

### 1. Introductions

- Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), Jacobs, Environment Agency (EA) – see end of document for attendee list.
- Local Authority (LA) representatives and WDF users – see end of document for attendee list.

### 2. Actions from last meeting

1. Most actions were complete from the November 2015 meeting. Any outstanding actions were relating to Q100 and would be picked up later in the meeting.

### 3. Update from Defra

2. Karen Bradley (Defra) provided an update on the proposed move to report fly-tipping data in WDF, currently captured in Flycapture. The update was to say the Flycapture system will close down at the end of July and local authorities will be required to report fly-tipping through WDF from October 2015. As the start of the development work was delayed, Defra said that local authorities can enter their Q2 data up to the end of December 2015 (extended deadline). Karen (Defra) is to update local authorities with notice of the move.

- **Action point 1: Defra**

### 4. Update from Jacobs

3. Timeliness of reporting – Jacobs mentioned that timeliness of reporting is increasingly becoming an issue. This has been raised previously and is a known issue that is related to resourcing in the main, based on LA feedback. Local authorities are reporting data later in the reporting period and more returns are coming in towards the end of the period which impacts on the WDF Helpdesk resources. It was stressed to authorities that timeliness is important and it can have an effect on the national statistics Defra produce. The authorities asked for the importance of timeliness of returns to be written into the WDF guidance.

- **Action point 2: Defra and Jacobs. LAs to feed back regarding FlyCapture and any potential points to raise.**

4. Data recording queries (other than those specific to Q100) – No other queries were raised.

5. BVPI and NI comparator calculations – Jacobs mentioned after the advent of Q100 these comparators were developed. They are intended to only be a 'like for like' comparison and Jacobs asked authorities for feedback. It was noted that some authorities had used the comparators and for some authorities there were noticeable changes to what figures were presented in the comparators pre-Q100. Jacobs advised that this was to be expected to some extent, due to the differences in the data recorded in Qu100 and the old calculations not being precisely replicable. LA

feedback was that it was important that the comparator calculations were maintained for the continued use of National indicators and Performance indicators by LAs even though they are not used at a national level. Jacobs asked for those authorities to get in touch with the WDF Helpdesk to look into the data further. Jacobs are aware of other authorities who have raised queries over 'process loss' and have alerted Defra. Defra are currently looking into these queries.

- **Action point 3: Defra and Jacobs. LAs to feed back regarding comparators.**

6. Dwelling stock figures – Jacobs provided an update to the meeting regarding the delayed publication of the dwelling stock figures by the Valuation Office Agency (VOA). It was noted that for this year the dwelling stock figures will not be updated and that the national statistics for the annual Local Authority Collected Waste due to be published in November will use the old dwelling stock figures.

7. One of the LA reps asked Defra about the intention to publish the 'waste from households' (WfH) recycling rate at a local authority level. Defra said there was no intention to publish the WfH recycling rate at a local authority level but as part of the ongoing development work, Defra have planned to make a WfH report available in WDF. Therefore until this report is available, local authorities can refer to the existing guidance on the WDF portal to calculate their WfH recycling rate. The timeframe for clarification on WfH use in the future is still unknown pending decisions at the EU level.

## **5. Q100 roll-out update**

8. There are 98 authorities reporting their 2014/15 data with Q100. Jacobs noted that it was hoped there would be more authorities taking the voluntary approach. Q100 will become mandatory in England for the reporting of 2015/16 data and Jacobs intend to have extra resource on the WDF Helpdesk when the remaining authorities come on board when Q100 is mandatory.

9. Jacobs mentioned the need to update the Q100 guidance and told the meeting that there had been a lot of discussion particularly on 'final/end destinations' between Defra, Jacobs and the Environment Agency. The progress with the Q100 guidance amendments is that it is still in a draft format but needs to move to a final format to be published on the WDF portal.

**Potential for an addition of a 'site details unknown' node was discussed as a development item as well a 'multiple destination node'.**

- **Action point 4: Local authorities to provide feedback on the updated guidance section 2.6 by 17<sup>th</sup> July 2015**

10. Jacobs told the meeting the XML Q100 upload was advanced in its development and will be ready for September 2015.

11. Jacobs told the meeting the Auto Final Destination Node is currently being developed and should help authorities by removing the need to enter their tonnages twice in the case of an end destination and accompanying final destination 'green node'.

12. Jacobs mentioned the training sessions and some authorities had attended the courses. However they noted that a lot of authorities have yet to sign up to the Q100 training course. There are extra sessions arranged and communications sent out to ensure that all LAs can attend a session before the roll-out is mandatory. Positive feedback from authorities who have already completed the training were that getting the WCAs and their relevant WDA in one training session worked well. Therefore Jacobs wanted to encourage others to approach the Q100 training in this way.

13. Feedback received so far from local authorities using Q100 are the following.

14. One local authority asked Jacobs why changes were needed to tree structures the following quarter after having being confirmed correct in the previous. Jacobs asked LA to send specific example to the helpdesk for further guidance.

15. A question was posed if it was possible to copy a tree from another LA. Currently this is not possible and after discussion within the group it wasn't generally seen as an important development item.

16. Advice from local authorities was to have all of the information together before you start constructing your waste management tree. Authorities who had started on Q100 said this is the most efficient way of constructing your tree for the first time. There were differences about the time it has taken to complete the waste management tree ranging from a couple of hours to a day with the availability of the data required being suggested as a reason for the time taken.

17. A request from one local authority who represented a WDA, asked for the back allocation element of Q100 to be the responsibility of the WDA and not all of its constituent WCAs. Defra and Jacobs are to look into the technical feasibility of this and it may be put forward as part of the development list.

- **Action point 5: Defra and Jacobs**

18. Local authorities were asked to provide feedback on the draft guidance for Q100 (specifically the new section 2.6). Local authorities could see issues around MRFs and the spot markets which operate which mean the waste can change from day to day. Defra asked if local authorities could try and get as much detail from their MRFs as possible. Authorities were happy with the way exports are to be recorded under Q100 and noted that most authorities will know the country of export but could be too onerous to report. So authorities are happy with what was put in the guidance about the non-EU and EU split. One authority mentioned 'stock change'. Jacobs said the WDF Helpdesk monitors this and there is no change to this due to the advent of Q100. It was suggested by an LA rep that Table 3 in the Q100 guidance should have a 'waste stream output type' of 'dry recycle' for 'facility/process type' of incinerators. Jacobs are to look into this.

- **Action point 6: Jacobs to email Q100 authorities who are not represented at the User Group meeting to ask for feedback on Q100 guidance. Jacobs to look into whether ‘dry recycle’ should be included as a ‘waste stream output type’ in table 3 for incinerators.**

19. There was discussion around the Waste Duty of Care and its application to WDF. Defra wanted to strike a balance between data quality and legal positions but emphasised the importance of WDF data in informing and assessing policy and legislative negotiations at a UK and EU level so the value in having complete and reliable data. .

## **6. Facilities selection list**

A brief update was provided by Jacobs on the development work for the amended selection list. The list is now in the live area after development and testing and local authorities will notice deactivated sites in red. These will remain in red for one year and after then the sites will be locked. Jacobs said there may be some adjustments for local authorities to make to their lists. A couple of enhancements to the selection list have been made where there is a change to the search function making it more flexible. And the facility and sub type entries have been removed. The Environment Agency said they hope to update the selection list (just for permits) every quarter.

- **Action point 8: Local authorities to make relevant amendments to their selection lists and Jacobs to send reminders to do these in-between quarters and alongside validation.**

## **7. User group issues**

**Code of conduct between local authorities** – This was discussed at the November 2014 user group meeting and Defra have drafted a report which would form the Code of Conduct. Defra stressed how important it is to be able to allow local authorities to benchmark their data but asked that local authorities do not give the data outside of that authority and to have a shared understanding. Defra asked local authorities for comments on the note to be fed back to the WDF Helpdesk who would forward to Defra in the next couple of weeks.

- **Action point 9: Local authorities to provide comments by Friday 17<sup>th</sup> July 2015**

**User group contact lists** –There was discussion around sharing of contact details in relation to reps at the user group. There is a development item for a Data confidentiality tick box to be added to the WDF log-in area, together with “contact confirmation on log-in” (i.e. users confirming their contact details can be used by Defra and UG representatives). It was agreed that this would make it easier for the representatives to be in touch with the users they represent.

- **Action point 10: Local authorities**

**EU proposals on recycling** – Ian Everett (Defra) gave a brief overview on what might be expected to from the new Circular Economy Package. He said there would be a short two-week consultation. Ian said early indications on the content of the consultation would be definitions and recycling calculations.

**Frequency of data reporting on WDF** – Lindsay Holmes (Defra) asked the meeting if the frequency of reporting could change from quarterly to annually. Most authorities said annual reporting would be difficult to do as it would take more resource and time to drill down to queries encountered during the year. One authority mentioned they did not think annual reporting would be helpful in terms of Q100 and the data would be better tracked if it was reported quarterly. Lindsay (Defra) asked the question if it would matter if Defra only produced the Local Authority Collected Waste statistical release annually. The general consensus was that it would not matter.

**Outputs from MRFs, reject rates and data confidentiality issues** – Some local authorities said they had problems getting the information out of MRFs. Some said that when contracts came up for renewal it is best to make it a contractual requirement for MRFs to supply the required data.

## **8. User group feedback**

**Rejects post the gate of the processor** – Defra asked the meeting to provide an account of what the local authorities are able to report in terms of rejects. It was explained that knowing what local authorities report now will help Defra understand when working through the EU negotiations. Defra asked if local authorities report reject data after the first gate rejects and the answer was no. The general consensus was felt that rejects are under-reported in WDF due to issues around collecting the information from re-processors. One local authority suggested ‘sampling from MRFs’ as a way of improving evidence on rejects. One local authority said it would be too resource-intensive to try and get more information on rejects on top of completing the Q100.

- **Action point 11: Defra and Jacobs. LAs to feed back in relation to data requirements and Rejects**

**Supermarkets’ recycling banks** – As part of the recycling calculation and the national ‘waste from households’ Defra want to understand how much waste collected by supermarkets is still reported to WDF. A lot of waste collected at the supermarkets is managed in house. It was felt that less than 20% of supermarkets report their waste data to their local authority.

## **9. A.O.B.**

**Materials Recycling Facility Code of Practice** – Ian Everett (Defra) said the Code of Practice is due to be published end of July. It will form part of the WRAP Portal. It will cover MRF sampling from the final quarter of 2015. Ian stressed this is a first-time publication and the data could be inconsistent with future publications.

**New Defra Ministerial team** – Ian Everett (Defra) reported that it was still early days for the ministerial team and what their commitment to recycling and waste was.

## Attendees

Name	Organisation
Andy Williams	Jacobs
Carole Taylor	Pendle
Debbie Fillingham	Lancashire
Debbie Mansell	East Riding
Fiona Gutteridge	Jacobs
Garry Wells	Environment Agency
Iain Stevens	Devon
Ian Everett	Department for Environment, Food and Rural affairs
James Kirkham	East London Waste
Janine Stevens-Hoare	Hampshire
Jenny Carmichael	East Riding
Julian Fox	Jacobs
Justin Lomax	Greater Manchester
Karen Bradley	Department for Environment, Food and Rural affairs
Kevin Lane	Environment Agency
Lindsay Holmes	Department for Environment, Food and Rural affairs
Michael Richards	Cambridgeshire
Mike Greenhalf	Southwark
Nicola Howell	Leicestershire
Nicola Pervival	Hertfordshire
Pat Thomas	Department for Environment, Food and Rural affairs
Paul Dobbs	Hackney
Paul Wright	Suffolk
Rebecca Piper	Suffolk
Richard Booth	Greater Manchester
Steve Lewington	Oxfordshire
Steve Lawson	Luton
Sunita Patel	Amey
Tim Forster	Hertfordshire

**Apologies**

Joanna Hayduck	WRAP
Pat Thomas	Department for Environment Food & Rural Affairs
John Woodruff	Bromley