



Extended Producer Consultation – Draft Response, 25 May 2021

Introduction

Q1 Your Name

BECKIE BENNETT, HEAD OF WASTE AND ENVIRONMENT

Q2 Your email address

beckie.bennett@ryedale.gov.uk

Q3 Which best describes you?

Local government – waste collection authority

Q4 Would you like your response to be confidential?
(Yes/No)

No

Q5 Government will need to understand the needs of users to build digital services for Extended Producer Responsibility. Would you like your contact details to be added to a user panel for Extended Producer Responsibility so that we can invite you to participate in user research (e.g. surveys, workshops and interviews) or to test digital services as they are designed and built?
(Yes/No)

Yes

What we want to achieve – principles, outcomes and targets

Q6 Do you agree or disagree with the proposed framework for setting packaging targets? (P30)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Q7 Do you agree or disagree that the business packaging waste recycling targets set for 2022 should be rolled over to the calendar year 2023? (P32)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.



Q8 Do you agree or disagree that the recycling target to be met by 2030 for aluminium could be higher than the rate in Table 3? (P36)

- a. Agree
- b. Disagree
- c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Q9 Do you agree or disagree with the proposed minimum target to be met by 2030 for glass set out in table 3? (P36)

- a. Agree
- b. Disagree
- c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Q10 What should the glass re-melt target for 2030 for non-bottle packaging be set at? (P37)

Please provide the reason for your response.

Unable to answer/Don't know

Q11 Do you agree or disagree with the proposed minimum target to be met by 2030 for plastic set out in table 3? (P37)

- a. Agree
- b. Disagree
- c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

In principle increasing the target is consistent with the overall objective to increase recycling however to achieve these targets it is essential that there is sorting infrastructure and end market capacity for films and flexibles in the short and medium term in the UK. It is therefore difficult to assess if the proposed target is realistic or not.

Q12 Do you think a higher recycling target should be set for wood in 2030 than the minimum rate shown in Table 3? (P38)

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. Unsure

Please provide the reason for your response.

Q13 If higher recycling targets are to be set for 2030, should a sub-target be set that encourages long term end markets for recycled wood? (P38)

- a. Yes



b. No

c. Unsure

Please provide the reason for your response.

Q14 Do you agree or disagree with the proposed minimum target to be met by 2030 for steel set out in table 3? (P39)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Q15 Do you agree or disagree with the proposed minimum target to be met by 2030 for paper/card set out in table 3? (P39)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Q16 Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to set recycling targets for fibre-based composites? (P41)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Agree in principle to plan to recycle this type of packaging however targets need to be set once evidence/data is available to inform the target setting and should reflect the ability to collect, sort and the availability of end markets.

Q17 Do you agree or disagree that there may be a need for closed loop recycling targets for plastics, in addition to the plastics packaging tax? (P43)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

Please provide the reason for your response.

Q18 Please indicate other packaging material that may benefit from closed loop targets. (P43)

Producer Obligations for Full Net Cost Payments and Reporting

Q19 Do you agree or disagree that Brand Owners are best placed to respond effectively and quickly to incentives that are provided through the scheme? (P50)



a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

- Q20 Are there any situations where the proposed approach to imports would result in packaging being imported into the UK which does not pick up an obligation (except if the importer or first-owner is below the de-minimis, or if the packaging is subsequently exported)? (P51) *Where available, please share evidence to support your view.*

Unanswered question

- Q21 Of Options 2 and 3, which do you think would be most effective at both capturing more packaging in the system and ensuring the smallest businesses are protected from excessive burden? (P54)

a. Option 2

b. Option 3

c. Neither

d. Don't know

If you answered 'neither', please provide the reason for your response and describe any suggestions for alternative approaches to small businesses.

- Q22 If either Option 2 or 3 is implemented, do you consider there to be a strong case to also reduce the de-minimis threshold as set out in Option 1? (P54)

a. Yes

b. No

c. Unsure

Please provide the reason for your response.

If option three is implemented in a manner that is intended, then as outlined in the consultation it should encompass the majority of packaging that would otherwise fall under the de-minimis level. Reducing the de-minimis level, whilst implementing option three, increases the administrative burden on small businesses without increasing the capture of packaging within the obligations.

- Q23 Do you think that Online Marketplaces should be obligated for unfilled packaging in addition to filled packaging? (P56)

a. Yes

b. No

c. Unsure

If you answered 'yes', please provide the reason for your response.



Q24 Do you foresee any issues with Online Marketplaces *not* being obligated for packaging sold through their platforms by UK-based businesses? (P56)

a. Yes

b. No

c. **Unsure**

If you answered 'yes', please provide the reason for your response.

Q25 This proposal will require Online Marketplaces to assess what packaging data they can collate and then, where there are gaps to work together to create a methodology for how they will fill those gaps. Do you think there are any barriers to Online Marketplaces developing a methodology by the start of the 2022 reporting year (January 2022)? (P56)

a. Yes

b. No

c. **Unsure**

If you answered 'yes', please provide the reason for your response.

Q26 Is there any packaging that would not be reported by the obligation as proposed? (except for packaging that is manufactured and sold by businesses who sit below the de-minimis) (P59)

a. Yes

b. No

c. **Unsure**

If you answered 'yes', please detail what packaging would not be reported by this approach.

Q27 Do you agree or disagree that the allocation method should be removed? (P60)

a. **Agree**

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

Producer Disposable Cups Takeback Obligation

Q28 Do you agree or disagree that a mandatory, producer-led takeback obligation should be placed on sellers of filled disposable paper cups? (P67)

a. **Agree**

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response and/or suggest any alternative proposals for increasing the collection and recycling of disposable cups.



Given that the DRS consultation has stated that cups will not be included in that system it makes sense that producer obligations relating to cups are captured under the EPR system to achieve increased recycling or to cover the costs of managing cups that are not captured through takeback arrangements either in business waste or litter.

Q29 Do you agree or disagree with the proposed phased approach to introducing any takeback obligation, with larger businesses/sellers of filled disposable paper cups obligated by the end of 2023, and the obligation extended to all sellers of filled disposable paper cups by the end of 2025? (P67)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please provide a reason for your response and/or how you think the mandatory takeback obligation should be introduced for sellers of filled disposable cups.

It would be less confusing for the public if all implementation dates for the proposed changes are aligned.

Modulated Fees and Labelling

Q30 Do you think that the proposed strategic frameworks will result in a fair and effective system to modulate producer fees being established? (P72)

a. Yes

b. No

c. Unsure

If you answered 'no', please provide the reason for your response being specific with your answer where possible.

Q31 Do you agree or disagree that the Scheme Administrator should decide what measures should be taken to adjust fees if a producer has been unable to self-assess, or provides inaccurate information? This is in addition to any enforcement action that might be undertaken by the regulators. (P75)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Q32 Do you agree or disagree with our preferred approach (Option 1) to implementing mandatory labelling? (P82)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree



If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

A single labelling scheme to ensure consumers are very clear on what they can and cannot recycle is essential and any variations will have the potential to mislead consumers on how to dispose of things which is what happens currently.

The labelling requirements will need to be linked with any requirements in England under the consistent collections policy. Manufacturers will need to be given suitable notice to allow for the lead in times they need to change the packaging design and printing and getting that on their products.

Q33 Do you agree or disagree with the proposal that all producers could be required to use the same 'do not recycle' label? (P82)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Q34 Do you think that the timescales proposed provide sufficient time to implement the new labelling requirements? (P82)

a. Yes

b. No

c. Unsure

If you answered 'no', please provide the reason for your response.

Q35 Do you agree or disagree that the labelling requirement should be placed on businesses who sell unfilled packaging directly to small businesses? (P82)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

The requirement to label packaging needs to be placed at the point in the process where it will be most effective and efficient to do so.

Q36 Do you think it would be useful to have enhancements on labels, such as including 'in the UK' and making them digitally enabled? (P83)

a. Yes

b. No

c. Unsure

If you answered 'yes', please state what enhancements would be useful.



It is important to keep the labelling simple and consistent to ensure consumers are clear on how to dispose of the product. Having digital enabled enhancements could assist the understanding however adding “in the uk” does not seem necessary.

Q37 Do you agree or disagree that local authorities across the UK who do not currently collect plastic films in their collection services should adopt the collection of this material no later than the end of financial year 2026/27? (P85)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response and/or what date you consider local authorities could collect films and flexibles from. Please share any supporting evidence to support your views.

It is agreed that local authorities should extend their collection services to include additional materials wherever practical/possible following a TEEP assessment however the issue is the ability to sort plastic film as this is not currently an option.

There is also a concern over how “films and flexibles” will be presented for collection at the kerbside and the lack of sorting and reprocessing infrastructure to cope with these materials and if this can be in place to meet the proposed timescale.

There will be issues around how these materials are communicated to consumers and this should not be underestimated as ensuring there is good understanding of what is a “film or flexible” will be a challenge.

A completely separately collected stream has implications for vehicle design and transfer station operations that would require greater changes and larger investments. It also impacts on collections efficiency and round configuration and there would need to be a greater understanding of this before widespread collections could be implemented with any certainty of the impact on overall operations.

Q38 Do you agree or disagree that collections of plastic films and flexibles from business premises across the UK could be achieved by end of financial year 2024/5? (P85)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither disagree nor agree

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response and/or what date you consider this could be achieved by. Please share any evidence to support your views.



The points made in response to question 37 are also applicable irrespective of which premises the materials are collected from.

- Q39 Do you think there should be an exemption from the 'do not recycle' label for biodegradable/compostable packaging that is filled and consumed (and collected and taken to composting/anaerobic digestion facilities that accept it), in closed situations where reuse or recycling options are unavailable? (P87)
- a. Agree
 - b. Disagree**
 - c. Neither agree nor disagree
- Please provide the reason for your response.*

If an item of household packaging cannot be collected for recycling through the household waste collection services than it should have a 'do not recycle' label on it.

- Q40 Do you consider that any unintended consequences may arise as a result of the proposed approach to modulated fees for compostable and biodegradable plastic packaging? (P87)
- a. Yes
 - b. No**
 - c. Unsure
- If you answered 'yes', please detail what you think these unintended consequences could be and provide any suggestions for how they may be avoided.*

Payments for Managing Packaging Waste

- Q41 Do you agree or disagree with the proposed definition and scope of necessary costs? (P90)
- a. Agree**
 - b. Disagree
 - c. Neither agree nor disagree
- If you disagree, please detail why and provide any costs you think should be included under the definition of necessary costs.*

There is broad support in the waste industry for the proposed scope of necessary costs. There are a number of areas which need to be considered as part of the necessary costs scope:

- Costs arising from contract changes that are needed as a result of and to deliver the new EPR policies.



- The cost of any changes in tonnages or calorific value as a result of removing recyclables from disposal/recovery that a WDA may incur with their contractor in operating a plant. Both these may be set out as limits in contracts.
- The ongoing costs of communications with residents must be included if the systems local authorities implement are to achieve high capture and low contamination rates. Experience shows that even established collection systems need regular and ongoing communications for them to be effective.
- Possible cost impact for Teckal/contracted out services. There may be a need to unpick roles and duties within contracts to establish what elements relate to packaging collections.
- Risk of non-viable contracts and the appropriate support for local authorities. Risks are surmountable, but consideration needed for timing and cost of interventions.
- Infrastructure changes as a result of EPR implementation will need to be funded. This could be one off capital costs as well as ongoing revenue costs.
- Service changes could have impacts on current costs of collection. Authorities will need to undertake new modelling and route optimisation if new materials are to be collected and these costs should be covered by producers given that it will only be because of EPR and producers need to have these materials collected that he changes will be made.
- Necessary costs may be inflated if all LAs implement service changes at the same time as result of the market reaction to being in strong supply position.
- Relevant enforcement costs will need to form part of necessary costs if local authorities are going to try and ensure residents place the correct materials into the system.

Other questions that need clarification are how necessary costs would be calculated:

- How will we be able to differentiate between costs that a local authority would incur anyway and those incurred as a result of the change mandated?
- How will it be determined and by who, when a contract change is deemed necessary because of EPR implementation?

Q42 Do you agree or disagree that payments should be based on good practice, efficient and effective system costs and relevant peer benchmarks? (P96)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please detail any issues you think there are with this approach and how you think payments should instead be calculated.

Without having had time to fully consider the related aspects of the consistent collections consultation it is difficult to form a full assessment of this proposal with regards to English local authorities.



There are potential issues regarding what is deemed “a cost effective and efficient” service and it could be a means by which producers will not have to pay full net costs. There may be value in establishing a theoretical reference cost for each individual local authority as a benchmark. But again, a model will never truly be able to calculate real world costs so there should be no financial penalties for an authority that is not achieving a predicted cost profile for very valid reasons. Rather, support and assistance could be offered to understand why that might be happening and if anything can be done to improve it.

LARAC is concerned that application of a set of standards against which payment can be made or withheld is not then seeing the UK implementing the producer pays principle, proper producer responsibility or full net cost recovery. Whilst LARAC can see merits in the grouping together of local authorities and even the calculation of a reference cost these should not be used as a level above which payments will not be made. They can be useful in understanding the service needs in a certain area and may help outline where resources could be targeted on communications and other work. There also needs to be a degree of flexibility in minimum standards that does allow for some of the legitimate differences in some authorities that might have operating environments that call for “nonstandard” systems.

After a decade of budget cuts local authorities have for years now been finding ways of making their services as efficient as possible. It will be rare that a service in an area is operating in an inefficient manner.

LARAC members have raised concern regarding the six groupings that were originally proposed and if they are wide enough to allow for legitimate differences that impact on cost. For example, it could be an urban area in the north of England is in the same group as a London Borough based on the deprivation index cited, but the costs of employing drivers, collectors etc will be vastly different. So, there will be a wide range of service costs within one group. There are also regional variations across the devolved nations within the UK and the often-higher costs of disposal in these parts of the UK due to a lack of reprocessing infrastructure should be factored into any benchmarking analysis too.

LARAC understands the concept of having groupings for benchmarking purposes but feels that more work needs to be done to form a view on the appropriate number of groups and the criteria by which a group is determined. Local authorities will need confidence in the formation of any groupings and there will also need to be a suitable appeals process for local authorities who believe they have been placed in an incorrect grouping.

There have been particular concerns raised by WDA LARAC members about the scale, size and historical nature of disposal and treatment contracts, meaning they



could be less likely to meet a theoretical benchmark cost. There are also concerns about the potential short length of any transition period to move to a benchmarked service cost.

There is a general feeling that 9 groupings are still too small to adequately reflect the genuine differences that exist across UK local authorities and so will result in too many local authorities' actual costs differing from the group benchmark costs. Local authorities will need confidence in the process of establishing the family groups and how each authority is assigned to them. For example, how will the differences between a London borough and a large city borough in the north reflect the differences in rates of pay etc when all other aspects may place them in the same family group?

LARAC members were strongly of the view that six family groupings were too small and would result in too many local authorities unable to achieve the benchmark cost for their group and so not receiving their full net costs.

LARAC members have raised concerns about how "efficient and effective" is determined and by who. If this is down to the Scheme Administrator what plans have been developed for any sort of appeals process where local authorities have good cause to dispute the decision that has been made?

Whilst LARAC understands the complexities involved in any payment system, one based on modelled costs and groupings will always mean some authorities are not receiving the costs they would reasonably expect to. Therefore, LARAC strongly recommends that a move from a system of modelled costs to a system of actual costs is planned and implemented by 2028 at the latest.

If local authorities knew that they would be moving to a system of actual cost payments, they would be more likely to accept a modelled costs payments system when EPR is first implemented in 2023.

Q43 Do you agree or disagree that the per tonne payment to local authorities for packaging materials collected and sorted for recycling should be net of an average price per tonne for each material collected? (P99)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please detail how material value should be netted-off a local authority's payment.

Material Income



LARAC and other local authority organisations have been consistent throughout stakeholder meetings and representation that payments to local authorities should be gross and not have any material income netted off. LARAC believes that the producers are best placed to maximise the income from the sale of materials and so will achieve overall lower compliance costs by taking responsibility for material sales.

LARAC believes that the sounding board was of the opinion also that the producers should take the responsibility for material income. LARAC therefore disputes the assertion in the consultation document that Defra are taking the advice of the sounding board in proposing that local authorities retain material income.

In a survey of LARAC members the majority of respondents state that the Scheme Administrator should be responsible for material income, as is proposed for the DMO in the DRS consultation.

This is an aspect of the system where producers can bring their commercial expertise to play to maximise the value of the material provided to them. LARAC strongly disagrees with the concept of payments being net of material income.

Local authorities are poorly placed to deal with the market fluctuations that occur with material prices and their budgets have suffered as result of such market volatility in the past. Having the surety of EPR payments on a gross basis covering actual costs will enable local authorities to provide consistent levels of service provision. It will also make the payments system from the scheme administrator to local authorities much simpler and efficient without having to calculate and net off material income that will vary payment to payment.

LARAC members have expressed significant concerns about how netting off income will work where material is handled by a third party, such as a waste management company. Given this is the majority of cases there is concern about how much of the income is and will be passed back to local authorities and this then means they are losing out compared to a gross payment system.

In the event that local authorities keep responsibility for material income (which LARAC does not support) LARAC members have indicated that the income should be based on actual values and not any reference values. The use of reference values further erodes the concept of full net cost recovery within the system.

Tonnage Payment

LARAC understands the reasoning behind a per tonne payment and this appears to make sense as long as the payment reflects the actual cost per tonne that the authority incurs in collecting the packaging material.



There is a lack of detail about whether the payments will be set at different per tonne rates for different packaging materials and if there will be different rates for different collection methods.

LARAC would support different payment rates based on the different collections systems (i.e. kerbside sort, twin stream, co-mingled) to allow for the variations that exist at present and ensure local authorities retain the ability to implement the best collection systems for their area and circumstances. There also needs to be consideration to schemes that collect from flats and communal premises as these will have a different cost profile from “standard” kerbside systems. Payments rates for these types of collections will need building into the payment system.

Q44 Do you agree or disagree that the Scheme Administrator should have the ability to apply incentive adjustments to local authority payments to drive performance and quality in the system? (P101)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please detail why you think the ability to apply an incentive adjustment should not apply.

Whilst LARAC agrees with the principle, it would depend on how the incentive was designed and applied as to whether LARAC members would support it or not.

The whole issue of quality is subjective and will need a great deal of work to enable a clear and objective definition to be agreed upon. At present there are comingled systems that are delivering paper and glass to end markets. To the end markets they are supplying, those collections are providing quality material and so there needs to be a better understanding of quality and how it is to be defined. In a drive to push material to the highest perceived quality possible we may be in danger of cutting off viable end markets for closed loop applications that are more cost effective.

These payments need to be seen as genuine incentives and not placed almost as penalties on those authorities that collect in a manner which is effective and efficient for their areas and circumstances. Any incentives would also need to take account of the nature and operations that differing local authorities have. What might be an incentive for one authority might not be for another.

Areas with high numbers of flats and communal premises may need incentives bespoke to them. Getting low contamination is much more challenging and so these areas may need higher levels of incentive and must not be penalised for the challenges that they face.



The incentives will also need to be made at a level that makes it worth the while of the local authority to provide additional services. If their costs are not covered then there would be little reason for them in doing anything different.

The system will need to have in place as suitable review or appeals process within it. This would enable the Scheme Administrator to be challenged if it was reasonably felt they incentive system they were putting in place appeared unfair in some aspect.

Q45 Do you agree or disagree that local authorities should be given reasonable time and support to move to efficient and effective systems and improve their performance before incentive adjustments to payments are applied? (P101)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

There are potentially some significant changes that local authorities will have to make to implement EPR policies. There may well be capacity issues within the waste industry and associated sectors such as collection vehicle and container supply.

Each local authority will have a set of circumstances that will influence their ability to change and the speed at which that change can take place. This must be taken into account in terms of the support and time they are given to make the required changes.

Q46 Should individual local authorities be guaranteed a minimum proportion of their waste management cost regardless of performance? (P101)

a. Yes

b. No

c. Unsure

Please provide the reason for your response.

Governments cannot claim to be implementing producer responsibility or the polluter pays principle if the full net costs of collection are being withheld.

If a local authority is making the efforts to increase performance to the desired level, then they should receive a guaranteed minimum payment.

Guaranteed levels would also greatly assist local authority in their budget planning and setting.



Minimum levels of payment would also help take account of the authorities that are at the edges of their family group and so may find it more difficult to achieve the benchmarked performance for that group.

In the absence of legislation which allows enforcement of recycling, local authorities are limited in what they can achieve and so should not be penalised if residents and business in their area do not comply and hence they cannot achieve expected performance.

Q47 Do you agree or disagree that there should be incentive adjustments or rewards to encourage local authorities to exceed their modelled recycling benchmarks? (P101)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please detail why you think incentive adjustments should not be applied to encourage local authorities to exceed their recycling performance benchmarks?

If producer responsibility is to mean just that then if a local authority performs well and better than a model suggests, then they should receive the full net costs involved in achieving those levels.

If a local authority is exceeding the level of benchmarked performance, then they are already likely to be receiving a higher level of payment.

Additional funding should perhaps therefore be aimed at those authorities that for legitimate reasons are not achieving the desired level of performance. For funds to be made available to do that funding cannot be taken from other authorities' full net cost payments.

There is likely to be a role for funding or incentives that promotes innovation and allows collection trials and experiments to take place that could lead to increases in recycling or efficiencies in collection.

Q48 Do you agree or disagree that unallocated payments should be used to help local authorities meet their recycling performance benchmarks, and contribute to Extended Producer Responsibility outcomes through wider investment and innovation, where it provides value for money? (P102)

a. Agree

b. Disagree



c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please detail how you think any unallocated payments to local authorities should be used.

LARAC believes that a fundamental aspect of EPR is that of “full net cost” being applied to dealing with packaging throughout its whole life. If local authorities are receiving their full net costs, then there should not be unallocated payments and so LARAC is concerned that there is a plan for unallocated payments within a full net cost system.

Any modelling of performance is hypothetical and is just a model that will be informed by assumptions. This means it will underplay performance in some instances and overplay it in others. Local authorities should receive their full net costs regardless of their performance. A suitable system should then be introduced that would assist in increasing performance of recycling levels for all authorities, whether their rate is considered high or not.

If a system did exist where there were producer funds available after full net costs have been met, then these funds should be used to help local authorities try and achieve performance benchmarks in the first instance.

Therefore, LARAC supports the principle of supporting local authorities meet their recycling performance benchmarks and contribute to Extended Producer Responsibility outcomes through wider investment and innovation. However, LARAC does not support this being funded through unallocated payments as LARAC fundamentally disagrees that a full net cost payment system should have unallocated funds built into it.

Q49 Do you agree or disagree that residual payments should be calculated using modelled costs of efficient and effective systems based on the average composition of packaging waste within the residual stream? (P103)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please detail how you think residual waste payments should instead be calculated.

There are potential issues regarding what is deemed an “efficient” service and it could be a means by which producers will not have to pay full net costs. LARAC strongly disagrees with this concept. There may be value in establishing a theoretical reference cost for each individual local authority as a benchmark. But again, a model will never truly be able to calculate real world costs so there should be no financial penalties for an authority that is not achieving a predicted cost profile for very valid



reasons. Rather, support and assistance could be offered to understand why that might be happening and if anything can be done to improve it.

The vast majority of local authority residual disposal services are undertaken by a third party under contract and so have been subject to market forces and competition. Also, after a decade of budget cuts local authorities have for years now been finding ways of making their services as efficient as possible. It will be rare that a service in an area is operating in an inefficient manner.

Whilst the use of compositional analysis makes sense, it needs to be done at levels that allow and take account of the various regional and socio-economic differences that impact on local authorities across the UK. As stated in relation to collection costs, LARAC does not believe that six family groups are wide enough to take account of the level of differences that exist.

Where the residual payment relates to the disposal aspect of packaging there are concerns that modelling will need to be done to a more detailed level than six or nine family groups. Disposal contracts and costs can be influenced by a variety of external factors that the family grouping system may not accommodate. Contracts tend to be let for longer periods so there will be more historical influences relating to disposal contracts that the potential family grouping system would not pick up on and take account of.

LARAC would therefore strongly urge that disposal payments take a different approach to the modelling and family group benchmark approach. With a lot fewer disposal authorities in the UK than there are collection authorities this should be reasonable exercise and system to implement by the time payments are due to start in October 2023. Any additional work involved in this, such as waste compositional analysis, would need to be funded through producer payments.

Q50 Do you agree or disagree that a disposal authority within a two-tier authority area (England only) should receive the disposal element of the residual waste payment directly? (P103)

- a. Agree
- b. Disagree
- c. Neither agree nor disagree

Q51 Do you agree or disagree that there remains a strong rationale for making producers responsible for the costs of managing packaging waste produced by businesses? (P109)

- a. Agree
- b. Disagree
- c. Neither agree nor disagree



If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Including packaging waste produced by businesses would help to achieve national recycling targets as well as delivering wider environmental and carbon benefits.

Increased home working because of the Covid pandemic has diverted some waste packaging from businesses to domestic disposal systems. Including packaging waste produced by businesses would allow local authorities to provide efficient and effective collections to businesses utilising the infrastructure provided for household packaging waste management helping to reduce the collection cost for producers, the associated carbon impacts and helping drive the change to packaging that is easily recycled.

Q52 Do you agree or disagree that all commercial and industrial packaging should be in scope of the producer payment requirements except where a producer has the necessary evidence that they have paid for its management directly? (P111)

- a. Agree
- b. Disagree
- c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Q53 Which approach do you believe is most suited to deliver the outcomes being sought in paragraph 8.84? (P115)

- a. Option 1
- b. Option 2
- c. Option 3
- d. All could work

e. I do not know enough to provide a view

Q54 Do you disagree strongly with any of the approaches above? (P115)

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. Unsure

If you answered 'yes', please explain which and provide your reason.

LARAC has concerns regarding the operation and management of all three options as they are presented and with the limited detail available.

Initial feedback from LARAC members is that option three is the least desirable and would be the most difficult for local authority trade waste services to implement.



It must be remembered that when added together local authority trade waste services have a large market share, but that it is made up of a large number of small businesses. This means lots of business customers and the associated invoicing and customer services that are needed to back the collections up.

At present the consultation proposals seem to have a rather simplistic and main focus on medium and large businesses that would be expected to have standard regular collections and the space to house a variety of containers. This is not representative of the standard local authority trade waste customer. They may often have bags collections two or three times a week and little space to store or segregate waste prior to collection.

It should also be noted that local authorities will often be sub contracted on behalf of a private waste firm as that firm does not operate in the area but has customers in a local authority area as a result of regional or national waste contracts with bigger businesses.

Q55 Do you think there will be any issues with not having either Packaging Recovery Notes/Packaging Export Recovery Notes or the business payment mechanism (and as a result recycling targets) in place for a short period of time? (P119)

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. **Unsure**

If you answered 'yes', please detail what issues you think there will be.

Q56 Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to introduce a sampling regime for packaging waste as an amendment to the MF Regulations in England, Wales and Scotland and incorporation into new or existing regulations in Northern Ireland? (P123)

- a. Agree
- b. Disagree
- c. **Neither agree nor disagree**

If you disagree, please detail why you think the proposed sampling regime for packaging waste should not be incorporated as an amendment to MF Regulations in England, Wales and Scotland and incorporated into new or existing regulations in Northern Ireland?

Q57 Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to require all First Points of Consolidation to be responsible for sampling and reporting in accordance with a new packaging waste sampling and reporting regime? (P124)

- a. Agree



b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please detail who you think should be required to meet the packaging sampling and reporting regime for Extended Producer Responsibility purposes?

Q58 Do you agree or disagree that the existing MF Regulations' de-minimis threshold of facilities that receive 1000 tonnes or more per annum of mixed waste material would need to be removed or changed to capture all First Points of Consolidation? (P124)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please detail why you think a de-minimis threshold is required.

It should be recognised that the costs of sampling of smaller facilities will be proportionally bigger than for large MRFs and that the full costs of sampling will need to be covered by producer payments.

Q59 Do you think the above list of materials and packaging formats should form the basis for a manual sampling protocol? (P126)

a. Yes

b. No

c. Unsure

If you answered 'no', what other materials, format categories or level of separation should be included as part of the manual sampling protocol?

It may be advantageous to include materials that may fall within EPR in the future, such as film and flexibles. It might also help to include disposal paper cups as one way in which the performance of in store takeback can be assessed.

Q60 Do you think it is feasible to implement more rigorous sampling arrangements, as suggested above, within 6-12 months of the regulations being in place? (P126)

a. Yes

b. No

c. Unsure

If you answered 'no', please provide the reason for your response and detail what should be considered in determining an appropriate implementation period.

While LARAC believes it is feasible within 12 months, this would depend on the level of sampling required and any changes needed at sorting sites to accommodate the new sampling regime.



Q61 Do you think visual detection technology should be introduced from 2025 to further enhance the sampling regime? (P127)

a. Yes

b. No

c. **Unsure**

If you answered 'no', please detail why you think it should not be considered as a medium to long-term method of sampling?

Any systems and technology that make the sampling regime both more effective and more efficient should be explored and introduced if they are cost effective.

There will need to be proof that the level of accuracy and performance is to a consistent and acceptable level before it is introduced. The impacts on possible sorting capacity and through put will also need to be considered.

Q62 Do you think existing packaging proportion protocols used by reprocessors would provide a robust and proportionate system to estimate the packaging content of source segregated materials? (P128)

a. Yes

b. **Yes, with refinement**

c. No

d. Unsure

If you answered 'no', please detail why you think these would not be suitable to use to determine the packaging content in source segregated material.

Source segregated material in this instance would need clearer definition. For example, nearly all source segregation collections have mixed cans and plastics which need further sorting and so will probably need to undergo some sort of sampling as well.

Q63 Do you agree or disagree that minimum output material quality standards should be set for sorted packaging materials at a material facility? (P128)

a. **Agree**

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Whilst LARAC agrees with the principle of setting output material quality standards, they need to be carefully designed. They should not be used by reprocessors as a means to pass elements of their costs down the chain to MRFs and collectors. It may be unrealistic in some circumstances for material to be presented to reprocessors as they would ideally want it.

There have been examples where reprocessors have pushed for providers to supply materials at a higher quality than they need, even though they have processes in



place to take material of a different composition. It needs to be recognised that there are many markets for the same materials, and they can all have a role to play in increasing recycling levels of packaging and it is not just the perceived “high quality” end markets that all material should aim for, as this is unrealistic and not viable.

Q64 Do you agree or disagree that material facilities that undertake sorting prior to sending the material to a reprocessor or exporter should have to meet those minimum standards in addition to just assessing and reporting against them? (P129)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Q65 Do you think any existing industry grades and standards could be used as minimum output material quality standards? (P129)

a. Yes

b. No

c. Unsure

If you answered ‘yes’, please provide evidence of standards you think would be suitable for use as minimum output material standards.

Q66 Do you agree or disagree that local authority payments should be made quarterly, on a financial year basis? (P132)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response and/or suggest any alternative proposals.

Q67 Do you agree or disagree that household and business packaging waste management payments should be based on previous year’s data? (P132)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please provide any concerns you have with the proposed approach and/or any alternative proposals.

Litter Payments



Q68 Do you agree or disagree that the costs of litter management should be borne by the producers of commonly littered items based on their prevalence in the litter waste stream as determined by a composition analysis which is described in option 2? (P137)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response and/or provide an alternative approach to litter management costs being based on a commonly littered basis.

Compositional analysis will need take account of season variations and variations in daytime/night-time economies in certain areas. There are also areas that might be affected by events more than others in relation to litter so these aspects would need to be factored into any calculations on producer obligations.

Q69 In addition to local authorities, which of the following duty bodies do you agree should also receive full net cost payments for managing littered packaging? Selecting multiple options is allowed. (P140)

a. Other duty bodies

b. Litter authorities

c. Statutory undertakers

d. None of the above

e. Any other(s) - please specify.

Options a-c are unclear in their definition which is why LARAC has selected "other". Feedback at workshops held for LARAC members was that if full net costs payments were extended beyond local authorities it should only be to bodies that have a statutory duty to clear litter from publicly accessible land.

There was some concern expressed about whether voluntary litter picks would look to access payments as well under the EPR scheme. It was generally felt by LARAC members that voluntary group payments, if applicable, were best suited to being made by local authorities from the payments they receive under EPR as part of the wider litter management responsibilities of local authorities.

Q70 Do you agree or disagree that producers should contribute to the costs of litter prevention and management activities on other land? (P140)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.



There would need to be a clear definition of what comes under “other land”. There would also need to be distinction between littering and fly tipping.

Q71 Do you agree or disagree that local authority litter payments should be linked to improved data reporting? (P141)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please detail why you think litter payments should not be linked to improved data reporting.

The use of improved data is supported however the process for collecting that data must be efficient and be able to be applied consistently across all local authority areas. It also needs to be designed in such a way that does not disadvantage or advantage any particular type of local authority or certain attributes.

It can be difficult to record exactly what items and materials have been littered when it is mixed in with other things. There also needs to be a clear definition between litter and fly tipping to ensure consistent reporting.

Therefore, more detail is need on the level of reporting, the systems involved and the process for collating data before a more informed view can be taken on this aspect of EPR policy.

There needs to be balance between improved data reporting and the costs and efforts associated with collecting, processing and collating it. It is important to remember that packaging, whilst a litter problem, is not the sole element of litter and so EPR litter payments will only relate to a proportion of litter costs.

Q72 Do you agree or disagree that payments should be linked to standards of local cleanliness over time? (P141)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

LARAC members have voiced concern over this proposal. Some local authorities, or areas within local authorities, can experience higher levels of litter that the local authority only has so much power to influence. Any system of payments linked to cleanliness would need to take this sort of situation into account and this might make it overly complex as a result.



Local authorities have control over what they clear up, when and how they clear up litter but little to no control in whether an item is littered in the first place. This requires a big change in public behaviour. There are some very good communications and behaviour change campaigns and groups that have been working on this for a number of years, yet littering is still a problem. To then expect local authorities to change citizen behaviour is unrealistic without potentially radical new measures and policies in place, over and above those outlined in EPR.

The issue of the cost involved in monitoring and reporting standards has also been raised by LARAC members and these would need to be included within the litter payments.

In the past, as part of the Best Value Performance Indicator (BVPI) system local authorities used to monitor and report on cleanliness standards (BVPI 199). This was timely to do and also contained a large element of subjectivity. Whilst this might have been acceptable for performance standards, when there are payments linked to this there would need to be a much more robust process in place and LARAC has concerns that such a system can be implemented.

As stated in other answers, packaging is only a portion of all litter and so this process, if instigated, would need to be able to differentiate between packaging cleanliness standards and non-packaging cleanliness standards.

There is not enough detail to support this proposal. There could be support for payments linked to cleanliness if the detail of how this would be done and to what extent was known. Such a system would need to take account of the points made above and be reasonable and fair for each local authority area and not used as a means by which producer funds could be held back from local authorities, thereby reducing producer costs.

Scheme Administration and Governance

Q73 Do you agree or disagree that the functions relating to the management of producer obligations in respect of household packaging waste and litter including the distribution of payments to local authorities are managed by a single organisation? (P147)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

Q74 Overall which governance and administrative option do you prefer? (P147)

a. Option 1

b. Option 2

c. Neither option 1 nor option 2



Please provide the reason for your response.

The creation of a central body allows for strategic oversight that could be beneficial to developing end markets, collection, better packaging design and higher recycling.

Local authorities would only be dealing with one organisation so there are no procurement or contracting issues. It therefore has a level of simplicity and clarity that local authorities believe would be very beneficial not just to them but the system as a whole. The fact that this model reduces the need to issue evidence and so cuts out the market aspect and trading is again a move to a simpler system that should be a benefit to producers and others. Other market areas and activities can bring about efficiencies for producers meeting their obligations.

LARAC members were strong in their desire to see local government involved in the governance of the single body and that it would not be just a purely producer managed organisation. LARAC supports this view as we believe it will strengthen the relationships between producers and local authorities and enable the single body to have insight into local authority operations that will aid its decision making and efficient use of funds.

Option 1 also ensures that local authorities who collect trade waste will have certainty that they will receive payments from one organisation. A concern for local authorities regarding option 2 is that they will receive payments for household waste from the single body but payments for household like (trade) from a variety of compliance schemes.

LARAC members have highlighted some general principles and ways of working that they believe should be present regardless of the model selected.

- Any model must avoid the evidence stockpiling and profiteering that we have witnessed under the current system.
- The model must have the concept of full net cost recovery at its heart and so suitable level of funds must be captured from producers to ensure full costs flow back out to those collecting the materials.
- The systems within a model relating to “evidence” and payments must be as simple and transparent as possible. Local authorities do not want to see a whole industry created through implementing EPR but appreciate there do need to be robust systems in place and appropriate auditing of these.
- The model chosen should not introduce undue burdens on local authorities, especially if these are then not included in the funding.
- The cashflow is critical to local authorities: a system whereby they get too far in arrears is not feasible.



There cannot be a situation where there is a shortfall in the funds producers pay into the costs of local authorities.

If for any reason option two were to go forward, LARAC would expect to see payments to local authorities for both household waste and household like waste administered by the single body. Having a disjointed system whereby local authorities have payments for household waste from a single body and payments for household like from compliance schemes will add inefficiency to the system and increase administrative costs and account management costs to local authorities which they may not be able to get back under producer payments.

Q75 How do you think in-year cost uncertainty to producers could be managed? (P149)

- a. A reserve fund
- b. In-year adjustments to fees
- c. Giving individual producers flexibility to choose between options 1) and 2)
- d. No preference
- e. Need more information to decide

Q76 Under Option 1, does the proposed initial contract period of 8-10 years (2023 to 2030/32) provide the necessary certainty for the Scheme Administrator to adopt a strategic approach to the management and delivery of its functions and make the investments necessary to deliver targets and outcomes? (P150)

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. Unsure

If you answered 'no', please detail what you think would be an appropriate contract length.

Q77 Under Option 2, does the proposed initial contract period of 8-10 years (2023 to 2030/32) provide the necessary certainty for the Scheme Administrator to adopt a strategic approach to the management and delivery of its functions and make the investments necessary to deliver targets and outcomes? (P150)

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. Unsure

If you answered 'no', please detail what you think would be an appropriate contract length.

Although it should be noted that LARAC does not support option 2.

Q78 Do you agree or disagree with the timeline proposed for the appointment of the Scheme Administrator? (P153)



a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Whilst LARAC agrees with the ambition of the timetable, it is still challenging and also leaves several challenges for the Scheme Administrator after it is appointed to meet the longer timetable for collecting producer fees and starting local authority payments.

Q79 If the Scheme Administrator is appointed in January 2023 as proposed, would it have sufficient time to mobilise in order to make payments to local authorities from October 2023? (P153)

a. Yes

b. No - from workshop one

c. Unsure

If you answered 'no', please provide the reason for your response.

This is an ambitious mobilisation timescale which may not be achievable and the process for claiming payments needs to be understood, with any additional costs incurred needing to be included in the EPR payments.

Q80 Do you agree or disagree with the approval criteria proposed for compliance schemes? (P156)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.

Q81 Should Government consider introducing a Compliance Scheme Code of Practice and/or a 'fit and proper person' test? (P156)

a. A Compliance Scheme Code of Practice

b. A 'fit and proper person' test for operators of compliance schemes

c. Both

d. Neither

e. Unsure

Please provide the reason for your response.

Q82 Do you agree or disagree with the proposed reporting requirements for Option 1? (P157)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree



- Q83 Do you agree or disagree with the proposed reporting requirements for Option 2? (P157)
- a. Agree
 - b. Disagree
 - c. Neither agree nor disagree

Reprocessors and Exporters

- Q84 Do you agree or disagree with the proposal that all reprocessors and exporters handling packaging waste will be required to register with a regulator? (P164)
- a. Agree
 - b. Disagree
 - c. Neither agree nor disagree
- If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response and detail any exemptions to the registration requirement that should apply.*

- Q85 Do you agree or disagree that all reprocessors and exporters should report on quality and quantity, of packaging waste received? (P164)
- a. Agree
 - b. Disagree
 - c. Neither agree nor disagree

There needs to be clearly defined and real-life approach to quality measurement and not an excuse to try and gold plate material standards that has the impact of pushing costs down the chain where they cannot be met or recovered. The measurement of quality needs to take into account the variety of end markets and applications accessible to packaging materials.

- Q86 What challenges would there be in reporting on the quality of packaging waste received at the point of reprocessing and/or export? (P164)
- Please provide specific detail on any processes, measures and/or costs that would be necessary to address these challenges.*

Reporting accurately on quality and quantity of packaging is key to ensuring the success of the scheme and flow of payments. Robust systems will need to be put in place in order that this is achieved.

- Q87 Do you think contractual arrangements between reprocessors and material facilities or with waste collectors and carriers are a suitable means for facilitating the apportionment and flow of recycling data back through the system to support Extended Producer Responsibility payment mechanisms, incentives and targets? (P164)
- a. Yes



b. No

c. Unsure

If you answered 'no', please provide the reason for your response and suggest any alternative proposals for using the quantity and quality data reported to support payments, incentives and targets.

There are likely to be different data needs and systems in place under the EPR scheme than there are now. The current contact arrangements may not be sufficient to provide the levels of reporting that are expected. Any data systems that are brought in to meet EPR requirements will need to have their costs, implementation and ongoing, covered by producer payments.

Q88 Do you agree or disagree that exporters should be required to provide evidence that exported waste has been received and processed by an overseas reprocessor? (P165)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please detail why you think exporters should not have to provide this evidence.

Q89 Do you agree or disagree that only packaging waste that has achieved end of waste status should be able to be exported and count towards the achievement of recycling targets? (P165)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please detail why you think it would not be necessary for waste to meet end of waste status prior to export.

Q90 Do you agree or disagree that there should be a mandatory requirement for exporters to submit fully completed Annex VII forms, contracts and other audit documentation as part of the supporting information when reporting on the export of packaging waste? (P165)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please detail why you think these additional registration requirements on exporters are not required.

Q91 Do you agree or disagree that regulators seek to undertake additional inspections of receiving sites, via 3rd party operators? (P165)

a. Agree

b. Disagree



c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please detail why you think it would not be necessary to undertake additional inspections and provide any alternative arrangements which could be implemented.

Compliance and Enforcement

Q92 Do you agree or disagree with the proposed approach to regulating the packaging Extended Producer Responsibility system? (P169)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please detail any perceived problem or issues with the proposed regulation of the system and provide comments on how the system could be regulated more effectively.

There is a concern that the regulators will not have the resources needed to undertake these new inspection and enforcement duties. Thought needs to be given as to how the right level of resources can be provided to ensure the system is suitably regulated.

Q93 Do you have further suggestions on what environmental regulators should include in their monitoring and inspection plans that they do not at present? (P169)

No

Q94 In principle, what are your views if the regulator fees and charges were used for enforcement? (P171)

Agreed

Q95 Would you prefer to see an instant monetary penalty for a non-compliance, or another sanction as listed in 12.26, such as prosecution? (P171)

Sanctions need to be relevant to the action that has triggered them and set at a level that acts as a deterrent. Regulators may need a suite of sanctions at their disposal within the EPR system.

Implementation Timeline

Q96 Do you agree or disagree with the activities that the Scheme Administrator would need to undertake in order to make initial payments to local authorities in 2023 (as described above under Phase 1)? (P176)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

If you disagree, please provide the reason for your response.



Q97 Do you think a phased approach to the implementation of packaging Extended Producer Responsibility, starting in 2023 is feasible and practical? (P176)

a. Yes

b. No

c. **Unsure**

If you answered 'no', please provide the reason for your response and detail any practical issues with the proposed approach.

The timescales for implementation are very challenging and may be unachievable.

Q98. Do you prefer a phased approach to implementing Extended Producer Responsibility starting in 2023 with partial recovery of the costs of managing packaging waste from households or later implementation, which could enable full cost recovery for household packaging waste from the start? (P176)

a. Phased approach starting in 2023

b. **Later implementation**

c. Unsure

Please provide the reason for your response.

The timeline for having a phased approach in 2023 is challenging therefore a later implementation date would seek to ensure that full cost recovery producer payments were actually made from the outset of the new regime.

Q99 Of the options presented for reporting of packaging data for 2022 which do you prefer? (P179)

a. Option 1

b. **Option 2**

c. Neither

If you answered 'neither', please suggest an alternative approach.

Whilst LARAC has indicated a preference for option 2 as we believe this is the most complete reporting method, there is a concern that by doing this there could be over reporting of self-managed waste in order to reduce producer payment levels. LARAC would want assurances on behalf of its members that a rigorous compliance and review process was in place that mitigated against this risk and ensured accurate reporting of packaging data.

Q100 Are there other data required to be reported by producers in order for the Scheme Administrator to determine the costs to be paid by them in 2023? (P179)

a. Yes



b. No

c. Unsure

If you answered 'yes', please detail which datasets will be needed.

Annex One

Q101 Which of the definitions listed above most accurately defines reusable packaging and could be applied to possible future reuse/refill targets or obligations in regulations. (P187)

a. Definition in The Packaging (Essential Requirements) 2015

b. Definition in The Packaging and Packaging Waste Directive (PPWD)

c. Definition adopted by The UK Plastic Pact/The Ellen MacArthur Foundation

d. None of the above

If you think none of these definitions accurately define reuse/refillable packaging please provide the reason for your response, including any suggestions of alternative definitions for us to consider.

Q102 Do you have any views on the above listed approaches, or any alternative approaches, for setting reuse and refill targets and obligations? (P189)
Please provide evidence where possible to support your views.

LARAC would support measures that increase the amount and use of refillable and reusable packaging. These measures need to be considered in relation to the possible impacts on the packaging that might then be displaced from the current collection systems and how this affects their operation and efficiency.

Q103 Do you agree or disagree that the Scheme Administrator should proactively fund the development and commercialisation of reuse systems? (P189)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

Please provide the reason for your response.

With reuse standing above recycling in the waste hierarchy, it is appropriate that reuse systems are explored and expanded. This must be done on the basis that they create environmental benefits and embrace the underlying principles of the circular economy.

Q104 Do you agree or disagree that the Scheme Administrator should look to use modulated fees to incentivise the adoption of reuse and refill packaging systems? (P189)

a. Agree

b. Disagree

c. Neither agree nor disagree

Please provide the reason for your response.