Safeguarding Scotland's Resources – A Programme for the Efficient Use of Our Materials: Analysis of Consultation Responses

Enviroment

social research

SAFEGUARDING SCOTLAND'S RESOURCES – A PROGRAMME FOR THE EFFICIENT USE OF OUR MATERIALS: ANALYSIS OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Linda Nicholson, The Research Shop

Scottish Government Social Research
2013

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2010 the Scottish Government launched Scotland's Zero Waste Plan[1] which promoted the vision of a Scotland where we waste as little as possible, recognising that every item and material used is a resource which has a value. The Waste (Scotland) Regulations 2012 set a clear path for this to happen. Building further upon these developments, the Scottish Government published a consultation, *Safeguarding Scotland's Resources – A Programme for the Efficient Use of our Materials*[2], to seek views on a range of proposals to reduce waste and promote resource efficiency.

The consultation is in line with the European Waste Framework Directive for every member of the European Union to produce a waste prevention programme by the end of 2013. *Safeguarding Scotland's Resources* proposes an overall target of a 5% reduction in all waste by 2015, and a longer term vision of a 15% reduction in all waste by 2025.

In total, 693 responses to the consultation were submitted, 594 of which resulted from internet campaigns. Ninety nine "standard" responses to the consultation were received: 75 (76%) of these were submitted by organisations and 24 (24%) were from individuals. Two separate internet campaigns were organised on aspects of the consultation which attracted 490 (WWF) and 104 (Marine Conservation Society) campaign responses respectively. The Marine Conservation Society campaign focused only on the proposal to introduce a charge for carrier bags. The WWF campaign also addressed this issue, and in addition made comments regarding deposit return schemes and the proposed headline targets.

A summary of views contained in the consultation responses follows.

Business resource efficiency

All of the respondents who provided a view supported the proposal for an **integrated Business Resource Efficiency service** to replace the business and public sector energy and resource efficiency advice currently delivered through Carbon Trust, Energy Saving Trust and Zero Waste Scotland (ZWS). The main benefit of the new service was perceived to be a more streamlined, 'one stop shop' approach, which would be easier to access than the present arrangements. A recurring comment was that the service should focus initially on areas offering most savings for least input.

Although the consultation did not pose a specific question relating to **voluntary agreements with businesses**, some respondents provided a view on these,

---

[1] http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2010/06/08092645/0
[2] http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2012/06/4215

with the majority considering that these could usefully be developed further by the Scottish Government.

There was much cross-sectoral support expressed for the proposal that ZWS should develop a **high level Zero Waste Pledge system** with a menu of actions open to companies of different sizes. The proposal was seen to offer benefits for companies largely in terms of showcasing their good intentions, commitment and 'green' credentials. A recurring suggestion was for the scope of the pledge to be widened to encompass 'resource efficiency' rather than focus solely on waste.

Seventy two percent of those who provided a view explicitly agreed or partially agreed with the principle of a **new voluntary agreement with the construction sector, following on from 'Halving Waste to Landfill'**, encompassing the impact of design on both construction waste and materials. It was generally thought that committing to the agreement would bring indirect financial and competitive advantages to organisations. Several local authorities, amongst others, expressed concern that some small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) in particular may not sign up to the agreement unless it is made mandatory.

Twenty one of the 23 respondents who expressed a view were supportive of waste management companies signing up to a **voluntary agreement to provide resource efficiency advice** to their customers. Ten local authorities requested that councils should also be able to sign up to the voluntary agreement. Amongst the suggestions from respondents for what they would like to see in terms of advice on resource savings and recycling from their waste management contractor were: good practice guidelines on reducing waste; a range of data services to help businesses understand better what wastes they produce and how they can be prevented, reused or recycled; and identification of process improvements and efficiencies, including the carbon footprint of the customer's operations.

Products and packaging

Ninety one percent of those who provided a view explicitly agreed or partially agreed with the actions identified in the consultation document to support the **sustainable design of products.** In particular, the proposal to include design in higher and further education provision attracted most cross-sector support, with long term gains identified. However, one recurring caution was that as most of the goods purchased in Scotland are designed and manufactured elsewhere, the proposed measures may have limited potential for impact.

Whilst 44% of those who commented agreed or partially agreed with the principle of amending the existing Producer Responsibility Regulations to enable separate identification of packaging waste arising in Scotland, there was also significant opposition (49% of those who commented) to this proposal. A main concern was that the additional burden and costs which most respondents associated with this

proposal may not be offset by the potential benefits. The possible complexity of the requirements for businesses with markets outwith Scotland were remarked upon repeatedly, with a recurring view that it may be difficult to capture accurate data.

A variety of views and constructive feedback was provided on the detail of this proposal and the responsibilities proposed for those with obligations under the scheme, namely retailers, supply chain businesses, importers, reprocessors, waste exporters and compliance schemes.

Although not included as a specific topic on which views were sought, several of the standard responses alluded to the topic of **deposit return and reverse vending schemes**. Whilst some respondents argued that these are expensive to operate and inefficient compared with existing household recycling schemes, others welcomed future piloting of such schemes in Scotland. The WWF campaign responses argued for the introduction of a nation-wide deposit return system.

The most common recommendations emerging from those who provided a view on the most **effective approaches to make it easier for people to return Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE)** for recycling and reuse were for increased, accessible collection provision supported by public awareness raising and education campaigns. There was general agreement that out-of-town collection centres for small WEEE were not as useful as local collection points, particularly for householders who are elderly, disabled or have no access to vehicles. A recurring theme was that the involvement of local authorities enables collections of WEEE to be harmonised with other waste streams and supports the effective implementation of schemes.

Amongst those respondents who provided views on priorities to increase resilience of the Scottish economy to supply risks associated with **critical materials** and maximise opportunities for Scottish businesses, the most common response was to recommend investment in innovation in infrastructure and technology with the aim of developing specialist reprocessing facilities in Scotland.

Reuse

The majority (80%) of those commenting explicitly agreed or partially agreed that the Scottish Government work with ZWS to increase the supply and demand for quality reusable items through a series of actions. The theme of quality of reused items and ensuring safety standards featured prominently in responses. Revolve was cited as a network associated with assurance of quality.

Another recurring theme was that whilst householders are becoming more accustomed to the concept of reuse, more work is required to raise awareness amongst businesses.

Overall, more respondents considered it impractical to collect separate data on the quantities of materials 'prepared for reuse' than those considering this practical. The main challenge identified was how to capture informal movement of reusable items, which often occurred online through auction sites.

However, two-thirds (68%) of those providing a view considered that whatever the challenges, it would be useful to collect 'prepared for reuse' data.

Influencing behaviours

There was much support, largely from local authorities and manufacturers, for **public campaigns** to influence the behaviour of individuals and organisations to use material resources more efficiently. A prominent request was for consistency in the message delivered in such campaigns, with suggestions made for one body to be made responsible for delivery.

There was explicit support from some respondents for a focus on **reducing food waste**; others provided support for delivery of messages through the **Eco-Schools** movement. The actions proposed regarding waste collection systems were specifically supported along with the proposals for **promoting community action**, and the emphasis on **public bodies leading the way** by example.

Overall, 94% of all those commenting voiced outright support for the proposal to introduce a **carrier bag charge**. The main focus of the two campaigns (WWF and Marine Conservation Society) was to support charging for carrier bags. The WWF campaign referred to introducing a *plastic* bag charge, whereas the Marine Conservation Society used the term 'single-use carrier bag levy'. In total, 594 campaign responses were submitted in favour of charging for carrier bags. Forty five per cent of the standard responses which addressed the topic also provided outright support, with a further 15% partially agreeing with the proposal as set out in the consultation document.

The main reasons given in support of the proposal were that charging has worked well previously and elsewhere; charging for carrier bags constitutes a powerful behaviour change message; and carrier bags contribute to pollution and litter. However, one recurring concern amongst supporters was that by placing too much emphasis on charging for carrier bags, other actions which may have more of an impact may be relegated. The most common reasons provided by those opposed to the introduction of a charge for carrier bags were: consumers may buy other bags such as bin liners to compensate, resulting in more waste; the proposal may have little impact on resource efficiency; and the proposal is based on what some perceived to be the false premise of carrier bags as 'single use'.

It was commonly thought that should charging for carrier bags be introduced, all retailers should be included in the scheme which should encompass all single

use/disposable carrier bags, regardless of material. There were mixed views on the minimum charge per bag, with most of those providing a view supporting the suggested 5p charge, but others recommending higher charges ranging up to 20p per bag.

All but one of the respondents who provided a view supported the directing of net revenue from carrier bag charging to good causes. It was recommended that there is transparency in how much revenue is being directed to which good causes. Some respondents felt that retailers should be given leeway to decide where to direct the net revenue, and causes other than environmental and resource efficiency organisations should be permitted.

A common view was to keep the reporting system as simple and minimal as possible. There were mixed views on the proposal for 'light touch' enforcement, with some respondents recommending a tighter approach.

Measuring progress

Whilst general support was provided by many respondents for the principle of overarching targets, some expressed reservation that those proposed based on waste volumes appeared to lack the wider context of, for example, general economic health, wider policy initiatives and the strategies of other countries. The balance of view was in favour of **linking targets to GDP** which was seen as providing context, being readily available and fitting with the agenda of economic growth.

Amongst the proposed indicators, the carbon impact of waste attracted most attention. Broad opinion was that the indicator would be very useful and important in measuring advances in both prevention and recycling.

The scale of ambition of the targets for waste reduction attracted commentary from some, with the WWF campaign in particular (490 respondents) recommending that the target for 2025 should be increased from 15% to 50% reduction in waste.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 In 2010 the Scottish Government launched Scotland's Zero Waste Plan[3] which promoted the vision of a Scotland where we waste as little as possible, recognising that every item and material used is a resource which has a value. The Waste (Scotland) Regulations 2012 set a clear path for this to happen. Building further upon these developments, the Scottish Government published a consultation, *Safeguarding Scotland's Resources – A Programme for the Efficient Use of our Materials*[4], to seek views on a range of proposals to reduce waste and promote resource efficiency.

1.2 The consultation was grounded in the principles of using materials efficiently, avoiding waste and reusing items, and contained a programme of proposals to drive progress towards furthering these principles in the broad areas of:
- working with businesses
- product design and packaging
- reuse
- influencing behaviours.

1.3 The consultation is in line with the European Waste Framework Directive for every member of the European Union to produce a waste prevention programme by the end of 2013. *Safeguarding Scotland's Resources* proposes an overall target of a 5% reduction in all waste by 2015, and a longer term vision of a 15% reduction in all waste by 2025. The proposals in the consultation go wider than a waste prevention strategy, however, and are designed to contribute to improving Scotland's economy (through savings to businesses and the creation of new business and market opportunities); protecting the environment; reducing carbon impact; conserving resources; and helping to deliver behaviour change.

1.4 Views were sought from stakeholders including retailers, manufacturers, PR (Producer Responsibility) compliance, packaging and waste companies, local authorities and other public bodies, non-Government organisations (NGOs) and others, with specific proposals relating to a variety of areas including the construction industry, waste management industry, manufacturing and retail. Two stakeholder events[5] were held in Edinburgh and Glasgow with attendees including representatives from businesses and business networks, local authorities and the Chartered Institution of Wastes Management. A written consultation was also published.

1.5 The written consultation closed on 28th September 2012. This report presents the analysis of the views contained in the written responses to the consultation. A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the proposed programme, "Safeguarding Scotland's Resources" was undertaken and the

---

[3] http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2010/06/08092645/0
[4] http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2012/06/4215
[5] Reports from these events are in Annexes 4 and 5.

Environmental Report was published on 1 February 2013. Views on the Environmental Report are reported in Annex 3. The main consultation was re-opened for responses while the SEA was out for consultation, with new comments on the original proposals incorporated into the main analysis.

Written consultation responses

1.6 In total, 693 responses to the consultation were submitted, 594 of which resulted from internet campaigns. Ninety nine "standard" responses to the consultation were received: 75 (76%) of these were submitted by organisations and 24 (24%) were from individuals. The standard responses have been made publicly available on the Scottish Government website[6] unless the respondent has specifically requested otherwise. Table 1 shows the numbers of standard responses by category of respondent.

Table 1: Number of standard responses by category of respondent

Category	Number	Percentage
Retail	15	15
Local authority bodies	14	14
Manufacturing	9	9
Non-Government Organisations	8	8
PR Compliance	8	8
Packaging	7	7
Waste Management	6	6
Business	4	4
Other Public Sector	4	4
Total organisations	**75**	**76**
Individuals	24	24
Total	**99**	**100**

NB Percentages are rounded and may not add to sub-totals or totals exactly

1.7 Retailers comprised the largest organisation respondent group, submitting 15% of all standard responses received. The full list of the organisations responding to the consultation is in Annex 1.

1.8 In addition to submitting their respective organisation's response, two respondents also organised campaigns on aspects of the consultation. Copies of the two pro-forma used are in Annex 2.   A summary of the number of campaign responses received is in Table 2 overleaf.

---

[6] The consultation non-confidential responses can be viewed at:
http://www.scotland.gov.uk/SSRresponses

Table 2: Summary of responses to campaigns

	Campaign organised by WWF	Campaign organised by Marine Conservation Society
No. of responses from within Scotland	429	61
No. of responses from the rest of the UK	52	34
No. of responses from elsewhere	9	6
Origin not clear		3
Total no. of responses	**490**	**104**

1.9 An electronic database was used to collate the standard responses to assist analysis. Both quantitative and qualitative approaches to analysis were adopted to reflect the nature of the consultation questions, many of which combined both closed and open elements. In reporting the results of the closed questions, the percentage figures given indicate the proportion agreeing/partially agreeing/disagreeing of **all those who provided comments** on the question. In some cases it was not clear from the comments whether the respondent was in agreement or otherwise; these are reported in the tables as 'commentary only'.

Report of findings

1.10 The following five chapters document the substance of the analysis. Chapter 2 examines views on the Scottish Government's proposals for efficiency in business resources. Chapter 3 presents views on proposals to promote the sustainable design of products and services. In Chapter 4, views are reported on Scottish Government proposals to work with ZWS to increase the supply and demand for quality reusable items. Chapter 5 analyses views on proposals designed to influence behaviours of individuals and organisations to use material resources more efficiently. Finally, comments on proposed targets and associated indicators for waste prevention are summarised and presented in Chapter 6.

1.11 Some respondent categories have been abbreviated as follows:

Local authority body	LA
Manufacturing	Man
Non-Government organisations	NGO
PR-Compliance	PR-C
Packaging	Pack
Waste Management	WM
Business	Bus
Other public sector	Pub-Oth
Individuals	Ind

2. BUSINESS RESOURCE EFFICIENCY

Business Resource Efficiency Support (Resource Efficient Scotland)

2.1 The Scottish Government proposed, by April 2013, to develop a new single business resource and energy efficiency service which will replace the business and public sector energy and resource efficiency advice currently delivered through Carbon Trust, Energy Saving Trust and ZWS.

2.2 The new service will offer comprehensive information, advice and support to business and public sector organisations including a specific focus on supporting SMEs to implement waste, energy and carbon efficiency measures that will translate into cost savings and increase competitiveness.

Question A: We have already decided to go ahead with the integrated Business Resource Efficiency service and are engaging directly with stakeholders over how it should be focused. We would however, welcome views on the priorities for the new integrated service.

2.3 Forty eight respondents (48% of standard responses) addressed this question.

Reasons given in support of the proposal

2.4 All of those who provided a view supported the proposal. Five substantive reasons were provided in support:

- Will result in a more streamlined and efficient 'one-stop' shop approach which is easier to access than the present arrangements (15 mentions). Typical comments were:
  'An integrated service should enable a more efficient delivery of advice to businesses, with a one stop shop making signposting of advice simpler and easier to access information, advice and funding' (Highland Council).

  '....hope that this will streamline the often confusing and cumbersome process through which small businesses, often with limited administrative resources, must go through to receive the necessary and correct support to reduce waste and achieve efficiency savings' (Scottish Grocers' Federation).

- Particularly helpful for SMEs (3 mentions).
- Will allow shared expertise, experience and strengths of the individual bodies to be pooled (2 mentions).
- Good for the many companies which do not have the technical skills to improve their resource efficiency and cannot buy in help (1 mention).
- Good to have both domestic and public bodies coming under the same support umbrella (1 mention).

Vision for the new service

2.5 It was proposed that a title for the new service should reflect its role in serving both the business and public sectors (LA). One respondent proposed the title of 'Resource Efficiency Scotland' (The Chartered Institution of Wastes Management). Two NGOs urged that the service is prominently advertised; another recommended a central location (WM).

2.6 Clarity was requested (2 respondents) on whether the service will be free, and if not, how access will be priced. One considered that:
> 'Uptake of the service will likely be inversely proportional to the cost of accessing the service' (Scottish Borders Council).

2.7 One respondent (Man) urged that the new service should be positioned as an advice service rather than a quasi-public policy regulatory body.

2.8 Three respondents envisaged the service as providing web-based information and tools. Two respondents considered that its functions should incorporate training and accreditation. It was recommended that the service should have a role in directing SMEs to local points of contact in addition to providing centralised support (2 mentions).

2.9 Three respondents recommended that the service be able to offer site visits. One commented:
> 'New approaches to reaching out to the small businesses are required. It is suggested that dedicated advisors are assigned to small businesses to 'walk through' and assist, hands on if necessary, with implementing change' (Clackmannanshire Council).

Suggestions for priorities for the new integrated service

2.10 A recurring comment (9 mentions) was that the service should focus initially on areas offering most savings for least input. For example:
> 'We believe that this service should focus on practical and easily implementable measures that will deliver both cost savings and resource efficiency outcomes for business' (Valpak Ltd).

2.11 Other recommendations were for:
*   information on the legal requirements with regard to the Waste (Scotland) Regulations 2012 (5 mentions)
*   management of recyclables (4 mentions)
*   carbon efficiency plans (2 mentions)
*   energy efficiency (2 mentions)
*   water efficiency (1 mention)
*   products which can help to achieve reduction of energy use (1 mention).

2.12 One respondent (WM) considered that it is difficult to set national priorities as different businesses have different priorities.

Outstanding concerns

2.13 Despite supporting the proposal, some respondents identified concerns or issues which they felt needed to be addressed in setting up the new service. One recurring comment (7 mentions) was that the Scottish Government should engage with stakeholders including trade association groups in establishing the role and nature of the new service. Others (5 mentions) urged that the there should be no deterioration of service as a result of the integration of different bodies into the one service.

2.14 Other concerns were:
- the need for consistent and impartial advice (2 mentions)
- how will the new body be managed/funded/evaluated? (2 mentions)
- how will the new body interact with support delivered by other bodies? (2 mentions)
- a need to ensure there is no duplication of effort as the different bodies merge (1 mention)
- the new service should also engage with larger organisations such as Scottish Water (1 mention).

Voluntary agreements with businesses

2.15 The Scottish Government proposes to ensure that voluntary agreements with business sectors work well in Scotland and include a focus on waste prevention – both through engaging positively with proposals for new UK or Scottish agreements and reviews of existing agreements. Although the consultation did not specifically seek views on this proposal, 14 respondents commented on this proposed action. Their comments are summarised below.

2.16 Seven respondents simply expressed support for the proposal with existing voluntary agreements perceived by them to be working well. One respondent remarked:
> '....the Scottish Government is right to want to seek to develop voluntary agreements with businesses and sectors in relation to resource efficiency. Such an approach can be both constructive and effective' (CBI Scotland).

2.17 Other respondents qualified their support by stating that voluntary agreements can be effective so long as certain conditions are met:
- clear objectives and priorities are set (Retail, Pack)
- the agreements are evidence-based and accompanied by evaluation (Retail)
- the reporting requirements are clear and simple (PR-C)

- there is business buy-in (Retail)
- there is good communication between individual businesses/sectors and government officials (Business)
- agreements are bespoke to the sector (Man)
- agreements take account of waste producers as well as the waste management industry (LA)
- as a minimum, pledges should commit businesses to meeting their responsibilities and regulatory obligations as prescribed by the duty of care and Waste Scotland regulations (WM)
- most likely to help achieve targets set out in the consultation if broadened to include water, transport and energy (Pub-Oth)
- stakeholders from across the sector are involved in the establishment and running of the voluntary agreement, creating industry ownership and responsibility (Pub-Oth)
- targets promote real environmental improvements (Pub-Oth)
- results are transparent (Pub-Oth).

Concerns relating to voluntary agreements

2.18 A minority of respondents expressed concerns about the proposed action. One waste management respondent expressed doubts over whether voluntary agreements are capable of bringing about real change. Another waste management respondent considered it a drawback that companies are not made to sign up to such agreements, allowing some to avoid otherwise regulatory obligations. One respondent commented:

> '....this must not be perceived by the business community as a 'soft option' to avoid new (and existing) regulatory obligations' (Scottish Environmental Services Association).

One retailer urged that voluntary agreements should not present companies with an unnecessary burden.

Zero Waste Pledges

2.19 The Scottish Government wishes to see proactive companies in Scotland gain recognition through pledging their commitment to zero waste. They propose that ZWS develops a high level Zero Waste Pledge system with a menu of actions open to companies of any size, such as waste prevention planning, staff training, adopting sustainable procurement guidelines and reporting on their achievements. ZWS will work to encourage Scottish companies to sign up and support signatories to take actions.

Question B: We would welcome views on the type of 'Zero Waste Pledge' companies might be interested in signing up to and the type of support needed.

2.20 Forty one respondents (41% of standard responses) addressed this question including 12 of the 14 local authorities, with much cross-sectoral support expressed in general for the proposal which was seen to have benefits for companies largely in terms of showcasing their good intentions, commitment and 'green' credentials.

2.21 A recurring theme (10 mentions) was for the scope of the pledge to be widened to encompass 'resource efficiency' rather than focus solely on waste. This was seen as more reflective of the holistic approach to efficient use of all resources adopted by businesses.

2.22 Many respondents expressed their broad support but only if certain conditions are met. These are listed below from most mentioned to least mentioned.
- Targets should be meaningful, realistic and measurable (9 mentions). Comments included:
  'The concept of zero waste is too theoretical and unrealistic for many sectors and we would consider 'significant reductions and 100% re-use or recycling to be more motivating' (Marks and Spencer).
  'Zero waste is the wrong message – indeed this is not even the 'target' and it will be impossible to get people on board with this vision' (SGL Carbon Fibers Limited).
- The pledge should not place an additional burden on businesses (7 mentions).
- Monitoring of performance should be ongoing and transparent to ensure the credibility of claims of achievement (6 mentions).
- Reporting should use simple and clear indicators and should be aligned with existing reporting arrangements (3 mentions).
- Should not duplicate existing arrangements which could lead to 'market clutter' (3 mentions).
- Needs to be able to accommodate organisations of different types (e.g. both public and commercial sectors) and of different sizes (2 mentions).
- There should be robust evidence of commitment and performance (2 mentions). One respondent remarked:
  'Making a pledge can be good for organisations in marketing their environmental credentials but it should be combined with more tangible evidence that they are working towards reducing their carbon footprint, rather than ticking a few boxes' (Highland Council).
- The pledge should remain voluntary and not mandatory (1 mention).
- Should not be overly prescriptive so as to restrict innovative action (1 mention).
- Should involve businesses (1 mention) and the community (1 mention) in developing the agreement.

2.23 Seven respondents suggested that **incentives,** particularly economic benefits, could be advantageous in underpinning the initiative. Two

recommended that the pledge should become embedded into procurement policies so that companies are required to sign up to the pledge in order to tender for contracts.   Other ideas for incentivising the scheme, each mentioned by one respondent were business rate reductions and tax breaks and rebates. Two local authorities considered that organisations may need help in identifying the particular benefits of the pledge for them and how incentives could play a part.

2.24 A few respondents outlined other types of support which companies may need.   Two local authorities suggested an online website with measuring and monitoring tools, examples of good practice, local contacts for support, tips, advice and so on.   Another local authority described their success in establishing a Zero Waste 'champion' dedicated to this topic, with resulting benefits for their organisation. A waste management company remarked that many companies do not know the cost of their waste and may need support in drawing up their waste prevention plan. They recommended companies sign up to other pledges too (e.g. Courtauld commitment) as this would help by generating company-specific information. One retailer considered that by being provided with examples of good practice, organisations will gain confidence in the achievability of the pledge.

2.25 Few remarks were made wholly in opposition to the proposal. However, three respondents expressed their concern that if the pledge remains voluntary, there will be no guarantee that any organisations bar the 'usual suspects' will take part.

Preventing construction wastes

2.26 Construction and demolition waste represents around 44% of total waste produced in Scotland[7].

> **Question C: For companies and organisations involved in the construction sector, do you agree with the principle of a new voluntary agreement, following on from 'Halving Waste to Landfill', encompassing the impact of design on both construction waste and materials? We would also welcome views on the level of ambition for such an agreement.**

---

[7] http://www.sepa.org.uk/waste/waste_data/commercial__industrial_waste/construction__demolition.aspx

2.27 Twenty nine respondents (29% of standard responses) addressed this question as follows:

	No.	%
Agree with principle of new voluntary agreement	14	48
Partially agree	7	24
Disagree	4	14
Commentary only	4	14

Responses were submitted from across a wide range of sectors with no obvious pattern emerging in where the support and disagreement lay.

2.28 Supporters of the proposed new voluntary agreement outlined what they perceived to be its key benefits. It was thought that committing to the agreement would bring indirect financial and competitive advantages to organisations. They were seen as better able to promote their business in the construction sector on the basis of this commitment. The new voluntary agreement was seen as helping steer strategy at organisational level. One respondent remarked:

> ' ....it would give clear indication to the construction industry of the direction the Scottish Government is moving towards, as well as influencing investment decisions' (AmeyCespa Ltd).

Several respondents agreed that the proposal will help to progress the designing out of construction waste.

2.29 Ten respondents (six of them local authorities) expressed concern that the proposal is for a voluntary rather than a mandatory agreement. It was felt that smaller SMEs in particular may not sign up without statutory requirement. Two respondents urged that any new scheme avoids duplication with existing programmes. A further two respondents suggested that the agreement may need to be adapted for small, domestic projects involving micro-construction companies. One individual respondent suggested that the scheme might be simpler if it incorporated economic incentives. One NGO considered the ambition to halve waste to landfill was 'commendable' but perhaps not realistic.

The value of data and tools

2.30 For any business to reduce its resource use, it needs first to understand how much it is using. The Scottish Government proposes that for those 500 or so businesses with the greatest potential environmental impact, the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA) will develop the use of Resource Utilisation Assessments (RUAs) to drive resource efficiency. This will include guidance, training and focus on RUAs during audits, and will be in line with the principles of better regulation.

> **Question D: For companies with existing RUAs, we want to hear any lessons or good practice points to help us make sure future guidance on RUAs is as useful as possible in enabling relevant businesses realise resource savings.**

2.31 Eleven respondents (11% of standard responses) representing seven different respondent sectors addressed this question. Five specifically outlined their support for actions to improve the quality of data available to businesses in order to help them to be more resource efficient. One respondent (Pub-Oth) urged that any changes to data collection should be done in consultation with industry.

2.32 Five respondents emphasised that good practice in RUAs along with all data collection should avoid placing additional administrative burdens on organisations. One respondent commented:
> 'While monitoring can allow business to identify efficiency savings, it is essential that it does not divert resources away from genuine improvement and innovation. Data collection will yield the most positive results if the data is already available, and where this is not possible business must be supported through the learning curve' (Scottish Council for Development and Industry).

2.33 One respondent expressed doubts over the added value of benchmarking resource efficiency (WM); another raised their concern that there may be general confusion over what RUAs are (NGO).

Waste Management Industry Role

2.34 The waste management industry is uniquely placed to help their clients move from waste disposal to advising on how to manage resources more efficiently to maintain the maximum value.   The Scottish Government proposes that it along with ZWS will explore with the waste management industry the potential for a voluntary agreement to provide resource efficiency services to their customers and help them reduce waste.

> **Question E: For waste management companies, would you be interested in signing up to a voluntary agreement to provide resource efficiency advice to your customers?**

2.35 Twenty three respondents (23% of standard responses) addressed this question including 11 of the 14 local authorities responding to the consultation and four of the six waste management companies. Overall, 21 were generally supportive of waste management companies signing up to such a voluntary agreement. Two respondents (Man, LA) provided arguments against the proposal. All four waste management companies were amongst the respondents supporting the proposal.

2.36 Ten local authorities requested that councils should also be able to sign up to the voluntary agreement, arguing that advising on resource efficiency is already part of their remit. One typical comment was:

> 'We believe this is also applicable to the council as waste authority as this would be beneficial to help maximise the local authority's waste services available to businesses. It would also help the local authority to progress towards the Zero Waste targets set out in the Waste (Scotland) Regulations 2012' (Dumfries and Galloway Council).

Concerns about the proposal

2.37 The reasons provided in opposition to the proposal were:
- The proposal appears to conflict with Action 1 by adding another party to the provision of advice to business (LA).
- Seems to present a conflict of interest for waste management companies who would be better off striving to be more efficient and effective in what they do (Man).

2.38 Despite providing support in principle, potential conflicts of commercial/procurement interests were highlighted by others, with two local authority respondents suggesting that individual waste management companies should be encouraged to provide consistent advice, and not be driven by their own commercial interests and sensitivities. One suggestion to make the option of signing up more attractive was to offer accreditation to engage the waste management industry (NGO).

2.39 Two respondents (both local authorities) considered that there may be staff resourcing and training issues should the proposal be extended to encompass local councils.

2.40 A waste management company argued that the approach should not be overly prescriptive or try to dictate the arrangements between businesses and their waste providers.

2.41 One view was that the voluntary requirements should be tailored to the size of the company:

> '....for such a scheme to be effective it has to a) be widely used in the industry and b) recognise that standards expected from large, national waste companies may not be appropriate for small, community 'niche' waste organisations' (Federation of Small Businesses).

2.42 A few other relevant comments were made by respondents. One local authority argued that the voluntary agreement should have two sides to it, with waste producers also having clear responsibilities to fulfil their part of the

agreement. Another local authority recommended that the voluntary agreement should be linked to national and local waste management awareness campaigns.

2.43 One waste management company suggested that the Scottish Government should refer to the Defra/ESA Responsibility Deal for an indication of the measures which the industry would be willing to sign up to.

2.44 A local authority respondent questioned whether support and training would be available for waste management companies who have signed up to the agreement.

Question F: For other companies, what more would you want to see in terms of advice on resource savings and recycling from your waste management contractor? (Action 6)

2.45 Eighteen respondents (18% of standard responses) addressed this question. Half of these respondents were either local authorities or manufacturers. The responses are summed up below in order from most mentions to fewest.

- Waste management infrastructure including good practice guidelines on reducing waste (4 mentions).
- Range of data services to help businesses understand better what can be thrown away (4 mentions).
- Identification of process improvements and efficiencies including the carbon footprint of the customer's operations (4 mentions). However, in contrast one respondent commented:
  'While advice on resource efficiency may be helpful and provide a firm with a competitive edge, this is probably not something a small business would expect from their waste collector. It would, perhaps, be better to expect waste collectors to signpost business customers to the Business Resource Efficiency Support service' (Federation of Small Businesses).
- Better transparency of billing to give customers more understanding of resource efficiency opportunities (3 mentions).
- Information on the destination of recycled materials (2 mentions).
- Guidance on/assistance with segregation of materials for recycling (2 mentions).
- Advice on options for baling/compacting (1 mention).
- Information on takeback schemes/reverse vending (1 mention).
- Advice on how to handle 'problem' materials (1 mention).
- Information on the National Industrial Symbiosis Partnership (1 mention).
- Sources of funding available to implement more costly resource efficiency measures (1 mention).

2.46 Three respondents raised their broad concern that waste management companies may not provide impartial advice, as they have a vested commercial interest in the outcome. One potential solution was provided by a local authority:

> '*advice* should be driven centrally by either the Scottish Government or ZWS to ensure there is a continuity of advice and good practice being delivered by waste management companies but also allowing customers to 'shop around' for the best price. If this type of advice was delivered direct by individual waste management companies it would be tailored to their specific preferred methods rather than the best method for that individual customer' (Inverclyde Council).

3. PRODUCTS AND PACKAGING

Sustainable design

3.1 To make lasting improvements in efficient use of resources it is important to look at the start of the process of design and manufacture of products. Around 80% of a product's lifetime environmental impact is decided by its design. The Scottish Government proposes to promote sustainable design of products and services (taking account of the key findings of their earlier review into reducing waste through better product design), including:
- ensuring the right further and higher education provision on sustainable design through integrating design into current projects looking at Low Carbon Opportunities and Skills Implications (led by Scottish Enterprise);
- providing guidance and training on the benefits of sustainable design in resource efficiency advice to businesses and Resource Efficient Scotland's programme of seminars and events;
- supporting the work of the Product Sustainability Forum[8] to assist businesses in identifying key areas to improve product design;
- promoting the case for sustainable design in EU legislation and policies, such as the Ecodesign Directive and the Eco-Innovation Roadmap.

Question G: We are interested in receiving feedback on the proposals designed to encourage more efficient use of material resources in providing the products and packaging we need. Do you agree with the actions identified to support sustainable design of products?

3.2 Fifty five respondents (56% of standard responses) answered this question as follows:

	No.	%
Agree with actions	40	73
Partially agree	10	18
Disagree		
Commentary only	5	9

3.3 A few respondents pointed out that there is much current and completed work on sustainable product design which should inform the proposals. One respondent (Man) urged that promotion and support of sustainable design should be framed in such a way as to allow for bespoke solutions, and the flexibility to accommodate the needs of different companies and sectors. Some respondents emphasised that promotion should focus on design for reuse; recycling; disassembly; easy and economic repair; long life; and end-of-life disposal.

---

[8]http://www.wrap.org.uk/content/product-sustainability-forum

3.4 Of the four featured ways in which the Scottish Government intends to promote sustainable design of products and services, the proposal to include design in education provision attracted most explicit cross-sector support. This was seen as providing long term gains and opening up potential for transfer of knowledge across industries. Comments included:

> '....there should be strong links made with academia, so as to bed the knowledge and expertise within the education system in Scotland and also to develop strong working relationships with trade associations who could promote best practice to members' (The Chartered Institution of Wastes Management).

3.4 Explicit support for the work of the Product Sustainability Forum was provided by three respondents. One remarked:

> 'We see this forum as the most appropriate body for industry, government and academia to engage on improving the sustainability of products' (Scottish Food and Drink Federation).

3.5 Regarding the proposal to provide guidance and training on the benefits of sustainable design, two respondents provided explicit support with one (PR-C) commenting that local guidance could fill in any gaps in UK-wide provision. Three local authorities remarked that as householders contribute to driving markets, then guidance and education should also be directed at them, to support more informed choices.

3.6 Two waste management companies addressed the proposal to promote the case for sustainable design in EU legislation and policies. One commented:

> '....we would like to see the Scottish Government develop strong links with global and pan-European businesses with Scottish economic interests, as well as design initiatives from the EU, as there will be merit in maximising collaboration opportunities on this set of issues' (Resource Association).

Perceived challenges and concerns

3.7 A recurring comment was that as most of the goods purchased in Scotland are designed and manufactured elsewhere, the proposed measures have **limited potential for impact** (13 mentions). Two respondents remarked that it will be difficult for Scotland to work in isolation on this, and instead will need to look at opportunities to work collaboratively with other nations.

3.8 Other concerns were:
- As the UK is a single market, Scottish initiatives need to avoid duplication with measures elsewhere (2 mentions).
- The proposals should ensure that the full lifecycle of products are properly accounted for and the relevant metrics are used to assess their design (1 mention).

- For the proposals to come to fruition, they need a supporting framework of grants, consultancy and access to expertise (1 mention).
- Shifting the attitudes of the consumer is more difficult and needs to be factored in (1 mention).
- The design of sustainable products needs input from raw material suppliers. Suppliers do not often get involved at the design stage, which restricts consideration of a range of design alternatives (1 mention).

Packaging waste

3.9 The Scottish Government proposes to work with other UK administrations to amend existing Producer Responsibility Regulations to enable separate identification of packaging waste arising in Scotland to use as a baseline for subsequent separate Producer Responsibility targets for packaging waste in Scotland.

> **Question H: Do you agree with the principle of amending the existing Producer Responsibility Regulations to enable separate identification of packaging waste arising in Scotland; to use as a baseline for subsequent separate Producer Responsibility targets for packaging waste in Scotland?**

3.10 Sixty three respondents (64% of standard responses) answered this question as follows:

	No.	%
Agree with principle of amending PRR	21	33
Partially agree	7	11
Disagree	31	49
Commentary only	4	6

NB Percentages may not add to 100% exactly due to rounding.

Concerns regarding the proposal

3.11 Whilst many respondents agreed with the principle of producer responsibility for packaging waste there were strong concerns particularly from retailers, manufacturers and packaging organisations that the predicted **additional burden and associated costs resulting from this proposal may not be offset by the benefits** to accrue. The proposal was not seen to be in keeping with the Better Regulation agenda. Typical comments included:

> '....this proposal does not sit well with a stated Scottish Government aim to promote better regulation, to simplify and reduce burdens on businesses' (Scottish Grocers' Federation).

> '....the costs and administrative burden for producers of implementing these requirements will lead to no environmental benefit and could in fact lead to a dis-benefit as resources are moved away from on the ground environmental improvements to reporting activity' (RePIC Ltd).

3.12 The potential **complexity of the requirements** for businesses with markets outwith Scotland were remarked upon repeatedly, with a recurring view that the accuracy of the information collected may be questionable. One respondent's view was typical:

> 'Our members would not be able to quantify with any accuracy the amounts of their packaging placed into the Scottish market... our members do not ...have full control over the final location of stocks' (Food Service Packaging Association).

3.13 The risk of **potential abuse** of the proposed scheme and fraudulent reporting was raised by two respondents.

3.14 A recurring theme was that **more research** should be undertaken into the reasons for Scotland's relatively poor performance in terms of recycling packaging waste and also a **cost-benefit analysis** of the proposal should be carried out, before deciding to pursue this option (10 mentions).

3.15 Another recurring view was that the proposal could contribute to **lack of parity with and inconsistency between Scotland and the rest of the UK** (7 mentions). One respondent commented:

> 'We agree that Scotland-only data would be interesting but would suggest that it is also very nationalistic and so, perhaps a bit divisive. At the moment, Scotland is still part of the UK and as such, is covered by the UK-wide legislative framework' (Scotpak).

3.16 Other concerns about the proposal included:

- There have been several new measures and regulations introduced and we should wait to see what impact they are having before going down this route (4 mentions).
- The proposal would require greater regulatory oversight of the Packaging Recovery Note (PRN) system and stricter data requirements on manufacturers (WM).
- Reprocessors would require to be accredited with both the Environment Agency and SEPA which would add to their costs (Pack).

Reasons given in support of the proposal

3.17 Those agreeing with the proposal represented seven different respondent sectors, and included over half of the local authority respondents. Some described the rationale behind their support, with each of the reasons below provided by one or two respondents:

- the proposal is in keeping with the principle of polluter pays
- it will result in a higher level of recycled packaging in Scotland
- it will reap rewards without creating unnecessary red tape
- it is needed in order to contribute to ZWS

- it will reduce unnecessary packaging at source
- it could be linked to identifying costs of packaging which will assist manufacturers and consumers
- it reflects the different Scottish geography and socio-demography
- it is sensible to have distinct Scottish data as Scotland has set more challenging targets than England.

Retailers

3.18 The Scottish Government proposes that retailers who are already required to report under the Producer Responsibility Regulations on packaging of products sold will also need to provide a separate figure for the proportion sold in Scotland.

Question H-1: Do you agree with the approach regarding retailers?

3.19 Thirty one respondents (31% of standard responses) answered this question as follows:

	No.	%
Agree with approach regarding retailers	12	39
Partially agree	4	13
Disagree	9	29
Commentary only	6	19

3.20 Those providing reasoning to underpin their support of the proposed approach were largely local authorities and PR Compliance organisations. The consensus was that retailers were typically well placed to be able to identify which packaged products were sold in Scotland and that the requirement to report under the Producer Responsibility Regulations would not add significantly to their existing obligations. One local authority urged that robust enforcement will need to be in hand to ensure compliance.

3.21 Opponents of the proposal (representing different respondent sectors) were largely of the view that benefits arising from the proposed action will not be significant enough to warrant the additional administrative burden which the proposal will impose.

3.22 Four respondents questioned the premise that the effect of cross-border movement will be neutral, particularly for retailers in border areas who may not be clear on whether their packaging ends up in England or Scotland.

3.23 Three PR Compliance organisations and a manufacturer considered that the proposal placed too much of an additional burden on retailers due to the potential complexity of the task.

3.33 Two packaging respondents and one PR Compliance respondent argued that any data arising may not be meaningful due to inaccuracies and omissions (e.g. transit and tertiary packaging discarded at the retailer's premises will not be included).

Supply chain

3.34 The Scottish Government believes that it would be difficult in most cases for businesses at the start of the supply chain (furthest away from the point at which the packaging becomes waste) to determine whether their product ends up as waste in Scotland or another part of the UK. It proposes, therefore, that supply chain companies who are already required to report under the PR regulations on packaging of products sold will only be required to provide evidenced estimates for the proportion sold in Scotland.

Question H-2: Do you agree with the approach regarding the retail supply chain?

3.35 Twenty seven respondents (27% of standard responses) answered this question as follows:

	No.	%
Agree with approach regarding the retail supply chain	5	19
Partially agree	4	15
Disagree	16	59
Commentary only	2	7

3.36 No substantive comments were made by the five respondents who agreed with the proposal. One (LA) qualified their agreement, stating that although they supported the approach they acknowledged that there may be associated complexities. Another local authority supporter urged that regular reviews should be conducted to assess the complexity of the scheme in operation; a third local authority emphasised that the proposal would need to be underpinned by compliance schemes.

3.37 Amongst the 16 respondents disagreeing with the proposal, the overarching concern was that the quality of the data collected would be too poor to be useful. PR Compliance organisations were well represented amongst opponents. Typical comments were:
> 'Producers further up the supply chain have no way of knowing what proportion of packaging they supply actually ends up in Scotland. Any proportionate figure would be entirely arbitrary. Establishing a separate and parallel system would appear to simply add bureaucracy and cost into the system' (Complypak Limited).

'The quality of the estimated data is likely to be so poor as to render it worthless, and therefore not useful, either statistically or qualitatively' (Hewlett-Packard).

3.38 One respondent (PR-C) expressed concern that each producer might create their own allocation formula, with another (PR-C) arguing for clear guidance on allocation method and acceptability of evidence.

Question H-3: Do you agree with the proposal that those in the pre-retail supply chain should be permitted to use a set allocation of their total output as 'Scottish' waste?

3.39 Twenty nine respondents (29% of standard responses) answered this question as follows:

	No.	%
Agree with set allocation	3	10
Partially agree	4	14
Disagree	20	69
Commentary only	2	7

3.40 Amongst those who agreed or partially agreed with the proposal, two local authorities argued that the underlying principle is sound. One stated:
    'The general principle of the proposal is reasonable and should ensure
    a fair and accurate allocation system' (North Ayrshire Council).

3.41 Others considered that the proposal struck a balance between establishing a reasonable picture whilst achieving an acceptable level of accuracy. Two respondents (PR-C and WM) called for policing of the system and consistency in formulae for calculating Scottish waste.

3.42 As before, the overriding concern amongst opponents was that the data quality will be so inaccurate as to render it meaningless. Once again, it was commented that the benefits of the system will not outweigh the drawbacks in operation, such as likely additional costs.

3.43 One local authority questioned whether the data could not be provided instead by SEPA or through the Waste Transfer Note System.

Question H-4 : If the supply chain businesses chose to provide evidence of the exact amount of their product that ends up as waste in Scotland, what evidence should be accepted?

3.44 Twenty eight respondents (28% of standard responses) addressed this question although several of these simply commented that providing meaningful evidence would be challenging.

3.45 Two respondents (PR-C and NGO) urged that guidance on acceptable evidence should not be overly prescriptive.

3.46 Others provided suggestions for the nature of the evidence to be accepted:
- sales of packaged goods to Scottish distributors (4 mentions)
- market research/surveys and consumer trend data (4 mentions)
- system similar to transfer notes/weighbridge transactions (3 mentions)
- invoicing data (1 mention)
- delivery notes (1 mention)
- waste management firms to supply evidence which is verified by SEPA (1 mention)
- evidence that requires minimum input to report (1 mention).

> **Question H-5: Should a distinction be made between the different stages of the supply chain?**

3.47 Twenty five respondents (25% of standard responses) addressed this question. There were very few substantive points made, with some simply re-iterating earlier points made.

3.48 Three respondents recommended that the Scottish Government examines how the existing PRN system works in order to inform the issues raised, particularly around apportioning of payments. One respondent (WM) urged that the Scottish system should be aligned with UK regulations. Two manufacturers remarked that they do not wish to share commercially confidential information with organisations across the different stages of the supply chain.

3.49 A recurring theme was that distinguishing between the different stages is too confusing and produces poor quality data. It was re-emphasised that parts of the supply chain do not know where packaging ends up. Two respondents (Man, PR-C) suggested that differentiating between the different stages of the supply chain could lead to double-counting.

Importers
3.50 Importers collect the 'rolled up' obligations for activities that take place outside the UK. This ensures that when packaging becomes waste, 100% of the obligations are accounted for. The Scottish Government proposes that as with retailers, importers who are already required to report under the PR regulations on packaging of products sold will also need to provide a separate figure for the proportion sold in Scotland.

> **Question H-6: Do you agree with the approach regarding importers? Please give reasons.**

3.51 Twenty one respondents (21% of standard responses) answered this question as follows:

	No.	%
Agree with approach	7	33
Partially agree	6	29
Disagree	6	29
Commentary only	2	10

NB Percentages may not add to 100% exactly due to rounding

3.52 Amongst those agreeing with the proposal were respondents who envisaged challenges to its operation, but were prepared to support the approach should it become implemented. Two respondents (WM, LA) recommended that a centrally supported awareness campaign should underpin implementation, in order to refresh knowledge of obligations and provide information on what is expected regarding reporting data and why. One respondent (PR-C) urged that research should still take place to investigate whether Scotland should go down the route of setting separate PR targets. One waste management company suggested that further work is done on the most effective way to manage the data collection system to make it fair and clear. Another respondent agreed with the approach providing that this applies only to goods imported directly to Scotland, on the grounds that:

> 'Companies in other parts of the UK will have difficulty in establishing how much of the imported transit packaging relates to goods that may eventually end up in Scotland' (ThInc).

3.53 Concerns over the proposal were expressed and included:
- Data collection will be complicated and may not be robust (5 mentions). One view was:
  'It could become complicated with national retailers who would have to ensure stock control methodology to accommodate this; also consideration needs to be taken for further cross-border product movement' (North Lanarkshire Council).
- The benefits (seen as estimated data) do not outweigh the additional work required (1 mention).
- Better to maintain UK-wide data rather than try to distinguish Scottish information (1 mention).

3.54 A few queries were raised:
- Could current information systems such as the Duty of Care Waste Transfer notes not be adapted to suit? (4 mentions)
- Would this be imposed on those importing to the UK or to Scotland? Would it apply to Scottish registered companies (even if based elsewhere) only, or those located in/with a representative in Scotland? (3 mentions)

Reprocessors (recyclers) and exporters
3.55 Accredited Reprocessors and exporters submit data on the tonnages of packaging waste they have reprocessed in the UK or exported for reprocessing abroad. The Scottish Government proposes that Reprocessors and exporters

who wish to issue Scottish Packaging Waste Recovery Notes (PRNs) or Packaging Waste Export Recovery Notes (PERNs) would need to demonstrate that the packaging waste was originally collected in Scotland. The Government considers that this is unlikely to require significant extra resource as the Duty of Care requires that waste transfer notes record the origin of the waste. The existing accreditation system is voluntary and it is suggested that the additional Scottish evidence is also voluntary. If the evidence fetches a higher price on the market, the Scottish Government believes it will be more attractive to reprocessors to make the additional investment in administration to record the necessary details.

> **Question H-7: Do you agree with the approach regarding reprocessors and waste exporters? Please give reasons.**

3.56 Twenty seven respondents (27% of standard responses) answered this question as follows:

	No.	%
Agree with approach	8	30
Partially agree	3	11
Disagree	10	37
Commentary only	6	22

3.57 One respondent (PR-C) outlined the reason for supporting the proposal as enabling more accurate representation of the amount of packaging waste arising in Scotland by issuing evidence on the basis of collection source rather than treatment location.   There was more commentary from those disagreeing with the proposal and/or those with concerns. Most prominent were:
- Introduces more complexity in an already volatile market (4 mentions).
- Inappropriate in the current situation with insufficient capacity within Scotland for reprocessors to meet demands (3 mentions).
- More research needed first on the relative value of Scottish P(E)RN against P(E)RN (2 mentions).
- If the scheme remains voluntary, companies are unlikely to buy into an approach which presents them with additional costs (2 mentions).
- Difficult for companies to ascertain the difference between Scottish and non-Scottish material (2 mentions).
- Disparity in purchase price between evidence and associated market forces could result in preference for non-Scottish evidence (2 mentions).
- Not clear what the added environmental value of the approach will be (1 mention).
- Scottish PRNs will be in short supply and expensive (1 mention).

3.58 A comment repeated by three manufacturers and one waste management company was:
> '.... a level-playing field should be set for Scotland and UK
> reprocessors by the three devolved administrations and the

Westminster Government agreeing to limit the PERN that can be claimed by materials exporters to only the weight of compliant materials exported. The current situation allows PERNs to be claimed on non-target, non-recyclable materials.'

Compliance and fraud/double counting prevention

3.59 Under the proposed system SEPA would extend its existing monitoring of registered compliance schemes and reprocessors to ensure that Scottish evidence is only issued for waste arising in Scotland. As waste from Scotland will potentially be dealt with in other parts of the UK, and it is anticipated that reprocessors and exporters will wish to issue SPRNs/SPERNs on Scottish waste, the co-operation of the relevant agencies to ensure compliance by companies operating outwith Scotland will be required.

Question H-8: We would welcome further views on the proposed approach to prevent fraud and double counting.

3.60 Nineteen respondents (19% of standard responses) addressed this question. Several of these cautioned that the more complex the approach, the greater the risk of fraud and double-counting. Comments included:

'....simplicity in compliance systems reduces fraud' (The Co-Operative Group).

'Further splitting data down to a Scotland subset would result in greater potential for errors. In any system where there is a lack of clarity linked to a regulatory requirement, the potential for fraud is increased and effective policing is decreased' (RePIC).

3.61 Three respondents (two of them PR-Compliance organisations) considered that placing a premium on Scottish PRNs/PERNs would set the context for a greater risk of fraud.

3.62 A concern for four respondents was that additional enforcement systems will be required to police the proposed approaches outlined in the consultation. This would have implications for costs of enforcement and need for consistency across the UK. One local authority argued this provided further argument against a separate system to measure packaging waste arisings in Scotland.

3.63 One retailer queried how SEPA intended to get the co-operation of agencies outwith Scotland without the support of regulation. A waste management company recommended that those currently operating the system should be engaged with fully, in order to address the issues of potential double-counting and fraud.

Deposit return schemes

3.64 Many countries run deposit return schemes particularly for drink containers which regularly achieve return rates of over 80%. Alternatively 'reverse vending' schemes can provide an incentive for recycling certain containers, e.g. through reward card points. The consultation did not pose a specific question seeking views on such schemes, but some respondents alluded to deposit return schemes at various points in their responses on other issues. A summary of the key points made follows (although these views may not represent those of the entire respondent population as a question on deposit return schemes was not asked).

3.65 Seven of the standard responses (three local authorities; two individuals; NGO; Pub-Oth) welcomed future piloting of deposit return schemes in Scotland which they felt had worked well in other countries, leading to benefits such as reduced litter and less packaging waste. The WWF campaign supported the introduction of a nationwide deposit return system (see Annex 2 for text).

3.66 Eight respondents (including three retailers and three manufacturers) argued against such schemes. Their key arguments were that these:
- are expensive to operate
- are inefficient in comparison to existing household recycling schemes
- open up opportunity for fraud
- undermine existing local authority provision for recycling
- potentially would create a significant price differential between drinks in Scotland compared with the rest of the UK.

Critical materials

3.67 Small waste electronic and electrical items contain valuable but potentially hazardous materials and can also have a high reuse value. However, all too often they are simply thrown away and their value is lost. Only around 22% of small waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE) is collected for recycling in the UK at present. ZWS, with support from SEPA, will therefore work with retailers and local authorities to encourage voluntary action to help more people return more of this type of equipment for recycling and reuse.

> **Question I: For those involved in the sale of electronic and electrical equipment or collection of WEEE, we would welcome views or good examples of the most effective approaches to making it easier for people to return more of this type of equipment for recycling and reuse.**

3.68 Thirty three respondents (33% of standard responses) addressed this question.

3.69 The overarching recommendations emerging from most of these responses were for increased, accessible collection provision supported by public awareness raising and education campaigns. There was general agreement that out-of-town collection centres for small WEEE were not as useful as local collection points, particularly for householders who are elderly, disabled or have no access to vehicles.

3.70 One manufacturer suggested that the presence of collection points in busy retailing outlets will contribute to increasing public awareness. A few other respondents, however, highlighted potential problems with returning heavier items to retailers, such as kettles and televisions. One view (PR-C) was that disadvantages of take-back schemes for very small WEEE are that they are less likely to yield large tonnages and they open up the possibility of theft. Another respondent (Ind) commented that it would be challenging to accommodate small WEEE bought online within a take-back scheme.

3.71 One way to make collection easier for householders is by increased/dedicated kerbside collection of unwanted WEEE. This was recommended by several respondents, some of whom suggested special, well publicised collections such as twice a year kerbside amnesties. Two local authorities, however, suggested that there may be a need to subsidise kerbside collections through producer responsibility or a third party so that local authorities are not over-burdened by the additional costs incurred.

3.72 Other recommendations were for:
- More focus on making it easier to reuse items including community reuse schemes (4 mentions).
- Introducing mandatory take-back schemes (2 mentions).
- Actively involving community groups already specialising in the collection and processing of WEEE (1 mention).
- Incentivising take-back (e.g. by offering discount on upgrades if the old equipment is returned) (1 mention).
- Setting increased recycling targets for each category of WEEE (1 mention).

3.73 Many respondents highlighted examples of effective initiatives and/or aspects of schemes which work well. A recurring theme was that the involvement of local authorities enables collections of WEEE to be harmonised with other waste streams, and supports effective implementation of schemes. Specific examples of effective local authority partnership working were provided:
- Scottish Borders Council and North Ayrshire Council both work with their WEEE Producer Compliance schemes on local community reuse schemes.
- Highland Council worked with the social enterprise group ILM (Highland) who carry out collections on behalf of RePIC. By working in partnership

with the council, ILM (Highland) built up the expertise required to enable it to bid for contracts on a level playing field.

3.74 Other examples of successful working were provided and included:
- Large WEEE taken back by supplier at the time of delivery of new goods (3 mentions). One retailer commented:
'We collect over 250 items of large WEEE a month and we pass it onto a business called Washroom Partnerships. The process of collecting large WEEE is simple for our customers and it works well because they do not have to do anything in particular to have their WEEE recycled/reused' (The Co-Operative Group).
- A local authority introduced small WEEE collection to its kerbside collections.
- Small WEEE collection points were set up at schools following a campaign, with the schools receiving a proportion of the income generated by this.
- Higher civic amenity site provision per capita produced better than average collection of WEEE.
- Dedicated WEEE communication/awareness activities were linked to amnesty days.
- Wecycle in the Netherlands works on behalf of 6 producer foundations, and amongst other functions, mobilises a team organising nationwide collection and high grade recycling of WEEE.
- Dumfries and Galloway Council operates a larger goods uplift service for a charge; also trialling the use of 'in town' small WEEE recycling banks.
- The Co-Operative Group operates small WEEE collections in all of its Scottish food stores.
- Perth and Kinross Council set up a WEEE collection point at its largest recycling centre to divert WEEE (computers, laptops, printers, mobile phones etc) from landfill to reuse. Perth College WEEE Centre refurbishes these for resale at affordable prices or strips unusable/un-repairable items down to their individual components for recycling. The students doing this gain a qualification which helps them in securing further employment.
- In North America a scheduled WEEE collection service is operated by local authorities at the kerbside on dedicated days of the month.

Question J: We would be interested in your views on priorities to increase resilience of the Scottish economy to supply risks associated with critical materials, and for maximising the opportunities for Scottish businesses.

3.75 Twenty seven respondents (27% of standard responses) addressed this question.

3.76 The most common response (eight respondents, five of whom were local authorities) was to recommend investment in innovation in infrastructure and

technology with the aim of **developing specialist reprocessing facilities** within Scotland. One respondent commented:

> 'Many of the desired policies and objectives of the Scottish Government are based on growing the volumes of materials captured, raising the quality standards of materials and then creating jobs by processing and treating that material in Scotland. This requires a reprocessing infrastructure which may require specialist support in the form of investment, enterprise support engaging existing manufacturers and innovative processes and technologies' (The Chartered Institution of Wastes Management).

3.77 The theme of **investment in research and development** was taken up by others (5 mentions) who advocated: identification of alternatives to these critical materials; mapping of the current destination of critical materials; and auditing of current provision for reprocessing in Scotland. One respondent remarked:

> 'It has to be acknowledged now that if the economy is to remain resilient in the long term, new technologies and alternative materials will be required. What is necessary both now and in the long term is support for innovation and cross-party research which utilises the expertise of Scottish universities, design experts and business' (Scottish Council for Development an Industry).

3.78 Five respondents considered that **improving packaging design** to facilitate recycling and sustainability will increase resilience and reduce risks. A further five respondents recommended that the **Scottish Government get tougher** by: setting industry-specific resource efficiency and recovery benchmarks for these critical materials (WM); stockpiling and banning the export of critical materials (PR-C); establishing a national strategy/resource security action plan (LA, WM); and exerting more pressure on businesses to accept WEEE (Ind).

3.79 Other suggestions for increasing reliance and maximising opportunities for Scottish businesses were:

- Offer incentives (e.g. tax breaks, grants, rewards) for collection and recycling to ensure products containing these critical materials are collected separately from other items (4 mentions).
- Increase communication between the recycling industry and producers to enable more recycling (3 mentions).
- Allow processors to trade WEEE evidence (1 mention).
- Perhaps actively encourage the import and reprocessing of these materials in Scotland (1 mention).
- Make it easier (relax regulations) to facilitate the entry of critical materials into Scotland (1 mention).

4. REUSE

Supply and demand for reused items

4.1 The Scottish Government proposes to work with ZWS to increase the supply and demand for quality reusable items through:
- supporting the pilots of new and innovative collection systems for reusable items, including through recycling centres and kerbside collections
- covering collection for reuse in the forthcoming household waste collection guidance
- raising awareness of households and businesses of how they can source reused items
- supporting reuse through public procurement.

Question K: Do you agree with the actions identified to increase supply and demand for reusable items?

4.2 Forty four respondents (44% of standard responses) addressed this question as follows:

	No.	%
Agree with actions	25	57
Partially agree	10	23
Disagree	2	5
Commentary only	7	16

NB Percentages may not add to 100% exactly due to rounding.

Community reuse

4.3 The benefits of community reuse were acknowledged both for the environment, but also in terms of wider social impact. One respondent commented:

> 'The delivery of social benefit which attaches to much consumer re-use activity is a powerful motivator, and the community sector, which has considerable experience in re-use, can both contribute to re-use in the commercial and business sectors and deliver social benefit' (Community Resources Network Scotland).

4.4 Three respondents urged that more should be done to encourage businesses to form partnerships with local community reuse groups. COSLA expressed an interest in exploring reuse networks as a potential delivery mechanism to provide support for vulnerable communities under the Social Fund Successor Arrangements.

4.5 The development of Revolve was welcomed as injecting professionalism and standards into the sector. One respondent remarked:

'We support the development of Revolve to help increase professionalism and standards within reuse and repair, as this will help allay companies' fears and associated reputational risk that repaired and refurbished goods will not perform adequately when resold' (AmeyCespa Ltd).

4.6 One waste management company emphasised that reuse should not be equated only with the social enterprise sector but also the significant number of SMEs who contribute to reuse.

Access to reusable items

4.7 The theme of quality of reused items and ensuring safety standards featured prominently in responses. Again, Revolve was cited as a network associated with assurance of quality. It was suggested that accreditation of reuse organisations should be a requirement, along with work to progress towards safety standards such as PAS141. Two local authorities agreed that large organisations need guarantees on product performance to encourage them to purchase reused products.

4.8 Whilst there was general agreement that potential exists for expanding opportunities to access reusable items, some felt that investment is required to support the infrastructure associated with expansion (3 mentions). For example, one individual described how expenditure on premises for reused furniture projects can be prohibitive, but Government subsidies could address this. Others (2 mentions) recommended that attention is given to ensure procurement policies are sustainable and designed to assist innovative small businesses in this field.

4.9 One retailer commented that larger items which consumers may find difficult to purchase new may be more commercially viable as reuse items than smaller products. An individual respondent perceived that private initiatives such as Gumtree and eBay tend to be more successful than computer-based 'waste exchange' schemes such as those piloted by waste associations. One local authority view was that the popularity of web-based tools such as eBay and Freecycle lay largely in their accessibility. Attention to making schemes 'visible' and 'practical to participate in' is key according to one NGO which described:
> 'excellent examples of tertiary education establishments that allow for the donation (or occasional collection) of goods from halls of residence and student flats' (Changeworks).

Demand for reused items

4.10 A recurring theme was that whilst householders are becoming more accustomed to the concept of reuse, through for example, car boot sales and charity shops, more work is required to raise awareness amongst businesses. Several respondents emphasised the need to convey messages about quality

and standards of reused items amongst the business community. Once again, Revolve was seen as helping to trail blaze in this respect.

4.11 Smarter and more creative marketing was advocated to help promote the benefits of reused items amongst the business sector. Educating the younger generation was also identified as a route into generating demand for reused items.

General comments

4.12 Five respondents commented on establishing a balance between Government intervention in the form of targets and strategy, and a softer 'market push' approach driven by consumers. One respondent commented:
> 'For the most part, the emphasis should focus on improving awareness and consumer confidence in reuse rather than through direct policy measures (such as targets)' (Hewlett-Packard).

4.13 Other comments included:
- The focus on reuse should be balanced with focus on designs for reuse and resource efficiencies (2 mentions). One respondent remarked: '....the emphasis should be at the design stage, rather than the 'end of pipe' (Scotpak).
- Important that reuse activities are carried out within the WEEE system so that data can be properly captured and count towards targets (1 mention).
- ZWS could provide support to study and disseminate best practice in this area (1 mention).

4.14 Three respondents cautioned that reuse may not always be the best environmental option, for example, where there have been advances in technology and newer models are more resource efficient. One NGO recommended guidance is provided to assist in this area.

Question L: Do you think it would be (a) practical and (b) valuable to collect separate data on the quantities of materials 'prepared for reuse' with a view to developing a preparing for reuse target contributing towards overall recycling targets?

Views on practicality of collecting separate data
4.15 Thirty respondents (30% of standard responses) addressed this question as follows:

	No.	%
Think it would be practical to collect separate data	11	37
Think it would not be practical to collect separate data	14	47
Commentary only	5	17

NB Percentages may not total 100% exactly due to rounding.

4.16 Amongst the 11 respondents who considered it feasible to collect separate 'prepared for reuse' data were five local authorities and three waste management companies. A recurring theme was that using average rather than actual weights of items would be beneficial particularly for smaller operations which may not have weighing facilities.   One local authority called for guidance on the extent of data to be gathered, types of items covered, and who is responsible for collection. One NGO suggested trialling a data collection system with Community Resource Network Scotland members and organisations participating in the Revolve Quality Programme.

4.17 Two local authorities commented that they already had a form of capturing reuse data, through the Waste Data Flow. Likewise, two respondents described how WEEE data is already being reported for WEEE received by a treatment facility for reuse.

4.18 One waste management company recognised the practical challenge of collecting such data, but nonetheless considered this worthwhile:
> 'Given the emergence of this part of the waste hierarchy as of increasing importance, any difficulties in developing measurement methodology should not be allowed to get in the way of establishing baselines for reuse as it becomes a more important part of the resource use mix' (Resource Association).

4.19 Amongst the 14 respondents who perceived data collection to be impractical, half were local authorities and three were manufacturers.

4.20 The main reasons provided in opposition to collecting data were:
- Although this may be easier for formal activity, there is much informal movement of reusable items, often online through sites such as eBay which would be very difficult to track and record (6 mentions).
- Too difficult to manage and will incur significant administrative costs (4 mentions).
- Smaller operations such as charity shops will not have the resources to record data accurately (2 mentions).
- Instead of measuring quantities of materials prepared for reuse it may be better to infer such data from other measures such as: decrease in landfill tonnes; public perception; buying habits; and public sector purchasing (2 mentions).
- The nature of reusable items is that they get reused repeatedly which makes data collection challenging (1 mention).

Views on the value of collecting separate data

4.21 Thirty one respondents (31% of standard responses) addressed this question as follows:

	No.	%
Think it would be valuable to collect separate data	21	68
Think it would not be valuable to collect separate data	3	10
Commentary only	7	23

NB Percentages may not add to 100% exactly due to rounding.

4.22 Twenty respondents representing seven different respondent sectors perceived there to be value in collecting separate data although many acknowledged the challenges associated with this. The usefulness of the data was seen in regard to the following:

- Essential for assessing progress towards a reuse target (3 mentions).
- Supports the Scottish Government's desire to promote reuse (3 mentions).
- Step forward in providing evidence for moving up the waste hierarchy (2 mentions).
- Will enable examination of how different sectors (e.g. local authorities) are contributing to overall local authority and national targets (1 mention).
- Way of educating people, for example, on the difference between reuse and recycling (1 mention).
- Will provide management information on waste trails (1 mention).
- Helps raise the profile of materials prepared for reuse (1 mention).

4.23 Some respondents set out what they perceived to be preparatory steps to take before the collection of separate data can be considered. A recurring theme was that an acceptable level of robustness of data will need to be achieved, with a regular reporting system in place. One waste management company recommended that clear definitions of recycling, recover, reuse, refurbishment and other terms will be needed. Clarity was also requested on the rationale for collection of data and its use. One PR-Compliance organisation suggested that further consideration on setting a reuse target should form part of the wider EU examination of potential separate targets.

4.24 Few substantive reasons were provided to support the view that separate reuse data will not be valuable. The crux of these arguments was that the data will be inaccurate and unreliable. One local authority argued:

'There is potential for confusion as to what can be counted as preparing for re-use and what is not. Does a shop selling architectural salvage count as reuse, but if the same items appear at a reuse shop on a recycling centre, what then? There are plenty of items that go through charities that do not get counted as "re-use" as part of the current data returns submitted to SEPA. Vehicle dismantlers have been selling items from used cars for years. Again does this count as preparing for re-use? (Highland Council).

5. INFLUENCING BEHAVIOURS

Background

5.1 The Scottish Government considers that effective and well targeted communication, awareness raising and support will help individuals and businesses make the changes needed to make more efficient use of resources. Ways in which this can be achieved are:
- public campaigns including those targeted at reducing food waste amongst householders
- Eco-Schools movement
- reducing the number of carrier bags used in Scotland
- community action for example through Climate Challenge Fund projects
- effective local waste collection services
- smarter, sustainable procurement for public organisations.

Question M: We are interested in receiving feedback on these proposals, including communications, designed to influence behaviours of individuals and organisations to use material resources more efficiently.

5.2 Forty two respondents (42% of standard responses) addressed this question. Overall there was much support amongst respondents for the proposals. General comments included:

'We support the broad thrust of the Scottish Government's intentions on communications and influencing behaviours. Consumer and business behaviour in both the purchase and consumption of materials/products as well as their sorting, collection and processing for recycling are critical elements to the success of a resource efficient approach that uses materials wisely and maintains their value in the wider economy' (Resource Association).

'We agree that a wide range of measures targeting awareness at different levels are required to improve resource efficiency throughout Scotland, provided that the infrastructure is in place to support increased recycling' (Scottish Council for Development and Industry).

5.3 Others agreed that one key to success is making it easy to reuse materials, for example, through kerbside recycling systems.

Views on public campaigns

5.4 There was much support for public campaigns, largely from local authorities and manufacturers, although it was pointed out that the impact from these may take time to filter through to targets. Five respondents urged that lessons on what has worked previously should inform the planning of future campaigns. For example, COSLA highlighted research commissioned by the Scottish

Government Climate Change Behaviours Research Programme to identify the best approaches to encouraging behaviour change. One respondent recommended a social marketing approach:

> 'Lessons from other fields show that effecting behaviour change requires a wide range of approaches, including awareness raising, education, legislation an continuing support for behaviour change. We would recommend a social marketing approach which encourages consumers by presenting behaviour changes in a fun, easy and popular way, and by emphasising benefits now and costs later' (Consumer Focus Scotland).

5.5 One dominant theme was that an essential factor in successful public campaigns is to ensure **consistency in message**. It was suggested that this can be achieved by using one body to deliver the message. For example, one respondent commented:

> 'We believe that there should be one message, delivered by one body – consistently. The public has been told different stories, by different agencies, and so does not have the utmost faith in the recycling message' (Scotpak).

Another view was:

> 'We believe that a national campaign is important to ensure that the message is consistent across Scotland. However, care must be taken to ensure that the national campaign compliments local systems and services and does not cause confusion......ZWS must act as the co-ordinating body for any national campaigns to ensure that local authorities are fully briefed on the communication plan and can compliment it accordingly at the local level' (Scottish Borders Council).

5.6 Nine respondents explicitly supported a focus on reducing **food waste**. One manufacturer urged that care should be taken with defining food waste and cognisance should be taken of discussions on this topic at European level through the FoodDrinkEurope initiative. One respondent in particular was eager for householders to understand the impact of food waste:

> 'In particular we support actions to reduce the scale of household food waste which has a resource and environmental impact many times that of used packaging' (British Glass).

5.7 Six respondents (representing five respondent sectors) documented their support for driving home messages through the **Eco-Schools** movement. However, it was recognised that some schools still were without adequate recycling facilities (NGO); and momentum could be lost in the transition from primary to secondary school (LA).

5.8 Two local authorities specifically welcomed the notion of a **dedicated website** to promote the key messages. Another, however, cautioned that such an approach may not impact on the most socially excluded households.

Views on proposals for promoting community action

5.9 Five respondents representing four different respondent sectors expressed broad support for the proposed action. One NGO remarked that they would like to see more learning garnered from local initiatives which could be disseminated wider and scaled up. A local authority suggested that more needs to be done at community level to target hard to reach and high density areas.

Views on waste collection systems

5.10 Six respondents representing four different respondent sectors expressed specific support for the actions proposed regarding waste collection systems. In particular, the production of guidance to local authorities on collection system design was welcomed. Two respondents urged that local authorities and reprocessors respectively be involved in the development of the guidance.

Views on public bodies leading by example

5.11 Five respondents representing three different respondent sectors provided broad support for the proposed action. One waste management company recommended that the Scottish Government develop firm green public procurement standards.

Views on charging for carrier bags

5.12 The Scottish Government proposes to reduce the number of carrier bags used in Scotland by legislating to require retailers to charge for bags with a voluntary agreement that net proceeds will be donated to charitable causes, a proportion of which will be for waste and litter prevention.

Question N: Do you support the proposal of introducing a charge for carrier bags?

5.13 In total, 665 respondents addressed this question (594 of which responded via a campaign). Overall, 94% of all those commenting voiced outright support for the proposal of introducing a carrier bag charge. The seventy one standard responses (72% of all standard responses) addressed this question directly as follows:

	No.	%
Agree with charging	32	45
Partially agree with charging	11	15
Disagree with charging	26	37
Commentary only	2	3

5.14 Local authorities and waste management companies were disproportionately represented amongst those agreeing with the proposal to introduce a charge for carrier bags. All eleven local authorities who provided a view agreed or partially agreed with the charge. Only one of the five waste management companies who responded on this question disagreed with the proposal. Packaging and PR compliance respondents were over-represented amongst those disagreeing with the proposal. All three packaging respondents and four of the five PR compliance respondents disagreed.

5.15 It is difficult to assess the overall body of view from retailers as whilst some indicated clearly whether or not they supported the proposal, others did not provide an overarching view, but instead focused on specific aspects of it, such as the proposed exemptions. Overall, eight of the 14 retailers provided a view on the principle of charging, with five agreeing or partially agreeing and three disagreeing.

5.16 The main focus of the two campaigns (WWF and Marine Conservation Society) was to support charging for carrier bags (see Annex 2 for the text of their respective responses). The WWF campaign referred to introducing a *plastic* bag charge, whereas the Marine Conservation Society used the term 'single-use carrier bag levy'.

Reasons in favour of charging for carrier bags

5.17 Few reasons were given in support of the proposal. Of those documented, three dominated:
- Charging has worked well previously and elsewhere (11 mentions).
- Whilst playing only one small part in the overall agenda for safeguarding Scotland's resources, charging for carrier bags constitutes a powerful behaviour change message (10 mentions). Comments included: 'Excellent way to bring the message home to each and every individual' (SGL Carbon Fibers Limited).
- Carrier bags contribute to pollution and litter (6 mentions).

5.18 Other reasons given in support of the proposal were that voluntary efforts are not sufficient to bring about change (2 mentions); and that the scheme will be relatively easy to implement (1 mention).

Qualifying comments

5.19 A few respondents added qualifications to their support of the proposal. It was argued that to be successful, the scheme and the underlying rationale will need to be widely publicised (4 mentions). One respondent (Retail) recommended that common, official messaging and promotional material be provided by the Scottish Government, with a helpline also established. Another respondent commented:

'We would welcome, for example, retailer packs that include detailed guidance, downloadable promotional materials to educate consumers and a communication toolkit' (Local Authority Recycling Advisory Committee).

5.20 Four respondents argued that vigorous enforcement will be required to ensure consistent application of the scheme.

5.21 A recurring concern (11 mentions) was that by placing too much emphasis on charging for carrier bags, other actions which may have more of an impact may be relegated by consumers who feel they have played their part in safeguarding resources. A typical comment was:

> 'We are not comfortable with measures of this kind being excessively trumpeted as waste prevention and/or resource efficiency measures, as their impact in these areas is marginal and there is a danger that a public perception is created which believes that a major waste problem has been solved – when patently it has not' (Resource Association).

Reasons against charging for carrier bags

5.22 Three arguments against the proposal were presented by five or more respondents:

- The proposal will have little impact on resource efficiency (9 mentions).
  One comment was:
  'We feel that the Scottish Government has other priorities we would wish to see them act on before tackling Scotland's plastic bag use. This policy has a risk of being a distraction from the real business of reducing waste and improving resource efficiency (Scotch Whisky Association).
- The proposal could inadvertently result in more waste if consumers buy other bags such as bin liners to compensate (8 mentions).
- The proposal is based on the false premise of carrier bags being 'single use' (6 mentions). One individual respondent underlined this point:
  '....they are used as bin liners, for emptying vacuum cleaners, picking up local rubbish, carrying wet or muddy sports gear.....or are donated to charity shops for reuse'.

5.23 A range of other reasons against charging for carrier bags was identified by four or fewer respondents:

- This imposes an additional tax on an item already taxed under the Producer Responsibility (Packaging Waste) Regulations.
- Will affect the poor and elderly disproportionately.
- We should wait for the longer term impact of the Welsh initiative to be clear before going down this route.
- Amounts to Government interference with business commercial interests.
  One respondent commented:
  'While some businesses agreed with the proposal...many expressed exasperation at being asked to effectively administer a Government

scheme to influence the public's behaviour' (Federation of Small Business).

- Could damage the retail sector in town centres as it will put people off impulse buying.
- Administrative burden, particularly for small firms.
- Too difficult to enforce.
- Voluntary measures are sufficient.
- Retailers will pass on overheads of the scheme onto their customers.
- Presents a health hazard with multi-use carrier bags harbouring food bugs such as E-Coli and salmonella.
- Customers using their own bags attract the attention of store detectives.
- Cannot use self check-out with own bags.
- Carrier bags make up a very small proportion of street litter.
- This constitutes an indirect attack on plastics as single use carrier bags are predominantly made from plastics.
- This presents packaging in a negative light, when in fact it has benefits of protecting valuable food and other products.
- Not likely to change behaviour in isolation, but must be part of a wider safeguarding resources agenda.

Views were invited on key aspects of the proposals: including all retailers; including all single use/disposable carrier bags regardless of material; setting the minimum charge at 5p; the proposed exemptions; making the scheme cost neutral for retailers; directing net revenues to good causes; design of the reporting system.

Views on including all retailers

5.24 In total, 125 respondents addressed this question (104 of which resulted from the Marine Conservation Society campaign). Overall, 97% of all those commenting voiced support for the proposal to include all retailers. The 21 standard responses (21% of all standard responses) addressed this topic as follows:

	No.	%
Agree	17	81
Disagree	2	10
Commentary only	2	10

NB Percentages may not add to 100% exactly due to rounding

5.25 A recurring comment (8 mentions) was that including all retailers was fair and contributed to a level playing field. For example:

'Consumers may be put off going to a certain shop if they have to pay for carrier bags when they can go to a competitor down the road and get bags for free' (Inverclyde Council).

5.26 Other supporting comments were:

- The inclusion of all retailers sends out a consistent message that is easy for consumers to understand (2 mentions).
- Easier to implement and enforce if all retailers are included (1 mention).
- This is how it has been introduced elsewhere (1 mention).

5.27 One respondent (Business) argued that the proposal to include all retailers does not present a level playing field as compliance will cost micro-businesses proportionately more than large businesses. Another (Retail) considered that consumers should not be encouraged to take their own bags for use in the takeaway sector due to the possibility of bacteria impacting on health.

5.28 One respondent sought further clarification on the definition of 'retailers' (Business). Two others recommended that impact assessments are undertaken prior to any firm decisions being made.

Views on including all single use/disposable carrier bags, regardless of material

5.29 In total, 123 respondents addressed this question (104 of which resulted from the Marine Conservation Society campaign). Overall, 96% of all those commenting voiced support for the proposal to include all single use/disposable carrier bags, regardless of material. The 19 standard responses (19% of all standard responses) addressed this topic as follows:

	No.	%
Agree	14	74
Partially agree	1	5
Disagree	3	16
Commentary only	1	5

5.30 Two substantive reasons were provided in favour of the inclusion of all single use bags regardless of material:
- Paper bags and plastic bags alike are damaging to the environment (5 mentions). One respondent commented:
  'There is nothing to be gained from replacing one type of free bag with another made from a different material' (Marine Conservation Society).
- Including all bags regardless of material is in keeping with the other proposals and presents a consistent front (2 mentions).

5.31 Those opposing the proposal emphasised their view that this inclusive approach had previously caused confusion in Wales (2 mentions); and that paper bags create fewer litter problems than plastic bags, so perhaps should be handled differently (e.g. charged but at a lower rate) (LA). Two respondents argued that it is inappropriate to place a levy on paper bags made from 100% recycled material. One remarked:

'....the single culprit for 100% of the issues highlighted is the Supermarket Plastic Checkout Vest Carrier Bag' (Smith Anderson Group Limited).

Views on setting the minimum charge at 5p

5.32 Twenty eight respondents (28% of standard responses) addressed this topic as follows:

	No.	%
Agree	17	61
Disagree	9	32
Commentary only	2	7

NB Percentages may not add to 100% exactly due to rounding

5.33 Those supporting setting the minimum charge at 5p included five retailers. The most common reason given in support was that 5p matches the charge in Wales which was sufficient to change behaviour and will provide a consistent approach thereby helping to keep administration costs down. One respondent (Business) argued that the charge should be no more than 5p as a higher cost would most likely be negatively received by customers. One retailer urged that the cost be equal to or lower than the current cheapest Bag for Life (currently thought to be 6p).

5.34 Those opposing the 5p charge were generally in favour of this being set at a higher level, with 5p considered too low to change attitudes. Recommended costs ranged from 8p – 20p.

5.35 Four respondents urged that provision is made for reviewing and potentially increasing any charge set.

Views on the exemptions proposed in Annex 2

5.36 Twenty eight respondents (28% of standard responses) addressed this topic. The majority agreed with the proposed exemptions, suggested additional exemptions or provided other relevant commentary. Only three respondents clearly stated their opposition to the proposals.

5.37 Where respondents recommended **additional candidates for exemption** these included:
- On-line deliveries, the packaging of which the customer has no control over (4 mentions).
- Bags used to transport take-away food (on the grounds of potential health risks of using the customer's own bag) (3 mentions).
- Compostable bags (2 mentions).
- Bags provided to prevent leakage (e.g. for flowers) (1 mention).

- In the case of clothes and accessories as retailers may not be willing to give full refunds on goods transported in customers' own bags (1 mention).
- Where a bag is clearly designed for significant reuse (1 mention).

5.38 A recurring comment amongst retailers was to welcome the proposed exemption in airports for purchases made after passing through security. This was viewed as particularly important for reasons of security, tax and to allow for impulse buying.

5.39 Whatever exemptions are put in place, it was argued that these will need to be widely publicised with definitions such as 'small bags' made explicit (4 mentions).

5.40 The three reasons given in opposition to the proposals were:
- Too generous and will open up the possibility of cost avoidance (Ind).
- Too much scope for confusion (Retail).
- There should be only one reason for exemptions – on grounds of risk to health (PR-C).

Views on making the scheme cost neutral for retailers

5.41 Nineteen respondents (19% of standard responses) addressed this topic. Sixteen of these agreed with the proposal and three disagreed.

5.42 Those in favour of the proposal considered that it constituted a pragmatic approach, which will facilitate acceptance of the scheme by retailers, and prevent retailers passing on additional costs to customers. One respondent (Business) commented that it would be helpful if other associated costs such as additional staff training and information campaigns could also be recovered by retailers.

5.43 The three reasons given in opposition to the proposal were:
- All of the charge should go to good causes as retailers are currently giving bags away free (Ind).
- If retailers are not permitted to recover their administrative costs this will provide an incentive to run the scheme efficiently (PR-C).
- Does not resonate with the trade. This is part of retailers' social responsibility agenda and if the proposal is introduced it will present an unlevel playing field with some retailers recovering their costs and others choosing not to do so (Retail).

Views on directing net revenue to good causes

5.44 In total, 138 respondents addressed this topic (104 of which were Marine Conservation Society campaign responses). Amongst the 34 standard respondents addressing the topic (34% of standard responses) all but one provided supportive commentary and suggestions. The remaining respondent (Business) argued that unless legislation is put in place to require retailers to direct net revenue to good causes, not all will do this.

5.45 Seven of the standard responses put forward a view that there should be transparency in how much revenue is going to good causes and which causes have been the recipients. It was agreed that this could be done by using posters (Ind) or by displaying a charity certificate (Ind). Six respondents requested clarity, perhaps in guidance, on which causes might be considered 'good' and what percentage of net revenue should be directed to them.

5.46 Several respondents argued that retailers should be given leeway to decide for themselves which causes to support and that the causes permitted should be wider than environmental and resource efficiency organisations.

5.47 The Marine Conservation Society campaign responses argued that proceeds should of a levy should go to charities and NGOs working on: litter and waste prevention and reduction; litter collection and surveying; recycling; and environmental protection and improvement. Some of the standard responses also highlighted the type of good cause which they perceived to be suitable candidates to receive such revenue. These were:
- environmental projects (6 mentions)
- recycling/reuse and resource efficiency projects (6 mentions)
- litter campaigns/collections (3 mentions)
- social enterprises involved in sustainable resource management (2 mentions)
- community gardens (1 mention)
- local projects nominated by local people (1 mention)
- health and welfare (1 mention).

Views on the design of the reporting system

5.48 Sixteen respondents (16% of standard responses) addressed this topic. Many simply welcomed the proposal to keep reporting as simple and minimal as possible. One typical comment was:
> '....every effort should be made to minimise the administrative impact on businesses resulting from these proposals. Any eventual reporting requirements must be simple and easy to implement' (CBI Scotland).

5.49 Some respondents emphasised their view that reporting should be transparent and open to scrutiny (4 mentions). Two respondents urged that reporting is tied in with the annual financial reporting cycle, with one (PR-C) suggesting that the revenue go through the company tax reporting system with audit picking up anything untoward.

5.50 There were mixed views on the proposal for 'light touch' enforcement. Whilst one respondent (Retail) explicitly welcomed this approach, others (4 respondents) felt that enforcement needs to be more prominent. One remarked:
> 'While a 'light touch' voluntary approach may be preferred due to the lower cost involved, it could provide an opportunity for unscrupulous retailers to keep the money raised' (Consumer Focus Scotland).

6. MEASURING PROGRESS

Background

6.1 The proposed Programme for the Efficient use of our Materials is designed to meet the requirements of the 2008 Waste Framework Directive for a waste prevention programme. The Directive requires appropriate benchmarks for waste prevention measures, with indicators to monitor these. The Scottish Government proposes to set:
- An overall target of a 5% reduction in all waste by 2015 against a baseline year of 2011.
- A longer term vision of a 15% reduction in all waste by 2025.
- Headline indicators relating to:
  - amount of waste produced (in different categories)
  - carbon impact of waste
  - amount of waste produced per unit of GDP/GVA in Scotland

> **Question O: We would welcome comments on these proposed targets and indicators, in particular views on the merits of an absolute target or one relative to GDP, given the strong relationship between economic growth and waste generation in previous years.**

6.2 Overall, 528 respondents addressed this question, of which 490 resulted from the WWF campaign and 38 were standard responses.

General comments on targets

6.3 Whilst general support was given by many respondents to the principle of overarching targets, some expressed reservations that those proposed appeared to lack the context of a broader strategy. Two respondents recommended that any Scottish strategy should be linked with the EU Resource Efficiency Roadmap. One respondent (Man) urged that the experiences of other countries regarding targets and indicators are taken on board.

6.4 Other general requirements of Scottish targets and indicators suggested were:
- should be associated with a consistent approach to reporting of performance (3 mentions)
- achievement must be weighed against the costs generated (1 mention)
- should not be commercially disadvantaging businesses operating in Scotland (1 mention)
- in the measurement of progress towards overall targets, it must still be possible to identify at micro level where reductions can be achieved (2 mentions).

Specific comments on the targets proposed

6.5 The 490 WWF campaign responses urged that the scale of ambition reflected by the targets should be increased, with an aim to cut waste volumes by half by 2025. Whilst one standard response (LA) considered the 15% waste reduction target ambitious in the context of economic growth returning to previous levels, other standard responses considered the headline targets not challenging enough.   Recommendations included doubling the targets (Ind); making them more in line with the more ambitious Welsh Assembly targets (NGO); or more stretching like those for carbon emissions reduction (80% by 2050) (Pub-Oth). Three of the standard responses questioned what policy initiatives will be put in place to achieve a further 10% waste reduction after the initial 5% by 2015. One retailer suggested that the longer term target of 15% waste reduction should be reassessed in the light of progress towards the 5% target as lessons may emerge which could strengthen the 2025 target.

6.6 A perceived lack of accuracy of the baseline data in particular concerned four respondents, with COSLA welcoming more consideration of this matter.

6.7 Other comments included:
- The mantra of "Zero Waste" should be replaced with a more meaningful message such as a vision of efficient use of valuable materials (2 mentions).
- There is inconsistency in that the commercial and industry sectors are included here in waste arisings yet excluded from the Waste (Scotland) Regulations recycling targets (1 mention).
- Prefer to see the targets apply to all waste and not just municipal waste (1 mention).
- How will the weight-based targets and the carbon metric-based measurements work together? (1 mention)
- Need to take account of the predicted increase in population and household numbers in some areas and the increase in waste arisings this will generate (1 mention).
- There are already numerous targets associated with the Zero Waste Plan. No further targets should be set (1 mention).
- The headline targets are too simplistic. One respondent remarked: '....targets such as 5% overall are a crude method of monitoring progress and are exposed to economic influences that the sector has no control over' (Clackmannanshire Council).

Views on whether targets should be absolute or relative to GDP

6.8 Eighteen respondents provided a view on the merits of an absolute target or one relative to GDP, given the strong relationship between economic growth and waste generation in previous years. Of these, one (WM) recommended further debate and consideration of this topic before final decisions are made. Another

(PR-C) did not consider GDP and waste generation to be inextricably linked. Not all of the others provided a clear view one way or the other, but overall the main balance of view was in favour of linking targets to GDP which was seen as providing context, being readily available and fitting with the agenda of economic growth.

6.9 Three of the 18 respondents were very clear that targets should be absolute. One (Retail) commented that absolute targets are more accurate. Another considered that absolute targets would reflect the need to drive down the use of resources in a sustainable manner (Pub-Oth). The third argued that unless absolute measures are used, overall growth in consumption will 'swamp those gains' (Changeworks).

Views on the carbon impact of waste indicator

6.10 Of the proposed indicators, the carbon impact of waste attracted most attention. Broad opinion was that the indicator will be very useful and important in measuring advances in both prevention and recycling. However, challenges were envisaged in terms of:
- requirement to analyse the contents of waste collected, which could be costly
- application to industrial waste is difficult.

Other proposals for indicators

6.11 A few respondents identified further indicators which they considered could provide useful information on progress towards the targets:
- capture rate into recycling/recovery or reuse – measuring how efficiently materials are recovered (LA)
- flows of WEEE collected and recycled by all actors (Man)
- ratio of raw materials to recycled materials (Retail)
- the proposed indicators, with data disaggregated by sector (Retail)
- supplementary indicators (such as levels of community engagement; indicators focused on environmental impact) in order to take more account of other contextual factors which have a significant bearing on the amount of resources used in Scotland (Pub-Oth).

ANNEX 1: ORGANISATIONS RESPONDING TO THE CONSULTATION

Aberdeen City Council
Aluminium Packaging Recycling Organisation
AmeyCespa Ltd
Asda Stores Ltd
Association for Organics Recycling
Boots UK Limited
British Glass
British Retail Consortium
British Soft Drinks Association
CBI Scotland
Changeworks
Chartered Institution of Wastes Management
Clackmannanshire Council
Co2 Compliance Ltd
Coca-Cola Enterprises Ltd
Community Pharmacy Scotland
Community Resources Network Scotland
Compliance Link
Complypak Limited
Consumer Focus Scotland
Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA)
Cooperative Group
Dumfries and Galloway Council
Dundee City Council
Federation of Master Builders
Federation of Small Business
Food Service Packaging Association
Glasgow Airport
Hewlett-Packard
Highland Council
INCPEN
Intellect
Inverclyde Council
Law Society of Scotland
Legardere Service Travel Retail UK and Ireland
Local Authority Recycling Advisory Committee
Marine Conservation Society
Marks and Spencer
McDonald's Restaurants Ltd
National Pharmacy Association Ltd
NHS Dumfries and Galloway
North Ayrshire Council
North Lanarkshire Council

Novamont
Nuance Group
Packaging and Films Association
Perth and Kinross Council
Planning Aid for Scotland
Renfrewshire Council
RePIC Ltd
Resource Association
Rexam Beverage Cans Europe and Asia
RSPB (comments in response to Environmental Report)
Scotch Whisky Association
Scotpak
Scottish Borders Council
Scottish Council for Development and Industry
Scottish Enterprise
Scottish Environmental Services Association
Scottish Food and Drink Federation
Scottish Grocers' Federation
Scottish Plastics and Rubber Association
Scottish Water
Scottish Wholesale Association
SGL Carbon Fibers Limited
Smith Anderson Group Limited
South Lanarkshire Council
Tata Steel
Tesco
THInc
Valpak Ltd
Wastepack Ltd
WEEE Solutions Ltd
World Duty Free Group
WWF Scotland
Zero Waste Scotland

ANNEX 2: COPIES OF THE CAMPAIGN RESPONSES

1. WWF campaign response letter

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing in response to the Scottish Government's consultation on resource efficiency.

Producing as little waste as possible and using materials much more efficiently is key to cutting our reliance on landfill, safeguarding precious resources upon which we all depend, and reducing climate emissions. The Government has made a welcome commitment to move towards a Zero Waste Scotland and the latest proposals on resource efficiency are an important part of this. However I think that the proposals should be strengthened in a number of areas.

1. Increase your ambition to reduce waste volume

I believe that if a Zero Waste Scotland is to become a reality, the scale of ambition within the proposals should be increased with an aim to cut waste volumes in half by 2025 through stepping up momentum on recycling, reuse and waste avoidance.

2. Introduce strong policies to reduce the amount of packaging materials going to landfill

In order to deliver the above, I would like to see the Government introduce policies such as a nation-wide deposit return system to reward people to reuse and recycle and delivering greater progress from businesses in Scotland to cut the packaging waste that they are responsible for.

3. Introduce a plastic bag charge

I support Government proposals to reduce the number of single use carrier bags used, which are symbolic of our wasteful attitude to resource use. Each year in Scotland nearly 600 million carrier bags are used, squandering non-renewable resources, polluting our environment, threatening wildlife and taking decades to break down in landfills. Charging for plastic bags has been highly successful in changing behaviour and cutting use elsewhere and we believe Scotland should follow suit.

I welcome the proposed plan of action to use resources more carefully and urge you to strengthen this in a number of areas in order to ensure that Scotland's Zero Waste future becomes a reality.

I am replying as an individual and am happy for my response and name to be published on the Scottish Government website, but not my address.

I understand that my name and address are required to identify me as an individual, so that my response can be included in the consultation analysis.

I am content for the Scottish Government to contact me again in relation to this consultation exercise.

Yours faithfully

2. Marine Conservation Society campaign letter

Dear

I am writing to respond as an individual to Question N of the Safeguarding Scotland's Resources consultation. I am happy for my response and name to be published on the Scottish Government website, but not my address. I am also happy for the Scottish Government to contact me again in relation to this consultation exercise.

I would like to see a single-use carrier bag levy introduced in Scotland as I believe that it is an important step in reducing one of the most obvious forms of pollution on land and at sea. I agree with the Marine Conservation Society's proposal that all bags at point of sale should be charged for, regardless of the material from which they are made. One of the main aims of the legislation should be to bring about a change in behaviour. Replacing one free bag with another made from a different material will not achieve this.

I would suggest that the terms 'single-use' or 'disposable' carrier bags could cause confusion. Many retailers and customers could argue that these bags are not single-use and are used again for bin liners, dog waste bags, or shopping. I am concerned that without carefully defining these terms this could cause potential problems in the future in enforcing the levy.

I would suggest that if all retailers have to comply with the regulations this would create a level playing field, which will make the regulations much easier to implement and enforce. I believe the proceeds of a levy should go to those charities and NGOs working on: litter and waste prevention and reduction; litter collection and surveying e.g. beach litter; recycling; and environmental protection and improvement.

Yours sincerely,

ANNEX 3: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT

On 1 February 2013 the Scottish Government published a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the proposed programme, Safeguarding Scotland's Resources[9] with comments invited by 1 March 2013. During this time the main consultation was also re-opened for responses. A summary of the views relating to the SEA is documented below. Where new comments were received on the original proposals, these are incorporated into the main analysis.

Six submissions were made in response to the invitation to comment on the Environmental Report; three from organisations and three from individuals. Five of these respondents had already submitted views on the main consultation document. The responses on the Environmental Report are published in full on the Scottish Government website at http://www.scotland.gov.uk/SSRresponses.

A brief summary of the topics they addressed and their key points follows.

General comments

One individual respondent provided their overarching view of the document. This respondent considered the report to be lacking in clear strategy and complicated. It appeared to them to be overly focused on the proposal to introduce a plastic carrier bag levy and on waste recycling rather than waste minimisation, which in their view could lead to greater sustainability.

This respondent advocated more policy focus on lifestyle-based changes, not simply targeting recycling, including greater incentives to householders to be more responsible for their waste.

The respondent highlighted what they perceived to be gaps: for example, no mention of the 'circular economy'; and no mention of addressing the instructions on packaging materials which state 'not presently recyclable'.

They encouraged the government to take the initiative in dealing with resistance from certain stakeholders such as manufacturers and retailers whom they viewed as largely resistant to working towards minimising packaging. They also recommended investigating what they perceived to be supermarkets' role in encouraging food waste through offers such as buy-one-get-one-free.

---

[9] http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/0041/00413697.pdf

Specific comments

Producer Responsibility for Packaging Waste (Action 8)
One respondent (Pack) considered that in comparison with the coverage given to producer responsibility for packaging in the main report, the Environmental Report gave scant coverage to this topic.

Carrier Bags (Action 10)
Three respondents provided comments on the Environmental Report's coverage of Action 10.

One respondent (Ind) considered that the report did not provide an accurate picture of the many complex issues or unintended consequences surrounding the proposed imposition of a charge for 'thin gauge carrier bags,' such as the increase in energy requirements, fuel usage, transport requirements, harmful emissions and increase in landfill requirements which they envisaged will follow the introduction of the proposed charge.

Another respondent (NGO) recommended that all funds from charging for carrier bags should be channelled to good causes that deliver environmental benefits and address behaviour change in relation to waste and consumption. This respondent considered that the content of the report relating to impacts of carrier bags on biodiversity should be improved by including more available information on impacts of plastic waste on wildlife.

A packaging company recommended that the public be made aware of the view that 'the introduction of a 5p tax is an additional tax on an item that is already 'taxed' under The Producer Responsibility (Packaging Waste) Regulations'. This respondent considered it to be more beneficial if the financial penalty on carrier bags under the PRO regulations is spent on recycling the carrier bags. The respondent made further comments including advocating plain/unprinted and un-pigmented carrier bags which would be easier to recycle; questioning what they perceived to be the singling out of carrier bags over general street litter; questioning how much of the 5p will be taken up by retailers' running costs; citing Defra reuse data showing that 80% of people reuse single trip plastic carrier bags within their household; and highlighting the health hazard of multi-use carrier bags.

Comments relating to Appendix B

More specific comments related to Appendix B of the Environmental Report headed, "Longlist of potential actions".

Pilot deposit refund systems
Pilot deposit refund systems are listed in Appendix B as a potential action. One individual respondent welcomed this as a potential action but queried why pilot

deposit refund systems are not included within the 13 actions proposed in section 2 (pages 10 – 11) of the report.

Reuse
One NGO recommended the following wording for the Background section:

'Revolve is Scotland's national re-use quality standard. The objective is to increase re-use by improving professionalism, customer experience and visibility of re-use organisations through harmonised standards, branding, data collection, training and awareness raising.

Re-use is also promoted through the Re-use Hotline which refers consumers to their nearest re-use centre. The Business Re-use and Recycling Directory has been developed to allow commercial organisations to access re-use and recycling provision.'

This NGO also recommended the following wording for the brief description of potential action:

'Continued expansion of the Revolve standard to the reuse sector and the promotion of the Reuse Hotline and the Business Reuse and Recycling Directory'.

Procurement
This section refers to The Climate Change (Scotland) Act which contains a provision allowing Scottish Ministers to make regulations requiring contracts to specify the use of recyclate.

One respondent (Pack) raised 2 queries:
- What is the definition of 'recyclate' i.e. process/commercial scrap? Or post consumer recycled (PCR) materials?
- Are there currently any Government contracts in place that specify the use of recyclate?

ANNEX 4: REPORT OF STAKEHOLDER EVENT HELD IN GLASGOW ON 27 AUGUST 2012

Safeguarding Scotland's Resources Business Consultation Event
27th August 2012, Radisson Blu, Glasgow

<u>Workshop Feedback – Group 1</u>

Business Resource Efficiency Support

Experience to date:
- Too many hurdles to access support
- Sector based support is too restrictive
- Support is 'same old' – consultants haven't updated their skills
- Report and feedback from consultants takes too long
- Type of support is now very limited. Example was given of Northern Ireland that has a new resource efficiency grant – really helpful as banks are not lending at the moment.

Ideas for delivery of new services:
- Joining up the services will help
- Needs to be more handholding to implement the identified actions
- Bring in SEPA to provide support on regulatory aspects of identified actions
- Generalist needs to hand over to specialists once issues identified
- Businesses will do this if they can see the financial return, but at the moment the payback on capital expenditure for environmental improvements is too long.
- Perhaps income from the carrier bag charge could be used by a company to fund their own environmental improvements programmes?
- Type of support (online / helpline / 1:1) will depend on where the company is at – need a clever checklist to direct to the right level of support
- In the past the 1:1 model has delivered £10 savings for every £1 of government spending. The 1:many model won't do this.

Voluntary Agreements
- Must have a benefit for the company – otherwise won't do it.
- Benefits can be financial, or lighter touch regulation, or reduced tax rate, or improved public relations
- Could link participation in voluntary agreement with triggering 1:1 support
- Sometimes difficult because if European competitors don't have to achieve targets then UK company is at a disadvantage e.g. reduction in peat use.

Zero Waste Pledge
- Must be clear about what you are signing up to – what does 'zero waste' mean?
- Could widen out from 'zero waste' to 'resource efficiency'
- Must link to existing agreements, such as Green Tourism Business Scheme

- Struggling to see what the benefit is to individual companies. Could link sign up to accessing 1:1 support.
- Could be a procurement criterion, but businesses will not use this if it means greater cost. Could possibly be included in public sector procurement.
- A pledge would be useless if not verified, but there would be cost in setting up a verification system.

Construction
- Site Waste Management Plans are useless – they just tick a planning box. No one checks, and they don't change on-site behaviour. To work they would need to be policed.
- Extension of 'Halving Waste To Landfill' commitment to design phase – architects are already doing this. Off-site fabrication of building panels reduces waste on site, but there are no Scottish suppliers.

Data, benchmarking, tools
- Data tools should be developed in line with the new Resource Efficient Scotland service
- There should be a common template for consistency
- Transparency is required when quoting figures otherwise they don't have credibility
- Perhaps there should be a requirement for resource efficiency / waste reporting in company reports. This could be linked to tax breaks for environmental spend.

Waste Industry Voluntary Agreement
- Yes it is appropriate for them to take on this role and 'yes' the skills are there
- Example was given of a company in the home improvement sector challenging their waste management contractor to find 10% waste reduction. Any savings were shared 50:50 between the company and the contractor. Contractor came up with two proposals which are now being implemented – closed loop plant pots (customers return plant pots and they are remade into other products which are then sold in-store) and green waste from store being composted and the compost sold in store.
- There may be a competitiveness issue, as maybe only the biggest have the capacity to do this
- We are doing this anyway – didn't need a voluntary agreement
- There must be financial benefits – improving public relations is good but not enough
- Could link a voluntary agreement to improving data and measurement
- There may be conflicts – eroding the traditional waste treatment business – however recognise that the sector needs to evolve

Producer responsibility
- Two companies are currently obligated under producer responsibility and operate across the UK. They expressed concern about the additional data capture that would be required to calculate their 'Scottish obligation' and 'rest of UK' obligation.
- One company reported that they had been chosen for a Producer Responsibility audit, because they had decided not to join a compliance scheme, and to go it

alone. They felt that this was unfairly penalising them for taking more responsibility for their packaging waste.

Carrier bag charge
- This needs to be a UK wide charge – there is no point having different regimes in the 4 UK nations.
- Companies operating cross border may opt to introduce a charge across the whole of the UK, for simplicity sake.
- Suggestion that carrier bag charges could be used to fund environmental works within a company, so long as it was transparently reported as such.

Workshop Feedback – Group 2

Business Resource Efficiency Support

- One helpline/website would be useful.
- Website should be easy to navigate and have good resources
- Considered beneficial to have advice in one place to prevent overlap
- One point was made that advice should be in line with regulation – i.e. that any advice should not conflict with legislative requirements imposed by SEPA.
- Implementation is often limited by services – location can limit access to waste management services , and these can often be far more expensive in rural areas.
- Support should include logistical support – i.e. support to find the right people/equipment etc. to help with implementing the recommendations contained within the report
- Support should take the form of an action plan, as a full report with lots of information is useful but doesn't tell the business what they need to do.
- Having account managers with experience/understanding of the sector was cited as being important.

Zero Waste Pledges

- Pledges could be a good idea if they inspire employees, and externally provide an opportunity to highlight good practice to customers
- Need to have credibility – can't just be a statement – there needs to be clarity on claims made.
- It was suggested that there could be a national benchmark/target for everyone to achieve as part of the pledge.
- It was also suggested that maybe an incentive should be offered to encourage join up, e.g. a reduction in business rates, or access to specific services/support.
- Halving Waste To Landfill was pointed out as a good model – 5 steps which can easily be achieved in a year, and assistance is provided by WRAP/ZWS to help with moving through the steps
- General discussion around the fact there are multiple schemes and many overlap, with some costing large amounts of money for certification. In construction alone there are 5 different certification schemes.

- Currently there is lack of consistence in public procurement policy – procurement should be driving which schemes are recognised for environmental performance. Maybe there should there be one government backed scheme which is recognised by public sector procurement

Construction Voluntary Agreement

There was only one construction company present. Their comments were as follows:
- Would want to see a final report on what the outcomes of Halving Waste To Landfill are before a new scheme is launched
- Interested to know how a wider voluntary agreement on resource efficiency would be practically implemented – i.e. how it would be measured.
- Needs to be incentives for designers and architects to consider sustainability/resource efficiency at the design stage.
- Issue is that the priority of the client may not be focused on resource efficiency!
- Question of where it sits with BREEAM (BRE environmental assessment method) as this already covers aspects of resource efficiency

Resource Utilisation Assessments

- One company was PPC (Pollution Prevention and Control) authorised but had not heard of RUAs
- Comment was made that the Site Waste Management Plan Tool developed by WRAP was very complicated
- There is already a range of software monitoring tools on the market, and some companies have their own internal systems in place
- Monitoring over transient sites is difficult
- However some kind of central database of benchmark data would be useful, but would need to be done carefully as everyone has a different way of reporting
- Would be good to learn from what other people are doing, and be able to see what solutions have been applied (probably ties more into Resource Efficient Scotland service – highlights strength of case studies and B2B [business-to-business] networking)

Waste Management Voluntary Agreement

There were two waste management companies on the table.
- Question over how it would be audited
- Question over how advice would be consistently delivered to customers, i.e. one company could provide conflicting advice to another to suit their own needs
- Wasn't felt that waste management companies should provide advice on resource efficiency. It was felt that the waste producers should be provided assistance in order to know what to ask of their contractors. Producers need to know how to choose a contractor who will deliver a good service
- There was some discussion on waste data and the difficulty of providing individuals with weight data when a route collected from multiple producers
- If Resource Efficient Scotland is effective then the waste management industry shouldn't be offering similar advice

- A waste management company should simply be providing advice on good waste management practice and could not be expected to tailor this to the individual sectors and their specific issues relating to resource efficiency

Workshop Feedback – Group 3

Business Resource Efficiency

- There was a noted risk of the potential loss of skills through transition of the various organisations to Resource Efficient Scotland.
- Lack of clarity over how it will operate. Will organisations have multiple contacts with the service or will there be one contact that is multi-skilled?
- One-to-many / remote assistance in terms of online training and tools etc. is never the thing you actually need or never goes far enough or into enough detail
- Support is not followed up by anyone once it has been completed - need for follow up to support tools
- Carbon Management programme by the Carbon Trust was highlighted. It should be expanded and continued as it was found to be very useful
- SMEs who are required to do a feasibility study and pay for it, only to be told that nothing is feasible, can be a costly barrier

Voluntary agreements

- Voluntary agreements (VAs) work because they are cross-UK which provides consistency for businesses who operate north and south of the border
- Peer pressure was a major driver
- The cost of implementing the internal systems necessary to comply with the various VAs can be considerable however there is a payback from taking action and this has to be communicated very clearly in order to gain buy in
- Providing as much off-the-shelf systems that an SME can just run can help reduce costs/burdens
- VAs should be used to create demand for recycled products
- Problems with including carbon as part of VA - companies do not have expertise in house
- Need to consider how messages are cascaded down to SMEs
- Sector bodies have a large role to play in terms of promotion and this should be driven by direct encouragement from Government
- VAs need to have more teeth as a means of driving performance and gaining credibility - such as a scorecard system – Olympic example
- Some sectors were highlighted as being more scrutinised than others and therefore this may affect the uptake of VAs
- The requirements need to be client-led through procurement as this is the primary route to ensure change by making it contractual
- Is there any consistency as to when all the various VAs finish?

Zero Waste Pledges

- Measurement of this was noted to be unclear and therefore difficult to support
- There is still confusion over the definition of Zero Waste and how this is understood
- It was highlighted that the name Zero Waste Pledges goes against what we are shaping ourselves as an organisation to be i.e. more than just waste
- Are pledges for SME companies?
- What do they really want to achieve?
- Must be embedded in procurement process (Local Government)
- Definitions key to the success and understanding and messaging around energy for waste important
- How hard will the pledges be to get? Is there a danger of market clutter? Too many badges?
- Sample templates will need to be provided.

Construction

- Quality of Site Waste Management Plans (SWMPs) currently being produced is not clear due to lack of regulation
- Possibility of embedding the requirement for SWMPs in Planning regulations and even Environmental Impact Assessments /Strategic Environmental Assessments is something that should be explored
- SWMPs do not cover all of the new areas of Resource Efficiency so these need to evolve to capture more

Resource Utilisation Assessments

- Benchmarks from SEPA data would be useful to circulate
- Show value of doing it before being asked to do it as a means of convincing people

Waste Management Voluntary Agreement

- VA would be needing careful policing to protect against false claims
- Who will monitor performance?
- Local authorities are lowest performers, private sector more commercial and therefore the VA could only be for this area
- Levels of performance should be considered
- Tools for smaller companies should be developed to assist
- Resourcing for smaller organisations is a major burden
- If embedded in public procurement then this would help drive things
- Specialised WM companies who only deal with one waste stream cannot be expected to provide info on material streams they nothing about
- Also the risk of losing business will prevent waste management companies from advising companies of other services from competitors
- There are doubts around the willingness to accept information provided from the waste management contractors and actually act on that information.

ANNEX 5: REPORT OF STAKEHOLDER EVENT HELD IN EDINBURGH ON 4 SEPTEMBER 2012

Safeguarding Scotland's Resources
Consultation Event – Resource Security
4 September 2012, 1400 – 1630
Victoria Quay, Edinburgh
Report of Meeting

1. Introduction - Lorna Walker, SEPA
The issue of resource security is one which is receiving much attention internationally, with high profile coverage of disputes over Rare Earth Elements, shootings at Platinum mines in South Africa etc. Today's event is part of the Scottish Government consultation on Safeguarding Scotland's Resources, and we want to probe current level of awareness of the issue, and hear your suggestions of what actions need to be taken forward in Scotland.

2. Presentations
2.1   Peter Stapleton, Scottish Government
Peter spoke about the underlying drivers behind pressures on our resources – a growing global population, increasing urbanisation and a burgeoning middle class. Coupled with increasing costs of extraction and geopolitical supply risks, the resulting impact is volatile prices in many key materials. At the same time recycling rates of critical materials are low – there is a challenge to develop recycling systems so that they can capture these critical materials. Action is being taken by many governments, and at international level, by the EU and UN. The UK has its own Resource Security Action Plan.

2.2   Ian Holmes, Environmental Sustainability Knowledge Transfer Network
Ian Holmes outlined the key elements of the UK Resource Security Action Plan – a resources dashboard to provide information to business on critical materials; a Circular Economy Task Force to inform government policy; and several innovation funds for businesses. He then gave examples of companies that are addressing the issue of resource security, by for example biomimicry.

2.3   Kennedy Miller, Brand-Rex
Kennedy Miller described Brand-Rex's activities as a leading supplier of data cabling, with a turnover of £90 million. Brand-Rex is carbon neutral and this has helped to differentiate them in the marketplace – including supplying cabling for the Olympics. They produce 1.4bn metres of cabling every year – both copper and fibre optic. Copper is critical to the functionality of their product, and price has risen four-fold since 2003. Other materials and energy are facing similar pressures. They have responded by improving their efficiency, designing a product which uses less material (but still meets high quality standards), and by greening their supply chain. They rely on product life cycle analysis and carbon measurement to drive improvements.

3.   Workshop 1 – Awareness and preparedness
Aim: To ascertain how important the issue of resource security is to the Scottish business community; how aware participants are of the issue; actions that are already underway to address the issue.

Report from Red Group

Importance
• Delegates were asked to score how important they think this issue is, from 0 (not important) to 10 (very important) • Scores given = 5,6,7,8,8,8

Awareness
• Delegates were asked to score how aware they, their organisation, and the Scottish economy generally are about the issue of resource security. • Awareness of participants = 5,8,8,9,9,10 • Awareness of their organisations = 7,8,8,9,9 • Perceived awareness in the Scottish Economy = 4,5,5,5,6,6, Comment There was a general feeling that this issue is important, and that generally the workshop participants were aware of the issue, but that awareness in the economy more generally was quite low. Suggested reasons for this included: • Companies are fighting for survival so other issues are 'front of mind' • People are used to having resources at their fingertips, so they will only engage with this issue if they are actually experiencing a problem. • In the construction sector, prices of raw materials are actually low – at 1990 levels • There is a feeling that individual companies cannot do anything at the geopolitical level, and so just absorb price increases. • Similarly the government of a small country like Scotland will find it difficult to intervene in geopolitics, and can't take unilateral action as may drive business away.

Preparedness
The group discussed actions that could be taken at a company level: • Talking to supply chains • Many companies have carbon tools, we should attempt to integrate resource issues into these • Companies need a strategic understanding of the issues • Waste exchange is one way forward. There was criticism of the decision to shut the National Industrial Symbiosis Programme in Scotland. • Need a Scottish focus to actions • Take forward last year's SEPA report

Report from Green Group

Importance
• Delegates were asked to score how important they think this issue is, from 0 (not important) to 10 (very important) • Scores given = agreement of a 10

Awareness
• Delegates were asked to score how aware they, their organisation, and the Scottish economy generally are about the issue of resource security. • Awareness of participants = agreement of a 10 • Awareness of their organisations = mid range, between 5 and 8. • Perceived awareness in the Scottish Economy = low around 2 – 4 with the caveat that you cannot place the business community in a single box and others will be much higher.

Comments

- No long term planning for these issues, in terms of increased cost businesses will take the hit or pass the cost on to the consumer.
- In terms of awareness and approach – it does depend on the company and what they are providing
- Need to recognise that there have always been resource fluctuations that companies have to deal with a resource security is very different

Preparedness

- Not all companies have the capacity to deal with resource security
- Resource central hub proposed
- Substitution question – when does it become a resource security issue?
- In terms of substitution and addressing this, it is very much a pyramid structure with a few businesses at the top that are totally aware, in the middle a few more that are aware with a bit of planning and substitution and then at the bottom most businesses that absorb cost.
- Companies with a research and development team or access to research and development will have a competitive advantage.

Report from Yellow Group

Importance
• Delegates were asked to score how important they think this issue is, from 0 (not important) to 10 (very important) • Scores given = averaged 8.5

Awareness
• Delegates were asked to score how aware they, their organisation, and the Scottish economy generally are about the issue of resource security. • Awareness of participants = was high, with scores of 9 and 10 • Scores were not given for 'awareness of their organisations' and 'Perceived awareness in the Scottish Economy', but see comments below: Comments Although the awareness of participants was high, the group generally felt that it was low across SMEs in Scotland and the wider economy. Other observations included: • Large construction companies were generally aware, but didn't pass down the supply chain to smaller operators • General feeling that business will resolve many of their supply issues through design or changing business models • The agricultural sector was generally aware, given rising costs of fertilisers and feeds, but it was felt they could do more to invest in animal and plant sciences to help mitigate these issues.

Preparedness
Actions that could be taken at a company level were discussed: • Dissemination through the supply chain • Consideration of different business models • More examples of good practice • Better design

4. Workshop 2 - Actions

Aim: To discuss how Scotland could engage with the UK Resource Security Action Plan (RSAP), and to identify additional actions that could be taken forward in Scotland.

Report from Red Group

Engagement with UK RSAP
• Innovation challenge – this is for individual companies to decide how to engage with. Needs more marketing – not heard of. • Resource dashboard – agreement that this is useful in Scotland and should be promoted. Trade bodies need to take ownership of this to ensure real business data, and updating. Must give added value – one way of doing this would be to link to suppliers of critical materials. Tailor this product for the SME market. • Industry Consortium (now called Circular Economy Task force). It is difficult for Scottish Companies to engage with this unless they have a headquarters south of the border. Could try instigating a Scottish Forum, recognising that this will be difficult.
Actions to take forward in Scotland
• Regulation focuses minds – Carbon Reduction Commitment, landfill tax, and packaging regulations have been great drivers of resource efficiency • There are many organisations already working on this issue – it is important to tie these strings together. • Need to make more links to work going on in Scottish Universities – they have much to add, and many of the solutions. Can government assist making direct university / business links - e.g. sponsoring graduate placements? • Business support on this issue must be faster – it is difficult to go through all the hoops, by which time opportunities have passed. • Better connection to planning policy – e.g. there is a current sand and gravel shortage • Better connection to SEPA policy
Organisations to work with
• Climate 2020 Group might be interested. One delegate sits on this group and offered to take a proposal to the table. • Business Council for Sustainable Development is also interested in this space – also offered to collaborate. • Trade bodies of key sectors which will be affected.

Report from Green Group

Engagement with UK RSAP
• Agreement to engage where appropriate. • Recognise that some areas useful to approach UK wide but others to develop Scottish specific e.g. industry led consortium.
Actions to take forward in Scotland
• Further research specific to Scottish economy looking at what we need to be doing in the short, medium and long term • Address the capacity of the manufacturers to look at scarcity e.g. use existing Knowledge Transfer Networks in an advisory capacity, Resource Efficient

Scotland service could include a focus on resource security. We need to make seamless links to support SMEs.
• Case studies to demonstrate best practice – how to consider and when to consider resource security
• Long term – academia, requires support, explore urban mining, aquatic mining
• Medium and short – material exchange, case studies
• Plug into UK industry led consortium proposed under UK RSAP but set up consortium specific to Scotland
• Recognise it is a global issue but need to take forward actions relevant to range of businesses and/or type of business

Organisations to work with
• Knowledge Transfer Networks
• Resource Efficient Scotland
• Academia

Report from Yellow Group

Engagement with UK RSAP
• Satisfied that these actions could be taken at a UK level and no need to set up something separately for Scotland
• Industry consortium - suggestion that Scotland could take the lead in specific industry areas of strength (such as renewables, oil & gas, aquaculture) and advise on best practice etc.

Actions to take forward in Scotland
• It was considered difficult to see how activities at a Scotland-level could make a difference in a global market. However a couple of actions were suggested.
• Increased engagement with small businesses and individuals on this issue, and in particular with the younger people through schools / universities etc.
• Increased engagement on a 'sector-based' approach
• Manufactured products should all have a list of materials used, to aid recycling and reuse (it was understood that an EU funded project was progressing on bar-coding of electrical products)

Organisations to work with
• Interface – links between business and universities
• Key trade organisations for sector-based approach