasing and disposal costs. Several London boroughs, corporate sponsors and public funds finance the programme.

Recycling Collection

- 4.3.12 The Mayor's Waste Strategy highlights this as a key priority²⁸, and states that Local Authorities should have the correct infrastructure in place by September 2004. The Strategy highlights a number of proposals under recycling collection, each being either a 'key' or 'high' priority, including household recycling collections, estates based recycling and adopt a bank schemes.
- 4.3.13 Responses to the electronic questionnaire from waste authorities show that many authorities are actively promoting and implementing borough-wide kerbside collection schemes for 1-3 materials (and some are providing services that collect more than 3 materials). A smaller number indicated that they

²⁴ London Recycling Fund Allocated rounds 1-7 from www.londonwasteaction.org

²⁵ Wrap Fact Sheet, May 2003

²⁶ A Landfill Tax-funded environmental body

²⁷ Conversation between Brook Lyndhurst and the NRWF, March 2004

²⁸ Proposals 16 and 17 in the Mayor's Implementation Plan.

provided 1 recycling site per 500 households for at least 3 materials on estates and multi occupancy properties, at a borough wide level, as suggested in the Mayor's Implementation Plan.

- 4.3.14 Kerbside infrastructure was a key priority of the Phase I London Recycling Fund, and it is estimated that as many as one million additional households are now benefiting from kerbside collections as a result²⁹. In rounds 1-7 of the LRF just over half of all allocations (51%) were for either 'kerbside' or 'CA' projects³⁰. The LRF Business Plan³¹ for years 3 and 4 has prioritised improving participation, multi-material recycling collections and the extension of collections for kitchen and green waste.
- 4.3.15 LCRN have prioritised high/low rise estates, bulky waste and WEEE as part of their work on their provision of recycling collections and bring sites. LCRN have been supporting boroughs and the community sector to bid to the LRF for projects within these priorities.
- 4.3.16 Although the Recycling and Organics Technical Advisory Team (ROTATE) programme run by WRAP is related to kerbside collections, it is discussed in more detail in the Best Practice section below. WIP have also undertaken a baseline audit of CA sites and more information can be found in the "Data Monitoring/Collection" section below.

Composting & Green Waste

Composting

- 4.3.17 The Mayor's Waste Strategy fully supports and promotes home composting and community composting.
- 4.3.18 As part of the kerbside best practice programme, WRAP are running a programme of organics market development and home composting promotion, with plans to provide 250,000 homes across the UK with compost bins in Phase 1 (2004)³². A total of £6.6m has been allocated for the home composting element. WRAP put out an open call for partners and there are now 22 boroughs that are acting as 'agents' – delivering leaflets, door knocking and a range of compost bins. Enfield and Kensington & Chelsea are the two boroughs in London who were selected as partners.³³ All 22 partners have adopted a standardised awareness/promotional campaign, and there are plans to roll this out nationally in the next few years. WRAP has provided each of the partners with a home composting advisor who provide support and training.
- 4.3.19 London Remade has developed an organics programme that is primarily aimed at developing composting infrastructure in London. They have a showcase facility at Rainham that takes 50,000 tonnes of kitchen and garden waste, and are also working alongside ECT recycling on a pilot scheme in West London (see below). Remade are also running a vertical composting project in Bromley. LCRN and the Community Composting Network have been commissioned to undertake a development strategy and 'state of the organics sector' report³⁴.

²⁹ Source: GLA/Assembly March 2004

³⁰ Brook Lyndhurst analysis of the London Recycling Fund Allocated rounds 1-7 from www.londonwasteaction.org

³¹ "Delivery Strategy and Business Plan, years 3 and 4", The London Recycling Fund, London Waste Action Feb 2004

³² From www.wrap.org.uk. Phase 2 aims to roll out 500,000 bins and Phase 3 750,000 bins.

³³ Enfield has received 8,000 subsidised bins (all the same) in Phase 1 and RBKC has received 6,000 (3 different types)

³⁴ Member news e-mail from London Community Recycling Network, March 2004

- 4.3.20 LCRN are promoting home composting and green waste collections and are working in conjunction with a number of boroughs as well as ECT recycling. LCRN are not 'delivering' home composting/green waste collections *per se*, but supporting existing programmes such as the West London Waste Authority community-composting network. LCRN are playing a further role in supporting community farms and gardens to compost, as well as promoting and developing the idea of centralised composting facilities. As part of this support programme, LCRN offer free training and advice for community composters.

Green Waste collections

- 4.3.21 Most respondents to the survey said they do, or are planning to within the next 3 years, provide facilities to receive/segregate green waste at CA sites. A small proportion said they provided free green waste collections and a still smaller proportion said that they are currently offering directly charged green waste collections.
- 4.3.22 Proposal 25 of the Implementation Plan states that boroughs are required to produce a '*fully costed feasibility study for the boroughwide collection of separated kitchen vegetable waste and green garden waste*' by September 2004. However, more than half of the waste authorities that responded to the questionnaire said that the Mayor's Strategy had had no influence on their current or planned activity in relation to green waste. This could, in part be due to the fact that boroughs were already undertaking activity in this area when the Final Strategy was produced.
- 4.3.23 Phase II of the London Recycling Fund has identified organic waste collections as a key area under its 'Enabling Recycling Collections and Improving Participation through Awareness, Education and Promotion' programme. The Fund states that:
- "it will support projects to enable the separate collection of organic waste (with the emphasis on kitchen waste) but only where it can be demonstrated that efforts to encourage home composting and other initiatives to minimise green waste have been introduced"*
- 4.3.24 Out of the 65 allocations made in the Phase I LRF allocations, 13 were earmarked for composting or green waste projects.
- 4.3.25 ECT, alongside London Remade, has been piloting a trial across 4,000 households in West London that collects dry recyclables alongside kitchen waste. Evidence from the pilot seems to suggest that when kitchen waste collections are run alongside normal kerbside collections there is an increase in recycling of dry recyclables³⁵. As part of this pilot, ECT is running an in-vessel composting trial and is also working with the Organics Resource Agency (ORA) to explore the possibilities of using other composting technologies.
- 4.3.26 The Communications Consultancy arm of Waste Watch is carrying out attitudinal research and monitoring as part of a trial in the West London Waste Authority Area on the collection, composting and "market" of green and kitchen waste. The consultancy has been asked to carry out a marketing campaign for the second year of this trial project. Project partners include Enviro, Network Recycling, West London Waste Authority, ECT Recycling, the London boroughs

³⁵ Conversation between Brook Lyndhurst and ECT recycling, February 2004

of Richmond, Brent, Ealing & Hounslow, and the Organics Research Agency (ORA).

Awareness/education

- 4.3.27 The GLA/Mayor recently launched the “Recycle for London” campaign that aims to increase and promote recycling in the capital. The campaign, the first phase of which ran throughout September and October 2003, is being conducted in partnership with Rethink Rubbish and the ALG, with substantial funding input from the London Recycling Fund. A campaign extranet (password protected website) contains all the campaign information and key documents for authorities’ use. Of the 31 London Boroughs engaged in the campaign, 27 signed up to producing standardised local level leaflets on the services available in their boroughs³⁶.
- 4.3.28 In March 2002, the Mayor launched the Capital Standards Campaign that aimed to improve the cleanliness and appearance of London’s streets. 26 of London’s 33 boroughs are members as well as the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority (LEFPA), Metropolitan Police and Transport for London (TfL). An important part of the programme is educational awareness aimed at schools to try and encourage increased environmental responsibility.
- 4.3.29 The electronic survey suggests that the Mayor’s Waste Strategy may have had a small impact on the activities of boroughs in London in relation to educating the public on sustainable waste management.
- 4.3.30 16 out of 65 allocations of the Phase 1 LRF were for awareness projects although the Recycle for London campaign accounted for 10% of the whole of the Phase I allocations. The Phase II Business Plan includes awareness, education and promotion as a key priority. It highlights 2 key areas:
- Building awareness locally and across London
 - Schools, colleges and other training establishments
- 4.3.31 London Waste Action will now require that all bids to LRF Phase II fully integrate issues of educational awareness and promotion³⁷ and WRAP have provided the LRF with fund specifically for this purpose.
- 4.3.32 The ALG were on the steering group for the “Recycle for London” campaign and have therefore played a direct role in promoting waste awareness in London. More formally, the ALG’s responsibility is in informing members about changes in waste policy and legislation which may affect them. They also provide information to boroughs on possible funding streams such as EU funding via an e-mail news service.
- 4.3.33 On behalf of the Waste Implementation Programme, WRAP is administering a new national initiative on waste awareness. The programme is composed of the following elements:
- A national programme of underpinning messages³⁸
 - A programme of support for locally focussed awareness schemes³⁹

³⁶ GLA presentation to the RRF “Waste Behaviour” conference, 1st March 2004

³⁷ Conversation between London Waste Action and Brook Lyndhurst, February 2004

³⁸ A review by Wrap of the existing national campaign, Rethink Rubbish concluded that although it had made good progress, it had not achieved a real impact with consumers or retailers. Funding will not continue for Rethink Rubbish and WRAP will develop a new national campaign.

- A series of issue-specific programmes to provide local support for home composting, reusable nappy schemes and retailer waste minimisation initiatives
- 4.3.34 A budget of £3m was earmarked for this programme of work in 2003/04 and in March 2004, WRAP announced a further £8.5m⁴⁰ for communications. This second tranche of funding has been launched via the Performance Improvement through Communications Initiative.
- 4.3.35 Also at a national level, Waste Watch run a highly focused programme of projects via their educational and communications branch. They administer the Schools Waste Action Club (SWAC), and have developed a set of comprehensive curriculum based activities that can be used throughout primary and secondary schools. Currently, Bexley run a SWAC and Western Riverside has adopted the scheme as part of its Rethink Rubbish campaign. Waste Watch also launched the Waste Education Support Programme (WESP) in 2003 via a bid to the London Recycling Fund for the Recycle for London Campaign. The GLA subsidised 60% of the cost of the 2-year course for recycling officers in five London boroughs and the scheme is scheduled to run to the end of 2004.

Best Practice

- 4.3.36 The Mayor's Waste Strategy states that providing best practice is a high priority in terms of recycling, composting and promotion, and recycling/reuse sites. The Mayor has the scope to implement best practice within waste contracts in order to try and encourage a consistent approach across London. The GLA are supporting a project looking at best practice in relation to New and Emerging Procurement Guidance (Capital Solutions) and also commissioned Enviro consulting to undertake a 'Best Practice Scoping Report' to assess the viability and applicability to London of existing best practice and to prioritise a programme of work. The scoping report, which reviewed a range of best practice guidance was published in March 2004 and suggests that there are five areas of best practice which should be prioritised⁴¹:
- Estates recycling in the UK
 - Improving bring site efficiency
 - Communicating with householders
 - Partnership working
 - Sharing best practice in London
- 4.3.37 Capital Waste Facts, managed by London Remade and the GLA is increasingly used as a portal to share best practice between authorities in London.⁴²
- 4.3.38 As part of the Capital Standards Programme, the Mayor alongside the ALG and ENCAMS ran a three day 'Street Academy' course for enforcement officers which included elements of best practice.
- 4.3.39 London Waste Action, along with its partners, is encouraging London boroughs to explore areas of best practice themselves rather than actively promote case studies, in effect facilitating dialogue between London boroughs. LWA are

³⁹ This programme of work will now be administered in London via the London Recycling Fund

⁴⁰ Wrap press release March 1st 2004

⁴¹ "Best Practice for Waste and Recycling in London", a report by Enviro Consulting Limited, March 2004.

⁴² Correspondence between Brook Lyndhurst and the GLA, March 2004

offering members and officers the opportunity to go on subsidised 'best practice' trips abroad to look at new technology waste and recycling plants.

- 4.3.40 The ALG have recently funded a project exploring best practice planning for waste management and have recently secured funding from the Home Office of £13.4m to target the removal of abandoned and untaxed vehicles.
- 4.3.41 Across four of WIP's work streams, (new technologies, LA support, LA funding and data) developing and disseminating best practice plays a central and recurring theme. The idea is that WIP will generate (national) transparency by collating best practice across these four areas⁴³. Best practice will be delivered via existing regional networks⁴⁴ in the form of toolkits and case studies, all of which will be accessible via a newly developed WIP website. The idea behind promoting best practice is to provide kudos to those authorities who are performing well, and also incentivise those authorities that are currently under-performing. WIP are not intending (at least at this stage) to dictate what should be best practice, rather to provide authorities with enough evidence to select which best practice is most relevant in their own setting.
- 4.3.42 The Landfill Tax Credit Scheme funded a number of best practice projects. WIP is currently in a process of evaluating all LTCS-funded research with a view to identifying the most useful for dissemination.
- 4.3.43 London Remade has brought a variety of international examples of best practice to London. Pilot projects range across eight estates pilots, a Vertical Composting Unit (VCU), two kerbside research projects, an education facility and a completed feasibility study on 'green works', to identify employment opportunities in a regeneration area of London. These pilot initiatives are an opportunity to establish best practice leading to a uniformity of collection, and helping to establish best practice methods for receiving, bulking, sorting and transportation of materials.
- 4.3.44 On behalf of WIP, WRAP is responsible for delivering the kerbside best practice programme and the ROTATE (Recycling and Organics Technical Advisory Team) programme side by side. The aim of this work stream is to expand and improve the performance of collection systems for dry recyclables and organic wastes, with a particular focus on kerbside. ROTATE will offer advice to Local Authorities across the country on how to improve the participation and effectiveness of their kerbside schemes. Staff will offer tailored and specific advice to LA's across the country via in-house staff and external advisors. Recruitment of advisors is taking place at the moment, and initial discussions are underway between WRAP and the GLA, ALG, London Waste Action and London Remade on how best to promote ROTATE in London⁴⁵. London offers some useful examples of how recycling can be implemented in urban (often deprived) areas which, if disseminated to other regions, may prove valuable. A total budget of £3.5m has been allocated to this project, with £0.7m available for the ROTATE programme.
- 4.3.45 The Joint Waste Disposal Authorities (including Manchester and Liverpool) liaise with each other twice a year in order to share best practice and discuss their BVPI data. It is an informal networking arrangement, but seems to provide a

⁴³Conversation between Brook Lyndhurst and WIP, March 2004

⁴⁴WIP have asked each of the Government Offices to host regional advisory group meetings.

⁴⁵ Informal telephone conversation between Brook Lyndhurst and WRAP, March 2004.

useful learning exercise in terms of pooling resources, sharing information and discussing strategic waste disposal issues⁴⁶.

- 4.3.46 Waste Watch have undertaken some strategic work on best practice relating to estates based recycling on behalf of WIP.
- 4.3.47 Both the London Recycling Officers Group (LROG) and the Association of London Cleansing Officers (ALCO) group are well-established and active networks. Each organises regular meetings and use an e-mail newsletter to share news and best practice.
- 4.3.48 The National Resource and Waste Forum encourage waste managers across the UK to send in their examples of best practice as case studies. The NRWF are also supporting a project 'Towards a UK Framework for Household Waste Prevention' which will explore current best practice in local authorities.
- 4.3.49 Some boroughs have undertaken their own best practice work, e.g. Western Riverside Waste Authority who commissioned Vantagepoint to carry out an investigation of waste management websites across the UK and thus develop a 'best practice' guide.
- 4.3.50 ECT are running pilot schemes on various new technologies
- 4.3.51 ESA run conferences, seminars and workshops in order to share best practice, e.g. the recent House of Commons conference "Maximising Recycling: the Ingredients of Success".

Training

- 4.3.52 WRAP run two national training programmes. Their Training and Development Programme for Recycling Managers, which works closely with the Local Authority Recycling Advisory Committee (LARAC), is a free-of-charge residential course aimed at Local Authorities, the community and the private sector. The content of the course focuses on developing cost-effective systems with high participation and recovery rates for the collection and sorting of materials that meet end market requirements. WRAP also run a Compost Quality Management Training Programme aimed at compost managers and site operators⁴⁷. Both of these training programmes are fully supported by the CIWM (see below). Finally, WRAP organises workshops across the UK to help Local Authorities put together sensible and effective bids. As part of the recently launched Performance Improvement through Communications Initiative, WRAP have set up a number of workshops which offer advice on completing application forms, as well advising on good practice in communications.
- 4.3.53 As part of its new integrated waste management contract, Western Riverside Waste Authority has undertaken a programme of training for recycling collectors which they believe has contributed to increased recovery.⁴⁸
- 4.3.54 The Chartered Institute of Waste Management offers over 70 training courses to its members around the UK⁴⁹. The majority of courses are technical although there are 'softer' courses available directed at recycling officers such as the

⁴⁶Conversation between Brook Lyndhurst and joint disposal authority in London, March 2004

⁴⁷ From www.wrap.co.uk

⁴⁸ Waste Watch and Cory Environmental presentation to the RRF "Waste Behaviour" conference, 1st March 2004

⁴⁹ www.ciwm.co.uk

‘Management of Refuse Collection and Kerbside recycling’. CIWM is accredited to CPD (Continuing Professional Development) and SET (the Structured Education and Training Scheme). The latter is designed to help new graduates develop a career in the waste industry and all graduate members of CIWM are expected to take part in this training programme.

- 4.3.55 London Waste Action does not provide formal training to boroughs, although under the auspices of the LRF it offers support in writing business plans and putting together LRF bids.
- 4.3.56 Waste Watch run a subsidised training programme for waste managers and Local Authorities’ recycling officers to help schools deliver waste education programmes and communications programmes.
- 4.3.57 LCRN, in partnership with Rethink Rubbish Western Riverside, run free training for community composters. The course offers advice on funding and legislation. East London Community Recycling Partnership offer similar training workshops twice a month. As part of their GIS modelling programme (see “Data Collection and Monitoring” below), LCRN provide GIS training days to Local Authorities.
- 4.3.58 London Remade has set up a technical training programme that is being developed around the capital investments being made at its eco-industrial sites. Remade also assist a small business support programme through the East London Small Business Centre. Existing and start up businesses within the waste sector can sign up for one-to-one mentoring from an experienced business advisor and apply for a loan from the London Remade Loan Fund⁵⁰.
- 4.3.59 The London Development Agency is currently tendering for a partner to provide a comprehensive package of support services to develop London’s reprocessing sector. This will include supporting access to finance, marketing, business planning and technical advice.
- 4.3.60 The GLA, alongside the ALG and ENCAMS, run an ongoing enforcement training school as part of the Capital Standards programme. Three days of ‘street training’ have so far been provided to London Borough enforcement officers on how to gather evidence and use powers to tackle environmental crime⁵¹.

Data monitoring/collection

- 4.3.61 Considerable effort has been expended in recent years on improving both the quality, reliability and availability of data on waste in London. The principal current data collection routes are:
- Best Value Performance Indicators (BVPI)
 - Defra National Municipal Waste Survey (via statutory returns)
 - Environment Agency waste flow project
- 4.3.62 Much of this data is presented via Capital Waste Facts, a web-site developed by London Remade and the GLA which aims to make data on waste and recycling across London Boroughs as transparent as possible.
- 4.3.63 The Environment Agency has undertaken National work on waste data flows across England and Wales. Data is collated on the quantities of waste produced,

⁵⁰ From www.londonremade.com

⁵¹ “Rethinking Rubbish in London”, Mayor’s Municipal Waste Strategy

what it consists of, where it comes from, how it is managed and what the relative costs and benefits of managing particular components of the waste stream using different options are. The work is evolving from the Defra Municipal Waste Management Survey and both Defra and the GLA have been working closely with the Environment Agency to take this work forward.⁵²

4.3.64 The GLA are currently undertaking a number of strategic projects including:

- *Technical Assessment for Waste Management in London*
Enviros Consulting have been appointed to evaluate the adequacy of existing strategically important waste management and disposal facilities to meet London's future needs. The project will compile an inventory of existing permanent and temporary waste management sites in London and sites used outside London in order for the GLA to make strategic planning decisions with regard to waste facilities. The final report is to be delivered by the end of April 2004.
- *Waste Composition*
An initial scoping study to explore the composition of London's waste is to be completed by the end of April 2004. The work will determine the recyclability and biodegradability of London's waste.

4.3.65 The GLA are in the process of developing a formal monitoring and evaluation scheme to measure the success of the Waste Strategy Implementation Plan. Within the GLA's waste team, there is a dedicated individual responsible for collecting and collating waste data from Local Authorities. At the moment, the GLA collects data on behalf of Defra to feed into the National Municipal Waste Survey (a mechanism which is expected to speed up the appearance of processed data). It is this data which forms the basis of Capital Waste Facts and this, along with ongoing monitoring of activity via waste plans, UDP's and waste contracts will form the basis for monitoring and evaluating the Implementation Plan.

4.3.66 The quarterly monitoring returns for the LRF have not yet been fully analysed but will in due course provide a useful source of information.

4.3.67 The ALG have undertaken a voluntary survey of enforcement of environment issues alongside the GLA that fed into the State of the Environment report published by the Mayor of London.

4.3.68 Funded by Shanks First, the ALG in conjunction with the GLA and London Remade are developing a piece of work assessing the cost of different disposal and treatment options and developing a 'costings' model for waste management in London. The deadline for the work is December 2004.

4.3.69 London Remade is undertaking a "gap analysis" to establish whether the Boroughs will meet their targets.

4.3.70 The ALG undertake an annual survey that asks 1,000 residents in London, their concerns about living in the Capital and what they think of their Council. The most recent results were published in December 2003 and show there was an increase in satisfaction levels with recycling services by 7%⁵³.

⁵² Correspondence between Brook Lyndhurst and the GLA, March 2004

⁵³ "Survey of Londoners", Association of London Government, 2003

4.3.71 The Waste Implementation Programme has identified data as a key work stream to be taken forward with the Environment Agency. The data programme highlights three projects⁵⁴:

- Data Integrity Project – a comprehensive review of current and future waste data and the development of a system to ensure integrity and consistency of data.
- Central Database – to review the feasibility options for a widely available central database to reduce duplication.
- An effective mechanism to monitor Local Authority and other delivery plan targets.

4.3.72 Projects which the WIP has already funded and are currently underway (at national level) include:

- A baseline audit of CA infrastructure and recycling and composting rates of waste deposited at CA sites
- Developing a database of various waste treatment technologies
- Model for projecting and monitoring recyclables capture
- Baseline information on bulky goods collection infrastructure and recycling and reuse rates
- Estates based/high density housing/high rise flats recycling.

4.3.73 LCRN run a GIS modelling programme to help London boroughs learn about data modelling approaches to increasing recycling and composting rates. Projects include⁵⁵:

- Mapping kerbside collection round performance against Acorn profile for LB Hackney.
- Modelling collection performance with census data (household type) to target door knocking campaigns on lower-than-expected recyclers.
- Mapping private garden coverage, incorporating the WRAP composting model for green waste and composting outputs.
- Mapping garden coverage for the Boroughs of Hammersmith & Fulham, Kensington & Chelsea, Wandsworth, Camden and Hackney, producing lists of properties by garden size to enable targeting of compost facilities and services.

4.3.74 WRAP has undertaken a great deal of research, including analysis of market growth, standards and specifications, specific materials etc. They recently conducted a national survey on plastics collection which aimed to find out the number of authorities offering plastics recycling, a performance and cost analysis of different collection approaches adopted by councils across the UK, and predictions for the future of household plastic bottle collections. As part of their home composting programme, WRAP have sub-contracted research to monitor and evaluate the year one compost bins, in terms of aesthetics and effectiveness. This monitoring will then feed into Phase 2 so that WRAP can reduce the range of compost bins offered to Local Authorities from nine at the moment to four or five.

⁵⁴ Waste Implementation Programme, Fact Sheets, November 2003

⁵⁵ Correspondence between Brook Lyndhurst and LCRN, March 2004

Infrastructure (including Civic Amenities sites)

- 4.3.75 Although the Mayor's Waste Strategy states that the GLA '*will work with boroughs to produce detailed waste planning guidance indicating the number, types and where appropriate locations of facilities needed to manage waste and recyclables in London*' the Implementation Plan does not give any indication of the exact nature of the infrastructure which will be required in London over the next 5 to 10 years. The Technical Waste Assessment for Waste Management discussed above will establish expected waste management requirements in tonnage terms, and project the number and type of expected sites that will be needed in London. The GLA are also working closely with WIP on new technologies funding. Waste is to be subject of the first alteration to the London Plan including a new Technical Waste Assessment which will be issued for consultation over the next few months.
- 4.3.76 Responses to our electronic questionnaire indicate that a minority of Boroughs are currently undertaking activity that involves the upgrade of CA/bring sites; and fewer still are providing 1 recycling site per 500 households for at least 3 materials on estates and multi occupancy properties, at a borough wide level, as required by the Municipal Waste Strategy.
- 4.3.77 The recently published London Plan recognises the need for substantial new recycling facilities and commits to working with the Boroughs to ensure that strategically important sites are safeguarded for developing waste reprocessing capacity.⁵⁶ The Plan also states that the Mayor will consider waste minimisation, recycling, composting and the development of new and emerging advanced conversion technologies for waste in preference to any increase in mass burn incineration capacity⁵⁷. The GLA, alongside the Boroughs, will develop waste policy guidance for each of the Sub Regional Development Frameworks, outlining the types, number and in some cases, locations of facilities needed to manage waste⁵⁸.
- 4.3.78 In 2002, Remade published the 'Supply Infrastructure Report' that lists all the major infrastructure projects in London. The report mapped out the network of London's processing and reprocessing infrastructure, but concluded that there was insufficient evidence to identify whether there were any 'gaps' in the current infrastructure.⁵⁹ The Table overleaf is from the report and indicates the number of processing/reprocessing facilities in London, as of 2003:

⁵⁶ The London Plan, Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, GLA, February 2004, p157

⁵⁷ Policy 4A.1: waste strategic policy and targets, London Plan p 156

⁵⁸ "Rethinking Rubbish in London", the Mayor's Municipal Waste Management Strategy, September 2003, proposal 84.

⁵⁹ "The Supply Infrastructure 2001-2002 Report", London Remade, 2003, p16

Type of processing/reprocessing facility	Number of sites in London
Composting	30
Glass	7
Metals	3
Paper	18
Wood	3
Construction and Demolition	29
Plastics	2
Textiles	15

Source: *London Remade, 2003, from the Environment Agency's database of licensed facilities*

4.3.79 A full map of planned and future infrastructural activity beyond 2003 is beyond the scope of this current project. Indicative information for the joint disposal authorities in London, however, is presented in the table below:

Disposal Authority	Planned Infrastructure
NLWA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two new waste transfer stations • Considering submitting a proposal to LRF Phase II for an in vessel composting plant to be located at Edmonton. • Relocation of Hendon rail transfer station – have not ruled out the possibility of having a mechanical/biological waste treatment or thermal treatment facility. Nothing agreed
WLWA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements to three CA sites • Possibility of a new green waste transfer facility
ELWA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have planning permission to install bio-MRFs in two separate locations • Upgrade of eight CA sites started in 2003
WRWA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have submitted proposal for a new MRF although no planning permission has yet been granted.

Source: *Capital Waste Facts and relevant authority websites, collated by Brook Lyndhurst, March 2004.*

4.3.80 London Remade have invested in significant reprocessing capacity: four showcase eco-sites now operate in London, reprocessing glass, organic waste, paper and construction and demolition waste. There are plans to support further reprocessing capacity focusing on plastics⁶⁰ and electrical and electronic equipment.

4.3.81 The London Development Agency plays an indirect, but still significant role in supporting reprocessing capacity in London. The LDA's Corporate Plan has identified the environment sector as a target sector for support and co-ordination, of which waste reprocessing is a key element. Investment in the London Recycling Fund, the London Remade SRB and the transition funding all

⁶⁰ London Remade plan to bid to WRAP to support a new plastics recycling facility in London.

have a priority to increase reprocessing capacity within London. The future support services for the sector will include requirement to work with WRAP and other funding organisations to maximise funding for reprocessing capacity within London⁶¹.

⁶¹ Correspondence between Brook Lyndhurst and the London Development Agency, March 2004

4.4 Financing municipal waste management in London

- 4.4.1 We have examined the main sources of funding for waste management in London and the extent to which funding is being directed towards the priorities set out within the Mayor's Municipal Waste Management Strategy. The sources identified are not necessarily available to all waste stakeholders in London: principal beneficiaries are identified where relevant below.
- 4.4.2 Given the scope of the brief and the timetable for this work we have had to take an overview of principal sources of funding and main stakeholders rather than building a detailed bottom-up picture from individual waste authorities (the boroughs and joint disposal authorities). This means that some sources of funding may have been overlooked in our mapping.

Historic sources of funding

The Landfill Tax Credit Scheme (LTCS)

- 4.4.3 The LTCS has funded or part-funded some significant sustainable waste management initiatives in London. In particular, securing various LTCS grants was, according to our consultees, instrumental in building the early capacity of London Waste Action.
- 4.4.4 Though we have not been able to determine the total amount of LTCS funds actually spent on waste in London (as opposed to awarded to London based organisations), the following are some of the major initiatives that have benefited from these funds:
- Management of the London Recycling Fund (£300,000 from LFTC and £300,000 from Legacy Landfill tax)
 - London Remade, including work on:
 - The Rainham Organics Eco site
 - The Mayor's Green Procurement Code
 - Capital Waste facts
 - Rethink Rubbish Western Riverside, £5 million provided by Cory Environmental through LTCS for a 5-year programme of education and market development, delivered jointly by Waste Watch and London Remade.
 - ALG modelling work - £420,000
 - GLA waste composition work £132,000
- 4.4.5 It is also worth noting that the LTCS has also been an important contributor to many smaller borough level and community sector led projects, but compiling a comprehensive list is outside the scope of the current work.
- 4.4.6 The change in qualifying rules of the LTCS in April 2003 removed a previously important source of funding for waste projects, that contributed both to building the capacity of some of London's key waste stakeholders (LWA and London Remade in particular) as well as funding strategic research. Some waste stakeholders, including the community sector, undoubtedly face a more uncertain funding future as a result of the change in LTCS rules.

Single Regeneration Budget

- 4.4.7 The most significant SRB contribution was the £5.4 million Round 6 award to London Remade to support their market development work over the four years to 2003/4.
- 4.4.8 This has been a significant catalyst to market development in the capital, including the creation of new processing facilities in the Thames Gateway, involving the private sector. According to the Remade 2002 Annual Report, in years 1 to 3 of the London Remade SRB programme, £4 million of funding from the LDA will have leveraged in £10.5 million, a ratio of 2.6. The combined total is allocated as follows:
- £10.1m on development of Eco-Sites
 - £1.77m on the Innovation Centre and training
 - £0.95m on communications/awareness
 - £1.28m on supply infrastructure
 - £0.33m on green procurement
- 4.4.9 London Remade estimates that diversion from landfill resulting from its SRB funded activities was 190,000 tonnes to year end 2002/3 and will be 150,000 tonnes in 2003/4.⁶²
- 4.4.10 Since SRB funding is no longer available, Remade faces an uncertain future in relation to income after April 2004. The LDA has allocated SRB legacy funding for a further year to April 2005, and additional funding of £1 million to support Remade to further develop the Mayor's Green Procurement Code.
- 4.4.11 Some boroughs have used SRB funds to develop local recycling facilities – for example, on-estate bring banks in Southwark – but we have not been able to calculate the full extent of this within the timeframe of the research. At least some of this borough level SRB funding will be included in the 'leveraged' funds attached to London Recycling Fund allocations.

Current sources of funding⁶³

The Boroughs

- 4.4.12 The Boroughs' own annual waste budgets are by far the most significant source of funding for waste management in London.
- 4.4.13 The main determinants of these budgets are annual government grant plus a council tax element which are wrapped up together in central government's Standard Spending Assessment for Environmental, Protective and Cultural Services for local authorities (EPCS SSAs) – that is, the amount that central

⁶² London Remade Limited 2003/4 Delivery Plan

⁶³ Given the time constraints of this work, the research did not examine in detail potential future income from the sale of recyclates or from PRNs, though both could be construed as future 'funding' sources for waste management. Given the complexities involved, we feel these types of income stream should be the subject of separate, and more detailed, investigation, including not only projections of total income but also the likely distribution between stakeholders. It may be the case, for example, that assessments of income from these sources are already accounted for in existing long-term waste contracts with the private sector.

government indicates should be spent on these services according to a standard formula.

- 4.4.14 As such, the EPCS assessment *theoretically* takes into account the performance targets of local authorities and thus what is expected of them on recycling and waste management. However, the *practice* is currently the subject of debate amongst those with whom we consulted, and the outcome of this debate is by no means clear.
- 4.4.15 According to BVPI data (2001/2) on costs per household of waste collection and costs per tonne for disposal (grossing up to borough then to London average figures) we estimate total waste expenditure by the boroughs to be around £260 million per year⁶⁴. The total, including street cleansing is estimated by the GLA at £360 million per year.⁶⁵
- 4.4.16 Local authorities can, in addition, elect to include waste management in a local Public Service Agreement, and be rewarded by central government accordingly. This includes both up-front pump-priming grant and credit approvals, together with a performance reward grant at the end of the Local PSA period. Defra say that, on waste, local PSAs have been used mainly to improve enforcement and publicity; to develop civic amenity sites; and to initiate or expand kerbside collection schemes.⁶⁶

London Recycling Fund

- 4.4.17 The London Recycling Fund (the partnership between the GLA, the Association of London Government and London Waste Action to deliver Defra's Waste Minimisation and Recycling Fund) has provided a significant boost to expenditure on sustainable waste management in London. Funds allocated to the LRF by Defra are:
- £24.9 million in the first tranche for 2002/4 (£21.3 million initial allocation plus £3.6 million announced in 2003)
 - £20.55 million in the second tranche for 2004/6 (£13.7 million in 2004/5 and £6.85 million in 2005/6).
- 4.4.18 These figures are clearly significant in relation to boroughs' core waste budgets. For example, the first tranche of the Defra element of the LRF added nearly 5% in each year to the aggregate *expenditure on waste services by London's boroughs* (though it is important to note that this extra money was not spread evenly across the boroughs because the LRF was allocated on a challenge basis).
- 4.4.19 The impact of the LRF is actually even more significant when the amount of additionality leveraged in the first tranche is taken into account, which amounts to some £20 million.⁶⁷ The additional funds are a mix of contributions from the private sector (including landfill tax credits) and funds from the Boroughs (including from existing waste budgets and regeneration funds in some cases).
- 4.4.20 The first tranche of LRF funds were allocated both according to Defra's priorities and with the key proposals in the Mayor's Municipal Waste Management

⁶⁴ BVPI 2001/02 information collated by Brook Lyndhurst, March 2004

⁶⁵ *The Case for London*, the Mayor's submission to Spending Review 2004

⁶⁶ <http://www.defra.gov.uk/environment/waste/localauth/lpsas.htm>

⁶⁷ London Recycling Fund, Delivery Strategy and Business Plan 2004-6

Strategy in mind. As the table below shows, the first tranche of the LRF provided significant investment in the recycling collection infrastructure:

Distribution of London Recycling Fund 2002-4				
LRF Project Type	Capital	Revenue	Total	Indicative allocation*
Awareness	£514,000	£2,158,200	£2,672,300	£2,219,000
Bring/CA	£1,867,900	£200,200	£2,068,100	£5,839,400
Estates	£4,730,400	£743,500	£5,473,900	£4,087,500
Infrastructure	£3,209,100	£1,568,400	£4,777,500	£5,839,400
Kerbside	£6,241,800	£3,583,300	£9,825,000	£6,423,300
Waste minimisation	£37,500	£21,400	£58,900	£467,100
Total: rounds 1-7	£ 16,600,600	£8,275,000	£ 24,875,600	£ 24,875,600

* As shown in LWA Business Plan 2002-4, grossed up to account for the additional £3.6 million allocated for Round 7

- 4.4.21 Bids for the second tranche for 2004/6 are encouraged around the following key priorities:
- Enabling recycling collections and improving participation through awareness, education and promotion (£13.55 million)
 - Supporting development of London's strategic materials recycling and processing infrastructure (£8 million)
 - Waste reduction and re-use (£0.5 million)
- 4.4.22 In addition to the core Defra funds, the LRF delivery strategy anticipates similar additionality in the second tranche as in the first. Also of note:
- WRAP are to contribute £2.6m to support local recycling awareness initiatives in London;
 - The LDA has pledged £0.5 million to the running costs of the LRF and an additional £2million to fund projects which have a primary economic development/regeneration focus around waste sector development.
- 4.4.23 LRF states that waste minimisation may receive more than the amount indicated above if this proves to be insufficient.
- 4.4.24 The first tranche of the LRF has clearly engineered a step change in the availability of household recycling services in London, in particular providing an extra million households with kerbside recycling collections⁶⁸. However, we suggest it is simply too early to assess fully the extent to which the LRF has 'filled the gap' to deliver high – and, critically, sustained⁶⁹ – recycling participation or made a significant contribution to the longer term requirement to cut the rate of growth in waste arisings.

⁶⁸ Source: GLA/Assembly

⁶⁹ Successful bids are required to commit to use mainstream funding in the future to maintain projects or programmes funded by the LRF – but the extent to which this actually takes place must be subject to some doubt

4.4.25 It will be clearer where any remaining gaps lie once data become available from the LRF partnership's planned evaluation of the LRF; from the GLA's monitoring of the Mayor's Implementation Plan; from the 'gap analysis' being undertaken by London Remade; and when the Defra Municipal Waste Management statistics for 2002/3 are finally published.

WIP and WRAP

4.4.26 Prior to WIP, Defra allowed £250,000 for the running of London Waste Action in relation to the LRF. We understand it has not yet been decided how much of the next LRF tranche will be retained by LWA for running costs.

4.4.27 Looking at the national picture, there are 8 funding streams within the WIP, of which 3 are to be delivered by WRAP and 5 by WIP, as follows:

Programme	Funding to 2006 (£ millions)
Local Authority Support	1.9
Local Authority Funding (2003/4)	114.0
New Technologies	3.8
Research	5.0
Data	3.5
Waste Minimisation (WRAP)	8.0
Recycling (WRAP)	3.5
Education & awareness (WRAP)	3.0

4.4.28 Also of note are the following:

- WRAP has agreed to allocate up to £2.6m specifically to support local recycling awareness initiatives in London.⁷⁰
- Funding shown for "Local Authority Funding" is mainly the Waste Minimisation and Recycling Fund, including London, though this unit will also be responsible for waste sector PFI.
- The "Local Authority Support" team have already commissioned a number of studies from consultants on best practice and performance benchmarking which are due to report in spring 2004.
- The LA Support team also anticipates that funds will be available to provide, or subsidise, local authorities with external support from consultants where WIP's own analysis suggests such intervention is required.
- In addition, LA Support are inviting bids under their £0.5 million "Network Support Fund" which is intended to support networks at regional level that facilitate information sharing and reinforce the aims of the LA Support Unit.
- The New Technology Team is currently inviting bids to fund demonstrator projects with the aim of having 10 in place in the next 2 years. Bidding rounds are March-May 2004 and September to November 2004, and it hoped that a total of up to £30mn of investment nationally will be "released".

⁷⁰ London Recycling Fund, Delivery Strategy & Business Plan 2004-6

- 4.4.29 While – apart from the LRF element – there is no explicit focus from WIP on London, the fact that London accounts for a large share of England’s waste arisings, and that it also contains some of the authorities with the lowest recycling rates, both mean that at least some parts of London will be a focus for work by WIP, including the Local Authority Support Team.
- 4.4.30 We were unable to determine from our conversations with the WIP Local Authority Support Team how WIP/WRAP will continue to be funded beyond this initial set-up phase. The situation may, however, become clearer once the outcome of the Government’s Spending Review 2004 is known.
- 4.4.31 Some consultees have suggested that, within this set up phase, London may not be getting its “fair share” of WRAP expenditure (although it clearly does get its fair share of the Waste Minimisation & Recycling Fund). We have been unable to ascertain whether this is actually the case or whether it is a subjective view.

New Opportunities Fund: Community Recycling and Economic Development (CRED)

- 4.4.32 The NOF CRED fund is available to community sector organisations. Launched in January 2003, the open grant programme, managed by the Fund's award partners, Royal Society for Nature Conservation (RSNC), is distributing £35.2 million to projects delivering recycling, re-use and composting across the country, running to 2007. It is part of the UK-wide transforming waste programme.
- 4.4.33 Grants of £50,000 to £300,000 are available for a maximum three year period to support recycling, re-use and composting schemes. Community projects in London have so far won £872,821 including a £165,000 re-usable nappy scheme in central London and £119,000 furniture re-use scheme run by elderly people in Deptford.

Greater London Authority

- 4.4.34 The role of the GLA and its waste team has been described earlier. Here we are concerned only with the role of the GLA as a source of funding for waste management.
- 4.4.35 The GLA waste team has an annual research and implementation budget of £250,000 in addition to supporting six staff. While the GLA does not fund many projects directly, its strategic role means that it can call on other resources within the GLA family to add value to waste-related work – for example from the marketing team in relation to the Recycle for London Campaign.
- 4.4.36 In relation to this campaign, the GLA also provided services to the boroughs (publicity materials that could be adapted to local needs but tied into a London-wide message) that would have been beyond the reach of individual boroughs. It has not been possible within this research to estimate how much this contribution is “worth” in monetary terms.
- 4.4.37 The GLA also provides financial support from time to time either to one-off projects or other partner networks which may benefit from the pooling of resources from different stakeholders. The GLA, for example, provided £10,000 to the running of London Recycling Fund.

Association of London Government

- 4.4.38 The ALG provides similar support, providing funds for projects that are of benefit both to its own members and the wider waste community in London (for example, the current investigation, with the GLA and London Remade, of the costs of sustainable waste management in London).
- 4.4.39 As a partner and co-founder of London Waste Action, the ALG has also made an important contribution over a moderately long period of time to one of London's key partnerships, including a £20,000 contribution to the LWA running costs as well as £10,000 to support the running costs of the LRF in the first 2 years.

London Development Agency

- 4.4.40 The LDA has been, and is likely to continue to be, an important financial contributor to waste sector development in London.
- 4.4.41 By supporting London Remade via SRB⁷¹, the LDA was an important catalyst behind initial market development for recycled materials *within* London, which might not otherwise have happened at that time. As outlined above, the LDA has subsequently committed £2.5 million in total to support the LRF in 2004/6, and further support to London Remade.

The Private Sector & PFI

- 4.4.42 The private sector is clearly a major funding stakeholder in the waste sector in London. As outlined above, significant matched funding has been drawn into sustainable waste management projects, particularly in the London Remade programme and also in LRF.
- 4.4.43 In mainstream terms, however, it is particularly difficult to disentangle expenditure by private companies that is *net additional* to public sector spending, and that which is, in fact, the spending by private companies of money that has been paid – or that they expect will be paid – by the public sector in order to provide a service. In principle, for example, investment in waste facilities may be undertaken by private contractors, and at first sight might be considered to be additional expenditure on waste services. Such an investment decision, however, will inevitably be predicated on a judgement by that investor that the investment will be (more than) recouped over its lifetime. While issues such as the (expected) value of recyclates, landfill tax rates, PRNs etc will certainly influence such a commercial decision, the backdrop is undoubtedly expected mainstream income from the public sector.
- 4.4.44 The (potential) role of PFI is relevant here. Spending Review 2002 provided Defra with £355 million towards the funding of waste PFI projects across the country, to cover the period 2003/4 to 2005/6; and so far as we are aware, the only major PFI project in London to date is the recently agreed ELWA integrated waste management contract, which attracted £47 million of PFI credits.
- 4.4.45 PFI offers a number of advantages in terms of funding capital investment, and of formalising the links between capital and revenue expenditure, but it is certainly not a route to (in the short term at least) greater transparency about

⁷¹ Though in fact the SRB6 allocation preceded the London Development Agency, who took over management of the fund and its associated projects.

the interaction between public and private expenditure on waste services in London.

- 4.4.46 Within this study, therefore, we have not been able to establish the extent of the private sector contribution to funding London's waste management. This is a significant knowledge gap, and further careful work will be required to assemble a complete picture.

Future funding

- 4.4.47 Following the last few years, when the various Challenge Funds have focused on achieving a step-change in recycling performance, the next period will see a change in emphasis for waste sector funding. Notably:

- some sources that have made important contributions in the past – LTCS and SRB – are no longer available;
- the basis on which future central government will allocate future funds for waste and recycling is changing.

- 4.4.48 Spending Review 2004 will have an influence on local authorities' EPCS SSAs (which is clearly recognised in the Mayor's and ALC's respective submissions to the Spending Review. It is to be hoped that Spending Review 2004 will clarify how the government expects local authorities and other stakeholders to fund the UK's obligations under the Landfill Directive.

- 4.4.49 Defra's proposed Performance and Reward Grant (to overlap with the WMRF in 2005/6, then as the sole source of additional waste funding in 2006/7) signifies a major shift from the Challenge Fund approach. The grant (for England) will start at £45 million in 2005/6 rising to £90 million in subsequent years. In particular, grants will be tied to 'performance' – most likely against BV recycling targets according to the current consultation on how the scheme will operate – and, significantly, will not be ring-fenced to waste services. In particular, this means that there will be no guaranteed funding pots for sustainable waste management. The only funding which is available will be that through the boroughs' EPCS SSAs although this is not ringfenced.

- 4.4.50 The current consultation document on PRG contains no separate reference to London and it is not yet clear how the scheme will affect London boroughs – though clearly some could struggle to meet levels of performance that would attract grants. It seems to us, in particular, that the criteria as proposed may not take account of the special problems faced by Inner City authorities in achieving – and paying for – high recycling.

- 4.4.51 PFI is also a potential opportunity, particularly in relation to funding the large facilities that will be required to deal with the waste expected to be diverted from landfill. However, it is not clear from the evidence to hand how PFI will contribute in detail, and this may have to wait until London's stakeholders have a clearer, strategic, idea about what infrastructure is required, and, indeed, how PFI in the sector will/should work.

- 4.4.52 Other future sources that may be available to London authorities or the community sector include:

- The WIP and WRAP programmes

- The New Opportunities CRED programme (for the community sector)⁷²
- 4.4.53 A big unknown – and one for which an assessment is well outside the remit of this work – is the potential growth of income from recyclates markets. As Section 3.3 pointed out, we have not had the opportunity to investigate this issue as part of this study, but can merely reiterate the two main points:
- That no consultee is of the view that the *general* value of recyclates will, in the short or medium term, begin to act as a major driver for higher levels of recycling⁷³
 - That many players – particularly those responsible for long-term investment decisions – are having to make assumptions about the future value of recyclates, and it is not at all clear whether the same assumptions are being used by the various different players
- 4.4.55 The end of challenge funds after 2005/6, together with the introduction of LATs and a continuing focus on ‘performance and reward’ in local government, therefore points to the need for:
- more funding for sustainable waste management – at least for collections – or at the minimum, the ringfencing of waste funds to prevent local authorities passporting waste monies to other budgets, together with
 - more effective management and targeting of existing budgets and hardware. Local authorities may need mentoring to do this and to secure the necessary culture change in their organisations, according to some of our consultees.
- 4.4.56 As we implied above, in relation to funding major capital infrastructure, the situation is less clear, and PFI appears to be the only significant funding possibility on the horizon. In this respect, central Government’s Spending Review 2004 will send important signals on how the UK is expected to secure the waste treatment infrastructure needed to deliver on the Landfill Directive. If London can demonstrate a region-wide case for help with capital funding for strategic recycling and reprocessing facilities then lobbying needs to be happening now.

How much is needed?

- 4.4.57 Given where we are – that is, projects funded by LRF are either only in their infancy or yet to be conceived – it is not possible to say at present how much more money is needed, particularly on the collection side, to hit the 25% recycling target for 2005 or even the longer term objectives of the Mayor’s waste strategy.
- 4.4.58 Although LWA, the GLA, ALG and WIP are all collating data on where boroughs are in relation to their recycling targets and/or their LRF project outcomes, it is not possible for us at this stage to make conclusions about how far the funding already identified will achieve some of the Mayor’s key priorities – including the 25% recycling target, the 3-kerbside materials or, indeed, wider improvements to bring and CA sites.

⁷² Ben Metz of LCRN is currently working with NOF to establish how the fund will work.

⁷³ Though there are some materials where this is already not the case (high grade paper) or may not be the case relatively soon (PET perhaps)

- 4.4.59 That said, the Enviro report for the GLA on *Costing the Mayor's Waste Strategy for London* suggests that, compared to current costs of around £250 million⁷⁴:
- in the order of £430 - £460 million (constant prices) would be required by 2010;
 - and £530-630 million by 2020 (i.e. more than double the present level *in real terms*).
- 4.4.60 On treatment and reprocessing infrastructure, the LRF Business Plan for 2002/4 says that *"a new processing infrastructure in London that will enable and support recycling rates in excess of 35% will require capital investment in the order of £100 million"*. We also understand that the ALG has commissioned consultants to identify the cost implications of hitting the landfill and recycling targets which will be an important addition to an understanding of how big any funding gap might be.
- 4.4.61 The data that are currently available suggest that London will have to find significantly more money in future to manage its municipal waste. What is less clear is where the funding is going to come from, especially given:
- Lack of timely (public) information about where boroughs are at present – in relation to both the Defra targets and some of the key aspirations in the Mayor's Strategy, for example, on kerbside collections.
 - The small amount of time since the start of the LRF and the fact that many projects are only in their infancy or not fully operational (LWA are in the process of completing a preliminary evaluation);
 - An inability to know at this point what the next tranche of the LRF will achieve;
 - Uncertainty about how the Defra Waste Performance and Reward scheme will work and what is likely to happen in central government's Spending Review 2004.
 - Uncertainty about future income from recyclates, and lack of clarity about the assumptions that are currently being made.

⁷⁴ Using Enviro's "Central scenario" for growth in waste arisings. Alternative waste arisings scenarios present a much broader spread of costs, as shown in the Enviro report.

5. Conclusions and recommendations

Introduction

- 5.1 Drawing conclusions from the research conducted for this study poses difficulties not merely because of the relatively short period of time available to our consultants in which to conduct the work, but for two important reasons that could not be addressed even if more time were available:
- the moving target problem
 - research methodology – qualitative interviews

the moving target problem

- 5.2 First, the moving target problem. The waste sector in London (and, indeed, elsewhere in the UK) is currently characterised by a particularly high rate of change. The arrival of WRAP, the publication of the Mayoral Waste Strategy, the first rounds of London Recycling Fund, the foundation of the Waste Implementation Programme and the end of SRB funding for London Remade are all recent or current changes with the capacity significantly to affect the management of waste in London.

- 5.3 In an environment in which *the targets* loom ever larger, virtually all organisations in London engaged in the waste sector are in some sort of flux, with many organisations waiting to see what other organisations will do before deciding what they themselves will do. The activities these organisations have undertaken, are undertaking or they are expecting to undertake are thus similarly uncertain. In such circumstances, *hard* conclusions are not merely difficult to draw; they run the risk of being overtaken by events very quickly.

research methodology – qualitative interviews

- 5.4 Second, and partly as a consequence of the first point, the principal methodology used in the research for this study comprised qualitative interviews with key participants in the sector. Because of the high rate of change in the sector, and the relative novelty of many of the activities now underway in the sector, little or no formal evaluation or quantitative assessment has been, or can yet be, undertaken. Thus, whilst qualitative research is the only available method for conducting the enquiry, it inevitably makes drawing hard conclusions more difficult than would quantitative evidence.

conclusions and recommendations

- 5.5 With these caveats in mind, our consultants have endeavoured to identify where there appear to be either gaps or overlaps in current or planned effort.
- 5.6 Our conclusions and recommendations are presented in below in terms of:
- the *overarching issues* of leadership and co-ordination, enforcement, infrastructure and funding, followed by
 - the major areas of *core activity* as discussed in Chapter 4.

Overarching issues

Leadership & Co-ordination

- 5.7 It would appear, perhaps largely as a function of the high rate of change in the waste sector mentioned earlier, but also because of the sheer size and complexity of London itself, that few individuals or organisations in London are fully aware of what is going on in the sector. This impression tends to be supported by the results from the electronic survey undertaken as part of this research, which revealed that the dominant relationships within the sector are ad hoc; and by the general lack of authoritative, comprehensive data on 'what is going on'.
- 5.8 Insofar as this represents a 'gap', it appears to be a gap of either communication, or leadership. The sector in London is characterised by a strong network of relationships, and in many respects this diversity is its strength. Paradoxically, it is London's (historic) fractured nature of governance that has resulted in a situation where there are such strong and well developed partnerships. It has been an organic rather than imposed process.
- 5.9 However, the communication and/or leadership gaps are problematic and appear to flow from the current partnership structure. On the one hand, those who are not in the 'right' partnerships may be excluded from information or knowledge, thereby creating the communication problem. And, on the other, the plethora of strong (but not strong enough?) partnerships (and players within those partnerships) creates a problem of leadership – there is a degree of competition between organisations, and a degree of 'wait-and-see' too.
- 5.10 A further interesting example of the 'London problem' is the status of RTAB, about which our consultants gathered conflicting views. In a partnership-dominated environment, any partnership will only survive if it fulfils a useful function – and it would appear that the RTAB has not yet achieved that position. In a more strongly-led set of circumstances, the RTAB could be given (following appropriate consultation, of course) a clear function or set of functions. At present, it is difficult to see how the RTAB could 'naturally' evolve a useful role.
- 5.11 The strong network of partnerships in London has served the capital well in recent years, but the latest challenges seem to require a degree of leadership and co-ordination that partnerships are unable to provide. Adopting a leadership position – to identify priorities, to mobilise resources, to tackle conflicts – is difficult not only because such leadership implies political risk, but because the well-developed partnerships throughout London, and the powerful organisations within them, take different views on how and by whom such leadership should be undertaken.
- 5.12 Nevertheless, it is our view that in the absence of such leadership there is a considerable risk that the current phase of extensive and intensive effort to change London's waste behaviour could be dissipated. London would not only miss the 2005 targets, but would be perpetually struggling thereafter.
- 5.13 We therefore conclude that is a clear role for the Mayor here to demonstrate waste management leadership for London, working in constructive partnership with key partners (such as the boroughs and other parties), via London Waste Action.

Recommendation 1

We support the Mayor in exercising the appropriate role of strong waste management leadership for London, working in constructive partnership with key partners, via London Waste Action.

Enforcement

- 5.14 Related to the issue of partnerships and leadership is the issue of enforcement. A recurring motif throughout the consultations undertaken as part of this research, and underpinning the many targets currently driving the industry, are questions about the extent to which action may or may not be taken, and by whom, if – more accurately, when – targets are missed.
- 5.15 The Mayor has certain powers of direction over waste contracts, but it is not yet clear how far these will be deployed if and when Boroughs miss their targets, or fail to deliver against the Implementation Plan.
- 5.16 Similarly, Defra, via the medium of WIP, appears to be taking a cautious approach, in which the precise circumstances required to prompt “intervention” (or enforcement) are currently unknown or unclear to those expected to respond to the targets.
- 5.17 In our view, whilst a certain degree of uncertainty in the minds of those responsible for on the ground delivery of the 25% target may spur action, there is a case for saying that, beyond a certain point, clarity is required as to the ‘rules’, that is to say, what happens if targets are not met. As 2005 gets ever closer, the need for that clarity – and the leadership required to specify that clarity – surely grows.

Recommendation 2

We call for greater public clarity from those with enforcement powers – notably Defra/WIP and the Mayor/GLA – and sooner rather than later. In particular, the consequences of failing to meet targets needs to be spelt out. Such clarity is not, in our view, inconsistent with the current approach. Rather, it should help to focus minds and effort, particular among individuals or organisations that have not yet woken up to the nature of the waste challenge in London, or the full implications of missing various targets.

Infrastructure

- 5.18 Another recurring theme throughout this concise research exercise has been the issue of infrastructure. Some consultees felt very strongly that, after a long period in which there had been no London-wide consideration of the infrastructural needs for London’s waste, profound gaps in provision could only be addressed at a strategic level via an entity with sufficient powers – namely, a Single Waste Authority.
- 5.19 Furthermore, the publication of The London Plan and, perhaps even more importantly in this current context, the imminent formulation of the Sub Regional Development Frameworks, should provide the land-use planning

context within which strategic waste disposal and treatment infrastructure can be developed.

- 5.20 At the same time, it appears increasingly likely that any major infrastructural investment – however it is managed – will be funded under the auspices of PFI. The full implications of this method of funding will need to be researched and considered carefully.
- 5.21 The Mayor has recently reiterated his argument for a Single Waste Disposal Authority⁷⁵. The Committee recognises that this proposal is far from securing Londonwide agreement.
- 5.22 Whilst it was not an issue upon which we asked our consultants to focus during this research, it is worth noting their advice to us that, in their view, it is difficult from one angle at least to see how the infrastructure required by almost any of the future scenarios for waste management in London⁷⁶ could be achieved by partnership working alone. On the other hand, the role of PFI as a primary vehicle for funding investment may complicate or blur this apparently straightforward picture.

Recommendation 3

We believe that an important and immediate effort is required by the boroughs and the Mayor to ensure the forthcoming round of London Plan Sub-Regional Development Frameworks both full take account of London's waste infrastructural needs and, in due course, provide the platform for strategic action.

- 5.23 In addition, in the light of expected announcements from Treasury on the role and extent of PFI in the waste sector, analysis of how PFI can best be deployed within London needs to take place. An essential element of this analysis will be discussion between the public and the private sectors. Developing stronger relationships with and between joint disposal authorities will also be an important part of understanding not merely what London's medium and long term infrastructural needs really are, but, perhaps more importantly, how they are actually going to be developed. London will need progress on this in the not too-distant-future, and cannot afford to wait for a Single Waste Authority.

Recommendation 4

We believe it would be useful for the Mayor to commission work from GLA Economics on the role and extent of PFI in the waste sector, the degree of flexibility which might be attained, and an analysis of how PFI can potentially best be deployed in London's waste management.

Funding

- 5.24 The Boroughs' own annual waste budgets are by far the most significant element of spending on waste management in London. There is a range of other inputs, however, most notably the London Recycling Fund. The LRF represents a significant injection of money – the first tranche represented in the

⁷⁵ "The Case for London: London's Loss is No-One's Gain", GLA, March 2004

⁷⁶ See "Waste Options Modelling: Technical Report for the London Plan", GLA, February 2004

region of 5% of annual waste management spend in the capital. (By way of comparison, regeneration spending typically accounts for a fraction of one per cent of mainstream spending in any given location.)

- 5.25 In our view, the LRF is of a sufficient order of magnitude to catalyse dramatic change in the way in which mainstream waste management spending is undertaken. While some consultees believe that this dramatic change has already occurred, in our view it remains too early to assess the scale of change, nor whether achievements will be sufficiently embedded to endure beyond the end of LRF investment.
- 5.26 In the medium and longer term, the scale of funding required is mapped out partly by the Enviro/GLA study (September 2003) and the forthcoming ALG/GLA study on the costs of treatment and disposal options (expected December 2004). Until the latter is published, the size of the funding gap remains unknown.
- 5.27 In the shorter term, nevertheless, there are three specific areas where, as far as we have been able to tell, gaps presently exist:
- Waste minimisation – as mentioned earlier, relatively little is being undertaken in this area and, in turn, relatively little is being spent – yet this is probably the biggest strategic challenge alongside building the right facilities.
 - Strategic infrastructure – as well as it not yet being clear what strategic infrastructural needs actually are, there is no sign of how or from what source such infrastructure will be funded. An understanding of the PFI route, and the relative involvement of both public and private sector, is required.
 - Community and social enterprise sector – the community and social enterprise sector has been noted for delivering innovation within the context of broader social, community and sustainability objectives. The end of LTCS will mean more competitive tendering and, perhaps, more integrated contracts. In our view, in way must be found to ensure that all contracts require compliance with broader social, community and sustainability objectives, without stifling innovative solutions.
- 5.28 In the short term, we believe efforts to focus expenditure on waste minimisation, strategic infrastructure and the role of the community and enterprise sector need to continue (via lobbying, discussion among partners etc). In particular, national programmes that will be operational in London need to be aware of these priorities, and mechanisms to ensure fair shares put in place. Decisions on longer-term funding need to wait for the conclusion of the ALG/GLA study on the costs of treatment and disposal options.

Recommendation 5

In the short term, we believe that expenditure on waste management in London should be focused on waste minimisation, strategic infrastructure and the role of the community and enterprise sector. We call upon those operating national programmes in London to be aware of these priorities, and to ensure that mechanisms to deliver fair shares are put in place.

Core activities

Waste minimisation

- 5.29 Waste minimisation appears to be an area where much has been written, but – so far, at least – initiatives tend to be piecemeal, idiosyncratic and poorly funded. Whilst this may be understandable – waste minimisation is the most difficult element of the waste hierarchy to address, and the most salient, short term targets are focused upon recycling – there is nevertheless a clear gap in this area. The gap applies both to the issue of tackling *residual* waste, as well as the total volume of waste.
- 5.30 Some recognition of this gap appears to be taking place, with signs that funding and/or effort may increase in the not-too-distant future. However, in our judgement, the gap remains wide, unbridged and (with the longer term in mind) serious.
- 5.31 The Committee believes that tackling the challenges of waste minimisation needs to be undertaken with much greater urgency. In our view, the Government should demonstrate national leadership through placing waste minimisation at the top of the waste management hierarchy. Waste minimisation should be incentivised at every level. For example, Ireland has demonstrated that a simple proposal such as their plastic shopping bag scheme can radically alter consumer behaviour.
- 5.32 A thorough and wide-ranging debate on how this can really be done needs to take place. Several of the key players in London’s waste sector, for example, the Government, the Mayor, London Remade and the forthcoming London Waste Reduction and Recycling Support Service are in a position to initiate and lead such a debate. Current instances where attempts to promote minimisation are underway need to be critically evaluated as part of this debate. More courageous and extensive pilots need to be devised, funded and put in place. There is a good argument for having WRAP retailer pilot schemes in London.

Recommendation 6

We believe that tackling the challenges of waste minimisation needs to be undertaken with much greater urgency, and this should be focused and led in London by the Mayor, London Remade and the forthcoming London Waste Reduction and Recycling Support Service. The aim should be to devise and implement an auditable, systematic waste minimisation programme for the capital linked to the Mayor’s waste reduction and reuse plan.

- 5.33 In our view, key players have the potential to be more proactive in raising the profile of and addressing waste minimisation issues. We see a role for the prospective London Waste Reduction and Recycling Support Service in garnering funding bids for waste minimisation schemes from the boroughs, and making sure that this area of activity is linked to and highlighted in the Capital Waste Facts website

Recommendation 7

We recommend that the London Waste Reduction and Recycling Support Service prioritises waste minimisation activity, supports borough level waste minimisation action through enabling funding, and promotes Londonwide waste minimisation activity through links to Capital Waste Facts.

- 5.34 To promote and give appropriate weight to waste minimisation activities, the Audit Commission should, in our view, consider establishing best value performance indicators for boroughs for waste minimisation activity.

Recommendation 8

The Audit Commission should consider establishing best value performance indicators for boroughs for waste minimisation activity.

Recycling collection

- 5.35 This is an area that has been the focus of considerable attention recently, not least because of the impact of the London Recycling Fund (the bidding priorities for which were configured to line up with the major themes of the Mayoral Strategy). The number of households benefiting from kerbside collection of recyclables has, it would appear, increased dramatically.
- 5.36 Nevertheless, gaps remain, both in terms of coverage (there remain households that are not receiving kerbside collections) and scope (not all kerbside collections are covering the recommended minimum of three materials for recycling).
- 5.37 Furthermore, there is an important distinction to be made between *effort* and *outcome*. It may be, for example, that even though there is currently much effort, the eventual outcome will prove to be insufficient to deliver, in this case, the intended 25% recycling rate. If this turns out to be the case, then *ex post* there will have been a gap. Further work would be required to answer this kind of question.

Recommendation 9

We applaud the useful work of the London Recycling Fund (LRF), and support its channeling of funds to the boroughs in support of recycling collection. In our view, the LRF has delivered a good service in the limited time available. If this funding stream cannot be sustained in future, we believe that the forthcoming London Waste Reduction and Recycling Support Service should play a proactive role, ensuring that funding bids come forward from boroughs. It is our ultimate belief that recycling funds should go direct to the boroughs.

Recommendation 10

We urge London boroughs and the London Recycling Fund to make a key priority the extension of the kerbside collection of recyclables to those areas of London not yet benefiting from such collections, for example, housing estates and parts of Inner London. We also support a continued effort to expand the range of materials collected.

Recommendation 11

We believe that the results from the detailed monitoring and evaluation of the impact of the London Recycling Fund need to be processed and disseminated quickly, not only to ensure that the LRF spending itself is used well, but also to maximise the knock-on impacts into mainstream spending (and, indeed, to influence other funding streams). We call on London boroughs to maintain recycling schemes kick-started by LRF funding, to encourage innovation and to duplicate successful methods.

Home composting

- 5.38 A variety of initiatives – from WRAP, Remade, LCRN, individual Boroughs – are underway in this area. As far as our consultants have been able to tell, there is no evidence of any significant overlap or duplication. Rather, the situation appears to be one in which activity is patchy – a mix of pilot schemes and borough-specific initiatives – and, given the apparent pattern of funding, appears set to continue to be so. In this sense, therefore, there appear to be gaps in coverage. However, what is also not clear is the expected or indeed appropriate balance between composting by households and municipal composting.
- 5.39 We believe that the patchy nature of home composting coverage across London identified by our consultants could be best addressed by filling in Outer London gaps first – where on average, domestic gardens are larger – followed by Inner London, and that the Mayor should act accordingly.
- 5.40 We also believe that the Audit commission should consider establishing best value performance indicators for boroughs for home composting.

Recommendation 12

The Mayor should set challenging targets for home composting, higher in Outer London where greater opportunities for home composting exist. In Inner London it may be more appropriate to consider the household collection of compostable waste.

Recommendation 13

The Audit Commission should consider establishing best value performance indicators for boroughs for home composting initiatives.

Green Waste Collections

- 5.41 As with composting, green waste collection appears to be currently patchy across London, but the effect of the Mayor's Municipal Waste Management Strategy (requiring Boroughs to undertake feasibility studies) could well address this gap over the next few months. These feasibility studies will inevitably need to make reference to best practice, which we have identified in Bexley, Haringey and Ealing.
- 5.42 We believe that the London Plan process – and in particular the Sub-Regional Development Frameworks – presents a good opportunity to establish the footprint for municipal green waste and compostable facility and site identification and safeguarding. In our view, London Recycling Fund infrastructure funding should be allocated to support this process, and the proposed London Waste Reduction and Recycling Support Service should play a proactive role, ensuring that funding bids come forward from boroughs.

Recommendation 14

The Mayor and boroughs should make good use of the London Plan Sub-Regional Development Frameworks process to identify the need for and to safeguard sites and facilities for green waste collection and processing. London Recycling Fund infrastructure funding should be allocated to support this process, and the proposed London Waste Reduction and Recycling Support Service should play a proactive role, ensuring that funding bids come forward from boroughs.

Awareness/education

- 5.43 The Recycle for London campaign has played a significant role in improving both the quality of communication, and the co-ordination of communication about waste and recycling issues in the capital, and is a good example of joined up thinking. Furthermore, within the remainder of the London Recycling Fund (which was used to support the Recycle for London campaign) awareness and education elements are now required as part of all projects.
- 5.44 Recent news that WRAP has agreed to co-ordinate their funding on awareness in London via LWA/LRF is also an important signifier of improving co-ordination.
- 5.45 There remain issues, however, about the relationship between national and London-level communication and education strategies.

- 5.46 In terms of the effort underway, therefore, our consultants conclude that there are no current significant gaps, nor overlaps. However, we would stress that continued effort will be required in this area to bring about the changes in household behaviour commensurate with not only the near-term 25% recycling rate target but also, and to a greater extent, the longer term targets. In this regard, we believe there is no substitute for knocking on doors and explaining to householders the services available locally and the benefits that increased take up can bring.
- 5.47 In our view, Recycle for London's awareness work needs to highlight specific borough initiatives, and explain what each borough does. Links to reprocessing facilities would enable Londoners to see what happens to their recyclable waste, thereby raising awareness and participation.

Recommendation 15

The success of Recycle for London needs to be maintained, and integration between national, regional and local initiatives ensured. It should continue to work with the boroughs, where continued effort to raise awareness, particularly among households (through, for example, door knocking), is essential in the short, medium and longer term.

Best practice

- 5.48 Together with training (see below) best practice is seen a key component of developing the capacity of London's waste industry to meet the challenges set out by both the national and London strategies.
- 5.49 The issue of disseminating best practice appears to have risen sharply up the agenda in London in the past couple of years. From a position – as little as 12 or 18 months ago – when this research would have concluded that there was a serious gap, the situation now appears to be one in which there is a risk of overlap. Whether the risk becomes a reality will depend in part on the outcome of ongoing analysis and discussion involving WIP, WRAP, LWA, the Boroughs and others.
- 5.50 The role of the proposed London Waste Reduction and Recycling Support Service could be crucial in this respect. An outcome in which there are too many competing sources of best practice advice and guidance could mitigate against progress, by confusing potential consumers; an outcome in which there are too few (or just one) sources could fail because innovation is stifled, or because (potential) consumers feel they are being dictated to rather than offered a choice.

Recommendation 16

The risk of overlap in the collection and dissemination of best practice information appears considerable. This would not merely be a waste of resources, but could confuse intended beneficiaries and undermine progress. We call upon the Mayor, London Waste Action and the London Waste Reduction and Recycling Support Service to focus on co-ordinating efforts to ensure this risk is minimised.

- 5.51 The proposed London Waste Reduction and Recycling Support Service appears consistent with this recommendation that there should be greater co-ordination, but our consultants not done an evaluation of this particular solution (and indeed different consultees refer to the planned centre by different names, and appear to have quite different expectations of its function). Whichever solution is adopted, the most important aspect will be to avoid duplication or overlap between what should be complementary organisations.

Training

- 5.52 The issue of training has not been separately identified as a priority in the Implementation Plan of the Mayor's Municipal Waste Strategy but is seen as a key issue for London by our consultees. It appears that employment in the waste sector in London remains shaped by negative connotations (among both politicians and the public) leading to a situation in which salaries and authority are relatively low, responsibilities are high and rising, and staff turnover is very high. (It is not an unknown experience, for example, for officers to contact the London Recycling Fund to find out what they are supposed to be doing with the money that a previous regime of officers, just a few months earlier, had successfully bid for.)
- 5.53 In such an environment, the provision of regular, high quality training, mentoring and support is vital. At present, it would appear that the market is heading in this direction, with a variety of provision (or planned provision) from WRAP, CIWM, Remade and others.
- 5.54 As with the provision of training more generally, however, establishing whether there is too much or too little training is fraught with difficulty. In principle, at least – and as appears to be the case with CIWM – if there is sufficient demand for a particular type of training, then supply normally arises to meet that demand. In practice, however, it is frequently the case that the *need* for training is not recognised, or the responsibility for the *funding* of training is unclear or disputed.
- 5.55 In this context, current plans from WRAP and others can be interpreted as representing an attempt to tackle a *market failure*, and the proposed London Waste Reduction and Recycling Support Service can be seen in the same light.
- 5.56 Overall, our judgement is that, whilst there appear to be some areas where there appears to be an overlap in provision, these overlaps in fact represent no more than healthy competition between suppliers. Such gaps as exist appear to be in the area of soft skills (such as procurement, project management, communication, public relations, lobbying etc.) rather than in hard, technical skills.

Recommendation 17

We believe that training comprises a key element of developing the capacity of all those in the waste sector in London to meet the challenges ahead. Greater provision of training for “soft” skills, via mentoring schemes and best practice exchange, should therefore be a priority, and could possibly be achieved through tweaking and refocusing existing training programmes. We call upon the London Waste Reduction and Recycling Support Service to keep a close eye on training provision across London.

Data monitoring and collection

- 5.57 Via initiatives such as Capital Waste Facts, recent years have seen a rapid increase and improvement in the quality, quantity and clarity of data on the waste sector in London. Most of the major players in the waste sector – WRAP, Defra, GLA, Environment Agency and so on – are both continuing to maintain existing data sets and to develop new ones.
- 5.58 Furthermore, mechanisms intended to monitor and track the impact of new initiatives, not least the Mayoral Strategy itself, are being developed.
- 5.59 Whilst it is invariably the case that there is always room for more data – a position that could lead to a conclusion that there are always “gaps” – it would appear, on the basis of the evidence we have been able to gather, that there is no current structural gap that is not being addressed; and that, if there are any overlaps, these appear to be of the kind that improved co-ordination could address relatively easily. In our view, this need not be an overly centralised or autocratic process; instead, some sort of data network, possibly as an adjunct to existing partnerships, could relatively easily provide the vehicle for communication and discussion on how to move forward in a more coherent way.
- 5.60 There is a related issue, however, which, in the view of our consultants, does constitute a gap, albeit an understandable one, in which potential *users* of data appear under-equipped to use or ill-disposed towards such data. In the absence of authoritative data or – more directly – a culture in which reliance upon data is a routine part of management, the gap is filled by politicised judgement, hunch or myth. This is a capacity issue, and needs addressing as suggested under the Training and/or Best Practice sections of this chapter of the report.

Recommendation 18

We believe that there needs to be greater co-ordination between the various organisations currently collecting data on waste in London, and that the Mayor should play a central co-ordinating role through Capital Waste Facts.

Annex A: Recommendations

1. We support the Mayor in exercising the appropriate role of strong waste management leadership for London, working in constructive partnership with key partners, via London Waste Action.
2. We call for greater public clarity from those with enforcement powers – notably Defra/WIP and the Mayor/GLA – and sooner rather than later. In particular, the consequences of failing to meet targets needs to be spelt out. Such clarity is not, in our view, inconsistent with the current approach. Rather, it should help to focus minds and effort, particular among individuals or organisations that have not yet woken up to the nature of the waste challenge in London, or the full implications of missing various targets.
3. We believe that an important and immediate effort is required by the boroughs and the Mayor to ensure the forthcoming round of London Plan Sub-Regional Development Frameworks both full take account of London’s waste infrastructural needs and, in due course, provide the platform for strategic action.
4. We believe it would be useful for the Mayor to commission work from GLA Economics on the role and extent of PFI in the waste sector, the degree of flexibility which might be attained, and an analysis of how PFI can potentially best be deployed in London’s waste management.
5. In the short term, we believe that expenditure on waste management in London should be focused on waste minimisation, strategic infrastructure and the role of the community and enterprise sector. We call upon those operating national programmes in London to be aware of these priorities, and to ensure that mechanisms to deliver fair shares are put in place.
6. We believe that tackling the challenges of waste minimisation needs to be undertaken with much greater urgency, and this should be focused and led in London by the Mayor, London Remade and the forthcoming London Waste Reduction and Recycling Support Service. The aim should be to devise and implement an auditable, systematic waste minimisation programme for the capital linked to the Mayor’s waste reduction and reuse plan.
7. We recommend that the London Waste Reduction and Recycling Support Service prioritises waste minimisation activity, supports borough level waste minimisation action through enabling funding, and promotes Londonwide waste minimisation activity through links to Capital Waste Facts.
8. The Audit Commission should consider establishing best value performance indicators for boroughs for waste minimisation activity.
9. We applaud the useful work of the London Recycling Fund (LRF), and support its channeling of funds to the boroughs in support of recycling collection. In our view, the LRF has delivered a good service in the limited time available. If this funding stream cannot be sustained in future, we believe that the forthcoming London Waste Reduction and Recycling Support Service should play a proactive role, ensuring that funding bids come forward from boroughs. It is our ultimate belief that recycling funds should go direct to the boroughs.

10. We urge London boroughs and the London Recycling Fund to make a key priority the extension of the kerbside collection of recyclables to those areas of London not yet benefiting from such collections, for example, housing estates and parts of Inner London. We also support a continued effort to expand the range of materials collected.
11. We believe that the results from the detailed monitoring and evaluation of the impact of the London Recycling Fund need to be processed and disseminated quickly, not only to ensure that the LRF spending itself is used well, but also to maximise the knock-on impacts into mainstream spending (and, indeed, to influence other funding streams). We call on London boroughs to maintain recycling schemes kick-started by LRF funding, to encourage innovation and to duplicate successful methods.
12. The Mayor should set challenging targets for home composting, higher in Outer London where greater opportunities for home composting exist. In Inner London it may be more appropriate to consider the household collection of compostable waste.
13. The Audit Commission should consider establishing best value performance indicators for boroughs for home composting initiatives.
14. The Mayor and boroughs should make good use of the London Plan Sub-Regional Development Frameworks process to identify the need for and to safeguard sites and facilities for green waste collection and processing. London Recycling Fund infrastructure funding should be allocated to support this process, and the proposed London Waste Reduction and Recycling Support Service should play a proactive role, ensuring that funding bids come forward from boroughs.
15. The success of Recycle for London needs to be maintained, and integration between national, regional and local initiatives ensured. It should continue to work with the boroughs, where continued effort to raise awareness, particularly among households (through, for example, door knocking), is essential in the short, medium and longer term.
16. The risk of overlap in the collection and dissemination of best practice information appears considerable. This would not merely be a waste of resources, but could confuse intended beneficiaries and undermine progress. We call upon the Mayor, London Waste Action and the London Waste Reduction and Recycling Support Service to focus on co-ordinating efforts to ensure this risk is minimised.
17. We believe that training comprises a key element of developing the capacity of all those in the waste sector in London to meet the challenges ahead. Greater provision of training for “soft” skills, via mentoring schemes and best practice exchange, should therefore be a priority, and could possibly be achieved through tweaking and refocusing existing training programmes. We call upon the London Waste Reduction and Recycling Support Service to keep a close eye on training provision across London.
18. We believe that there needs to be greater co-ordination between the various organisations currently collecting data on waste in London, and that the Mayor should play a central co-ordinating role through Capital Waste Facts.

Annex B: List of Consultees

Ben Metz	London Community Recycling Network
Colin Roberts	London Waste Action
Katherine Higgins	Greater London Authority
Hugh Carr Harris	London Remade
Simon Read	London Recycling Fund
John Enright	Defra/WIP
Chris Lee	Defra/WIP
Barbara Herridge	Wastewatch
Mel Barrett	London Development Agency
Lesley Harding	London Development Agency
Shirley Rodrigues	Association of London Government
Michael Bland	Chartered Institute of Waste Management
Andy Bond	Ealing Community Transport
Andrew Lappage	North London Waste Authority
Mike Nicholls	West London Waste Authority
Linda Crichton	WRAP

Annex C: Topic Guide

1. Introduction

Introduce Brook Lyndhurst and self. Interviews are on record but off record comments can be made.

Background to the work – London Assembly scrutiny of the Mayor's Waste Implementation Plan. Mapping current waste activity in London and how this fits into the medium/long term strategic objectives of sustainable waste management in London (25% recycling)

2. Role of organisation in London (mapping)

Background to the organisation – who they are, when they formed including how they were/are funded and set up (where relevant).

What are the 'strategic' objectives of organisation?

Activity

Main areas of activity in London (in detail), planned activity in London (in detail). Discuss in relation to the following key areas:

- 1) Waste Reduction and reuse
- 2) Recycling collection and CA sites
- 3) Composting
- 4) Waste Treatment and disposal
- 5) Transport of waste
- 6) Infrastructure

On what scale is this activity taking place - pilot level, borough wide London wide or even nationally?

What kind of budgets are involved in this 'delivery' activity?

Funding

Who are you funded by now - will this change or remain the same? (e.g. landfill tax, LRF, Objective 2 etc).

What is the balance between 'core' funding and 'other' funding?

What is the balance between getting 'general' centralised funding and project specific funding?

Are you applying for any kind of third party funding (e.g. EU etc)

Is your funding tied to performance (or other) targets? What kind of targets?

What is your spend on 'waste activity' in London (roughly) and what proportion of your spending goes on waste compared to other activity?

Do you think money is being spent/channelled effectively in London on waste activity? If not why not? Do you think there is duplication of funding? If so, do you think funding should be redirected?

Are there untapped funding streams which you have been trying to access? Have you had any success? Could these streams be made more easily available?

3a. the 25% target by 2005

Do you think that London will meet the 25% target?

If not, why not?

If yes, what is working well and what is not to achieve this?

Does the Mayor's Waste Strategy make a difference?

What makes your organisations own objectives easy or difficult?

What barriers does your organisation face in terms of delivery? How could these barriers be overcome?

Would working with others help you overcome these barriers – who might these 'others' be?

3b. Drivers and objectives

What are the key drivers that your organisation faces? Does the Mayor's Waste Strategy play a part? Will it play a part in the future?

Statutory waste targets

Landfill directive

Mayor's Waste Strategy

The 25% target

Markets for recycled material (inc costs)

Partnership working

4. Partnership working in London

Do you work with other organisations in London? Who are these (key) organisations and what is your relationship with them? How did these relationships come about?

What is the impact of partnership working on your organisation? Positives & negative. It is making a real difference?

If lots of partnership working - how has it changed your priorities/activities if at all? Do you share best practise to avoid duplicating work? Is there enough sharing of good practise?

If not – why not?

-
- What do you think of the existing 'strategic' partnerships which exist in London (e.g London Waste Action). Could these more effective? How?

Do you think partnerships will play a key role in the delivery of a 25% recycling target in London? Will this be an effective mechanism of delivery or does more need to be done?

What would an 'effective waste partnership' in London look like? Would something like this work in London?

5. Conclusion and thanks

Annex D: Questionnaire

London Assembly Environment Committee - Waste Implementation Scrutiny

Thank you for taking the time to fill in this questionnaire. The survey is being run by Brook Lyndhurst on behalf of the London Assembly Environment Committee. If you have any queries about the survey please contact Lucy Jenkins on 020 8233 2972.

We are asking a wide range of organisations about their views on the Mayor's Implementation Plan which forms part of the Mayor's Municipal Waste Strategy. **The questions are designed to gather general opinions only.**

PLEASE NOTE: Responses are **STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL** and will not be attributed to individuals or organisations; your answers will be aggregated with all others to produce an analysis of the opinions of key stakeholders.

Q1 For each of the following statements relating to waste activity please indicate whether your organisation is doing work in this area at the moment, or planning to do work in the next 3 years.

For each statement please mark X in the box which matches your opinion

	Have done in past/have piloted	Are doing now		Planned within next 3 years		Not applicable
		Pilot/ trial	Borough/ area wide	Pilot/ trial	Borough/ area wide	
WASTE REDUCTION AND REUSE						
Public education programme to promote waste reduction and reuse locally						
Promote home composting						
Make compost bins/ wormeries available to all households						
Run/co-ordinate a scheme which allows for furniture reuse and recycling						
Run/promote a re-usable nappy scheme						
Actively promote the Mailing Preference Service						
RECYCLING COLLECTION & CA SITES						
Provide (where practical) all households with a kerbside recycling collection of at least 1 material						
Provide all households (where practical) with a kerbside recycling collection of at least 3 materials						
Facilities for the separation of reusable items at all CA sites in the borough						
Up-grade facilities & management of recycling sites						
Implement 'adopt a bank' schemes						
Provide 1 recycling site per 500 households for at least 3 materials on estates and multi-occupancy properties						
COMPOSTING						
Civic Amenity sites have facilities to receive and segregate green waste						
Provide free of charge green waste collections to households						
Provide green waste collections to households - directly charged						
WASTE TREATMENT AND DISPOSAL						
Undertake work to introduce new and emerging advanced conversion technologies for waste (e.g. anaerobic digestion, gasification and pyrolysis, in vessel composting)						
Safeguard land in UDP for sustainable waste management and treatment facilities (excluding reprocessing)						
Safeguard land in UDP for waste re-processing facilities						
TRANSPORT OF WASTE						
Ensure use of rail or river to transport recyclables and related materials						
Ensure use of 'clean' fuel vehicles (either retro-fit existing vehicles or new 'clean' fuel vehicles) vehicles						

Q2 To what extent would you say that the Mayor's Municipal Waste Strategy has influenced your current or planned activity in each of the following areas?

For each statement please mark X in the box which matches your opinion

	Not influenced at all	Influenced a little	Influenced a lot	Not sure
Public education/promotion of sustainable waste management				
Household recycling collections (kerbside)				
Bring sites and Civic Amenity sites				
Collection/treatment of green waste (including home composting)				
Collection/treatment of hazardous and clinical waste				
Waste treatment and disposal - household waste				
Scope of municipal waste contracts				
Developing partnerships with other waste stakeholders				
Transport of waste for treatment and disposal				
Forward planning of waste for treatment/disposal				
Safe-guarding land for waste facilities in your area				
Investment in new treatment facilities (e.g. MRF, anaerobic digestion, composting vessels)				
Other (please specify)				

Q3 The Mayor's Municipal Waste Strategy suggests that partnerships and co-operative working will play a key role in delivering change.

How closely would you say your organisation works with each of the sectors listed below?

For each organisation please mark X in the box which matches your opinion

	Have no contact with	Have ad hoc contact regarding specific issues	Have voluntary working arrangement with	Have statutory or contractual arrangement with	Not sure
London Development Agency					
Waste Authorities					
Mayor of London/GLA					
London Assembly					
Association of London Government					
London Remade					
London Waste Action					
DEFRA					
Environment Agency					
WRAP					
Community Sector					
WasteWatch					
London/ South East RTAB (Regional Technical Advisory Board)					
Other (please specify)					

Q4 Organisations responsible for delivering the waste agenda face different pressures, drivers and barriers.

To what extent, in your opinion, do the following influence your organisation?

For each factor please mark X in the box which matches your opinion

	Not influenced at all	Influenced a little	Very influenced	Not sure
Increasing landfill tax				
Statutory waste targets				
Borough waste strategies				
Increasing profitability				

Q5 The Mayor believes the best way to achieve sustainable waste management in London is for waste disposal to be under the control of a single waste disposal authority.

In your opinion, would a single Waste Authority be more or less likely to deliver the following compared to current arrangements for municipal waste management in London?

For each statement please mark X in the box which matches your opinion

	Much less likely	Less likely	Neither less or more likely	More likely	Much more likely
Ensure that London as a whole achieves statutory recycling and recovery targets					
Strategic planning of London's waste infrastructure to prevent gaps or overlap					
Secure investment in the infrastructure required to prevent gaps or overlaps					
Ensure that sufficient land is safeguarded for waste treatment options, according to the hierarchy set out in the Waste Strategy 2000					

THANK YOU FOR TAKING PART IN THIS SURVEY. PLEASE BE ASSURED THAT INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES WILL REMAIN CONFIDENTIAL.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

If you have any other comments you wish to make, please use this space.

Annex E: Orders and translations

How to order

For further information on this report or to order a copy, please contact Richard Linton, Senior Scrutiny Manager, on 0207 983 4207 or email to richard.linton@london.gov.uk

See it for free on our website

You can also view and download a copy of this report from <http://www.london.gov.uk/assembly/reports/plansd.jsp>

Large print, Braille or translations

If you, or someone you know, needs a copy of this report in large print or Braille, or a copy of the summary and main findings in another language, then please call us on 020 7983 4100 or email to assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

ਪ੍ਰਸਤਾਵ ਨਾ ਪ੍ਰਸਤਾਵਤਾਵ ਸੰਬੰਧਤ ਹਰੇਕ ਐਕਸ਼ਨ ਪਲਾਨ ਸੰਬੰਧਤ ਕੰਮਾਂ ਲਿਸਟਿੰਗਾਂ ਵਰਤਮਾਨ ਦੀ ਹੋਰਤੋਂ, ਸਮਾਨ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਲਿਸਟਿੰਗ ਸਮੇਤ ਟੈਲੀਫੋਨ 020 7983 4100 ਤੇ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਕਰਕੇ ਜਾਂ ਆਪਣੇ ਆਪ ਦੀ ਆਪਣੀ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਤੇ ਲਿਖਾਵੇਂ: assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

Se você, ou alguém de seu conhecimento, gostaria de ter uma cópia do sumário executivo e recomendações desse relatório em impressão grande ou Braille, ou na sua língua, sem custo, favor nos contatar por telefone no número 020 7983 4100 ou email em assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

Se você, ou alguém de seu conhecimento, gostaria de ter uma cópia do sumário executivo e recomendações desse relatório em impressão grande ou Braille, ou na sua língua, sem custo, favor nos contatar por telefone no número 020 7983 4100 ou email em assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

ਜੇ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਜਾਂ ਕੋਈ ਤੁਹਾਡੇ ਜਾਣਕਾਰ ਪਤਾ ਲਿਖ ਕੇ ਪੁੱਛਣਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਅਸੀਂ ਇਸ ਪ੍ਰਸਤਾਵ ਨੂੰ ਅਨੁਵਾਦਿਤ ਕਰਕੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਡੇ ਅੱਖਰਾਂ ਵਿੱਚ, ਸ਼੍ਰੇਣੀ ਵਿੱਚ ਜਾਂ ਅਨੁਵਾਦਿਤ ਕਰਕੇ ਪ੍ਰਾਪਤ ਕਰਨਾ ਚਾਹੀਦਾ ਹੈ ਤਾਂ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਸਾਡੇ ਨਾਲ 020 7983 4100 ਤੇ ਟੈਲੀਫੋਨ ਕਰਕੇ ਜਾਂ ਆਪਣੇ ਆਪ ਦੀ ਆਪਣੀ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਤੇ ਲਿਖਾਵੇਂ: assembly.translations@london.gov.uk ਤੇ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਕਰੋ।

Si usted o algún conocido, quiere recibir copia del resumen ejecutivo y las recomendaciones relatadas a este informe en formato de Braille, en su propia idioma, y gratis, no dude en ponerse en contacto con nosotros por teléfono al 020 7983 4100 o por correo electrónico assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

ਜੇ ਤੁਸੀਂ ਜਾਂ ਕੋਈ ਤੁਹਾਡੇ ਜਾਣਕਾਰ ਪਤਾ ਲਿਖ ਕੇ ਪੁੱਛਣਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਅਸੀਂ ਇਸ ਪ੍ਰਸਤਾਵ ਨੂੰ ਅਨੁਵਾਦਿਤ ਕਰਕੇ ਜਾਂ ਵੱਡੇ ਅੱਖਰਾਂ ਵਿੱਚ, ਸ਼੍ਰੇਣੀ ਵਿੱਚ ਜਾਂ ਅਨੁਵਾਦਿਤ ਕਰਕੇ ਪ੍ਰਾਪਤ ਕਰਨਾ ਚਾਹੀਦਾ ਹੈ ਤਾਂ ਕਿਰਪਾ ਕਰਕੇ ਸਾਡੇ ਨਾਲ 020 7983 4100 ਤੇ ਟੈਲੀਫੋਨ ਕਰਕੇ ਜਾਂ ਆਪਣੇ ਆਪ ਦੀ ਆਪਣੀ ਭਾਸ਼ਾ ਤੇ ਲਿਖਾਵੇਂ: assembly.translations@london.gov.uk ਤੇ ਸੰਪਰਕ ਕਰੋ।

Ta ba ri onikoni ti o ba ni ife lati ni eda ewe nla ti igbimo awon asoju tabi papa julo ni ede ti abinibi won. ki o kansiya lori ero ibanisoro. Nomba wa ni 020 7983 4100 tabi ki e kan si wa lori ero assembly.translations@london.gov.uk. Ako ni gbowa lowo yin fun eto yi.

Haddii adiga, ama qofaad taqaanid, uu doonaayo ruuu ku helo koobi aha warbixinta on koonka iyo talooyinka ee waaweyn ama farta qolka mifaaaha la' hoga talagalay, ama huuqadooda, oo helaaash u ah, dadkan nagala soo xiriir telefoonka 020 7983 4100 ama email-ka cinwaanka yahay assembly.translations@london.gov.uk

Annex F: Scrutiny principles

The powers of the London Assembly include power to investigate and report on decisions and actions of the Mayor, or on matters relating to the principal purposes of the Greater London Authority, and on any other matters which the Assembly considers to be of importance to Londoners. In the conduct of scrutiny and investigation the Assembly abides by a number of principles.

Scrutinies:

- aim to recommend action to achieve improvements;
- are conducted with objectivity and independence;
- examine all aspects of the Mayor's strategies;
- consult widely, having regard to issues of timeliness and cost;
- are conducted in a constructive and positive manner; and
- are conducted with an awareness of the need to spend taxpayers money wisely and well.

More information about scrutiny work of the London Assembly, including published reports, details of committee meetings and contact information, can be found on the London Assembly web page at www.london.gov.uk/assembly.

Greater London Authority

City Hall

The Queen's Walk

London SE1 2AA

www.london.gov.uk

Enquiries **020 7983 4100**

Minicom **020 7983 4458**