

# Resource London Partnership Board

Date: **7 March 2016**  
Time: **10:00 hours**  
Location: Room 6, London Councils,  
59½ Southwark Street. London.  
SE1 0AL

## Attendees

Cllr Clyde Loakes	LWARB
Carolyn Dwyer	LEDNET / City of London
Wayne Hubbard	LWARB
Adam Batchelor	Greater London Authority
Katharina Winbeck	London Councils
Peter Maddox	Wrap

Approved at the Resource London Partnership Board Meeting on 31 October 2016.

Signature: .....  
Clyde Loakes, Chair.

## Officers

Antony Buchan	Resource London
Ali Moore	Resource London
Beverley Simonson	Resource London
Esther Thomas	LWARB

## Apologies

Niall Bolger	CELC / LB Sutton
Marcus Gover	WRAP

## Notes

### 1. Introductions

Introductions were made.

### 2. Declaration of Interests

No declarations were made over and above those recorded in members' standing declarations.

### 3. Notes of the previous meeting

Carolyn said that she had thought that the board had been supportive of the recycling guarantee and agreed that the project should be aspiration. The minutes suggested that the project hadn't been progressed as a result of the board's suggestion. Antony explained that officers were waiting to see how the national agenda was progressing before pushing ahead

with regional work. The project was under item 9 of the new programme plan so was still to be developed.

The notes of the previous meeting were agreed.

#### **4. General Programme Update**

Antony talked through the paper by exception. Officers were finalising a new set of borough data maps. The final maps would be shared with the board as well as Defra and other parties. They would also be placed on the Resource London website.

##### ***Defra's new Head of Waste Policy***

Officers had had a productive meeting with Chris Preston, Defra's new Head of Waste Policy. Officers were in the process of arranging educational site visits for Chris and members of his team. Chris Preston is new to waste policy - his background was water and climate change.

##### ***London Conference***

The Resource London sponsored London Conference would take place on 10 March 2016. Clyde and Marcus were speakers and other board members were scheduled to attend. Resource London was sponsoring free places for London boroughs and waste authorities - 35 of 38 had signed up. In addition, 7 members/portfolio holders had signed up to attend.

##### ***Programme Audit***

There was not much to report in relation to a programme audit. Recommendations on budgeting and how staff time was tracked had already been incorporated in ways of working.

##### ***Green Hustings***

Beverley fed back to the board on her attendance at the Green hustings hosted by the Green Alliance. The hustings had taken place the following week. The areas covered included waste and recycling and the role of the mayor. The hustings was attended by the Green, Conversation, Labour and Liberal Democrat parties.

The discussion had mainly focused on pollution and the number of related deaths in London e.g., people-friendly streets, road closures near schools, walking routes to town centres, safe cycling, solar panels (a few pledges in this area), heating for low income families. All were in favour of remaining in Europe with the exception of Zach Goldsmith who declined to comment.

The following points were also discussed:

- it was expressed that the Mayor shouldn't be in charge of waste;
- More recycling on-the-go e.g., commuter papers;
- localisation and a single system with comparable bins;
- the use of the Mayor's buying power for greener procurement;
- Zach Goldsmith mentioned the circular economy and zero waste city;
- Single use water bottles were mentioned, though it was thought that this would be unrealistic to manage;
- No more incinerators in London;

- It was expressed that working with London councils was an ambitious targets – reservation was expressed about 'taking on 33 leaders'.

The board agreed that that Resource London should be involved with these discussions and that messages should be coordinated. Peter Maddox agreed to take this forward.

## 5. Local Authority Support Update

Antony provided the board with an update. Officers had now met all London boroughs and waste authorities (38). This had led to a number of direct one to one support projects.

### **Commercial Waste**

Officers were pursuing work with NHS England on clinical waste in the form of a joint collections contract and a managing agent contract.

### **Local Authority Support**

Beverley provided a brief update on local authority support as follows:

- Beverley was working with Ealing on procuring plastic waste materials;
- The boroughs had confirmed that contamination was a significant issue. Resource London needed a greater understanding of how to assist the boroughs. Once the results of the survey had been analysed, officers would update the board;
- Waltham Forest crew training had taken place and, as a result, there were fewer rejects due to contamination.

### **Development and innovation**

- a material sales workshop had taken place on 8 December, attendees had included finance and procurement staff. The workshop had produced good information for future tenders;
- The question had arisen as to whether another MRF was needed in London. Wayne suggested that capacity should be bulked in order to facilitate use of MRF facilities outside of London. This issue would be passed to the infrastructure team to take forward.
- **Dense urban recycling** – This is a Wrap project up-weighted by Resource London, the projects looks a mechanisms for driving up recycle in dense urban environments. Two London boroughs are involved, Hackney and Southwark, looking specifically at flatted properties. Projects should be replicable in other boroughs;
- **Private sector rentals** – Resource London was carrying out research jointly funded with LEDnet looking at the rented sector in London (private mainly), any lessons would be replicable for social landlords too. Resource London was currently evaluating tenders. The aim was to provide local authorities with a toolkit to enforce engagement in waste services at local level with the private rented sector and HMOs with residents, managing agents and landlords.

### **2020 route map project**

- Resource London had engaged Wrap to carry out analysis of various service provision scenarios and how each scenario might impact upon London and help to achieve its

recycling targets e.g. a route map to 50% recycling rates. Wrap's modelling highlighted the service interventions that were most important to focus on and what changes authorities could make over time.

- Chris reported that restricted weekly collections seemed to be the main activity that would add to the recycling rates. For some of the scenarios, there would be implementation costs e.g., purchasing smaller bins for restricted waste scenarios. For other scenarios, there would be cost savings from, for example, not collecting residual waste every week.
- The research concluded that, based on the numbers, it would be difficult for boroughs to attain a 50% recycling rate. It was noted that other urban cities reported 50% and above recycling rates as they combined the figures differently. If London used the same methods of reporting, it too would be in excess of 50%.
- The board considered whether there needed to be a review of mayoral policy if targets could not be achieved within existing constraints. It was agreed that Resource London would need to feed into any mayoral policy review. It was pointed out that London could reach 50% recycling if municipal waste was included. If all waste were to be included, London would be around the 50% level.
- It was agreed that London would need to examine ways of dealing with constraints. The board considered what the next game changer might be (the last one had been landfill tax). It was recognised that there could be a huge amount of value in recycling in the future. It was thought that local authorities would not be keen on pay-as-you-throw and might be sceptical about where the revenue would go.
- Chris advised that material sales figures were included but that economies of scale had not been factored in. Also, timescales needed to be mapped for councils to be able to move to new ways of working. On average it would take about 3 years to get to 45%. Timing was important so that there wasn't a large cluster of boroughs acting at the same time. Planning would need to start now. It would depend what happened next year in terms of local authority support. It would be necessary to target key authorities to ensure that schemes were optimised. There were only a few measures that could achieve change.
- There was budget available to rerun the research next year to see if anything had changed. Although the research had been desk research, information from Resource London's meeting with the boroughs had been used to support the research.
- Clyde pointed out that the political scenarios in London were different and that nothing was likely to happen until 2018 due to elections. This needed to be factored in.
- Chris agreed to model pay-as-you-throw for individual boroughs as the board felt that it might help to gain political support. Beverley pointed out that, approximately 8 years ago, Wrap had money to pilot pay-as-you-throw but no authority wanted to take this up. Chris advised that a lot of big gains had been achieved through pay-as-you-throw.
- Antony advised that, potentially, a review of packaging arrangements might be considered as a result of the EU Circular Economy package. This would put the onus on manufacturers.
- The board agreed that there needed to be consideration of how an exit from Europe might affect programme planning.
- It was suggested that the Mayor should think about waste management rather than just recycling. It was also agreed that Antony and Chris would look at a policy 'ask list'.

Resource London was now more aware of the issues and drivers happening in London, this knowledge was helping to shape and focus the work of the programme going forward.

The board agreed to a closed session following item 8. Confidential items within item 5 would be picked up at this point.

## **6. Communications and behaviour change update**

### ***Recycle for London Launch***

The Recycle for London launch took place in November followed by two months of activity. The project was now in planning mode in order to focus on the right activity moving forward.

### ***Communications workshops***

Communications workshop had taken place during the previous week. Seventeen local authorities had attended and attendees had included communications officers which had been a step forward. There had been a waiting list for the workshop with another one planned for the end of April.

### ***Match funding***

Resource London had hit its targets with regard to match funding. Resource London was joining with Wrap and other partners on Ecap.

### ***Recycle week 2016***

A brief had been sent out to boroughs in January 2016. There had been more expressions of interest than before and more authorities buying in. Resource London would be offering funding of up to £7.5k to up to 10 authorities. In total, 16 authorities had responded including a joint waste authority. There had been an issue with regard to the timing of recycle week as it coincided with purdah for the EU referendum. This meant that it might be necessary to move the activity to later in the year – perhaps September.

### ***Food waste recycling communications***

Resource London was in the process of getting as many funding agreements in place as possible in order to roll out food waste intervention run by Wrap. Four west London boroughs were undertaking a joint programme. Ten to twelve boroughs were participating in the project which would involve leaflets, liners, bin stickers mostly.

### ***Fortnightly refuse attitudes research***

Consultants carried out research into how residents perceived the way that local authorities communicated transition from weekly to fortnightly service. The research had taken the form of 3 diverse focus groups each with 12 people. Ealing and Hounslow were due to move to fortnightly collections over the next year. Resource London had commissioned consumer research to see what householders thought of fortnightly collections and what communications worked with them. There had been a good mixture of participants. The testing showed that people were less interested in the why than the how. They just wanted to be told what they needed to do so that they could get on and do it. The results tied in with Wrap's research. Residents wanted simple non-technical messages.

There had been a certain amount of pushback as residents had perceived that they were having something taken away when they were paying council tax. The results reinforce Recycle Now messaging. Boroughs had found the exercise very useful. Both boroughs had fed back

how incredibly valuable the research had been. The consultants were putting together a short report that could be shared with other London boroughs.

### ***Love Your Clothes***

Resource London had rewritten the Ecap plan to reflect that Resource London had taken over from Zero Waste Scotland and was awaiting feedback from the EU. Resource London had taken over as Zero Waste Scotland couldn't meet the match funding criteria. Resource London would do very little in this area until confirmation had been received from the EU. There would be a launch in Copenhagen.

### ***Charity Fashion Live***

The event would take place again during London fashion week in September as it tied in with the reuse and repair theme and it would include sewing and repair classes. It has anticipated that jumble trail type activity would also take place in September. Resource London also wanted to promote the use of HWRCs on a borough by borough basis.

### ***Love Food Hate Waste***

Resource London had appointed creative agencies to help to develop the LFHW campaign over the next 4 years. Workshops were scheduled to take place on 14, 15 and 16 March testing messaging to inform the roll out of campaign next year. Board members had been invited to attend. Resource London was planning a launch during the week of 16 May 2016.

## **7. Budget 2015-16**

Resource London was predicting a programme underspend for LWARB and Wrap. This was because not all forecasted spend had taken place e.g. LFHW. Also a lot more spend within income generating areas had been predicted. Resource London was now forecasting how to use the underspend. The Wrap underspend would be used during the next financial year and the LWARB underspend had been forecast to be spent in 2017-18 and 2018-19 on communications.

## **8. Programme evaluation and KPIs update**

Resource London had set out a number of KPIs for the programme together with proxy indicators and a reporting timeframe for these. Defra figures for 2014-15 were slightly disappointing as they showed a 0.8% fall in London. Resource London had sent out a briefing at the time with high-level analysis. The analysis was also helping to inform the work of the programme e.g. rented sector. Resource London was talking to Wrap's evaluations team to see what targets could be set for the programme.

## **9. 2016-17 Programme Planning**

Antony explained that the document contained the programme delivery plan for 2016/17 and the individual communication campaign plans beneath. Resource London had used all of the intelligence gathered from local authorities, including meetings and projects and intelligence from the 2020 London Routemap, to inform the programme plan. This had led to amendments to the original plan. The overarching programme objectives remained the same, however, two key amendments had been made. The plan was still linked to Mayor's strategies.

The first amended was that there was no specific high-level focus on flats as flats fitted into the detail of the plan. Also there was the introduction of the word 'quality' in relation to targeting contamination, which is in all types of recycling. The focus would be on quality and quantity to help drive up performance.

Second change was the removal of the focus: *Increasing the quality of dry recycling to maximise income and service performance* to be replaced by a focus on: *restricting residual waste*

The programme focuses are were therefore:

1. Minimising waste produced and maximising reuse;
2. Increasing and improving the capture of unavoidable food waste;
3. Improving the quality and the yield of dry recycling;
4. Restricting residual waste – containment and frequency.

Through out the plan this is also a far greater focus and emphasis on consistency and harmonisation.

The workstreams had also been reduced in number as follows:

- Service review (this still included some income generating activity such as the work carried out by James Fulford);
- Behaviour change and communications;
- Innovation and development – developing Resource London's innovative and research projects together with national opportunities;

The board thought that the plan was very strong. Carolyn liked the up-skilling and recycling content.

Wayne advised that he had negotiated additional places on circular economy acceleration workshops and additional places on the web education course. Local authority officers could be encouraged to apply for these and to become local authority circular economy champions. It would be an opportunity to meet people from other cities and disseminate information through their networks. There were four spaces over 2 years. There were more spaces on the executive education courses and everyone could access the library. It was agreed that it would be a good addition. Resource London could add a sentence on the circular economy and flag training.

Antony talked through the budget including income sources and how best to use these e.g., Ecap and any new opportunities. With regard to the service review budget, Antony pointed out that there was a new element to the workstream called 'service interventions'. This would involve working with the local authorities to identify a need for a service change and looking at investment to support local authorities to make the change (capital investment). In response to Clyde's question, Antony confirmed that, were there future underspend, more spending would

take place in this area. It was also agreed that a line would be added to the plan to show that Resource London was also drawing in funds which was very positive.

The board agreed the programme plan and budget and agreed the recommendations.

### **Recycling for London Plan**

Ali provided an overview of the plan. She advised the board that local authority support drove resident confidence levels, which in turn were linked to recycling rates. In the short-term, there was a need for a PR call-off contract and digital campaign resource to enable Resource London to keep engaging and producing communications and digital content each week. The longer-term approach involved insight and segmentation work to understand behaviour and how best to segment.

Extra resource would enable the introduction of an events and campaign workstream. Ali would develop a plan to partner with 2 to 3 major public events a year e.g., London Marathon. This would involve co-branding, PR, people on the ground, branded gear and bins etc. The target audience would be 18 to 34 year olds. This would also tie into the private rented sector work and transience. Adam suggested linkage to the Mayor's programme of events. Adam agreed to put Ali in touch with the GLA Sponsorship team.

Ali advised that she would be running events at tips. Antony agreed to work up draft plans. The board RfL agreed the budget.

### **10. Any Other Business**

No further business was discussed.

### **11. Date of next meeting.**

To be confirmed.