

<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Recycling Review
<b>DIRECTORATE:</b>	Operations / Waste & Street Services
<b>MEETING:</b>	Cabinet
<b>DATE:</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> March 2016
<b>DIVISION/WARDS AFFECTED:</b>	All

**PURPOSE:**

1. For Cabinet to approve the proposed way forward for recycling collections in Monmouthshire.

**RECOMMENDATIONS ON PROPOSED WAY FORWARD:**

2. The recommendations are:
  - I. The principles of the existing collection service of dry recycling materials (red & purple scheme) be continued given the lack of a strong evidence base on the *necessity* to change the collection method for all dry recycling materials;
  - II. A robust 6 month pilot is undertaken on *separating glass* at kerbside (option 2);
  - III. The pilot results to be reviewed by Recycling Review Member Steering Group, Select Committee and Cabinet and appropriate regulatory bodies prior to proceeding with full implementation following the trial period and adjust collection methodology if necessary;
  - IV. The Scottish model (explained in para. 23 below) is reviewed through the pilot period;
  - V. That food and garden waste kerbside collections will be split, with food waste to be treated via AD and garden waste via open windrow; and
  - VI. The Council, recognising it is not currently *necessary* to adopt the default position for the WFD requirements for '*separate collections*' keep the service continually under review to ensure that compliance and best environmental and economic outcomes are being achieved.

**KEY ISSUES**

3. MCC has carried out a strategic review of the recycling and waste service in response to changes in EU and UK law and Welsh Government (WG) policy and guidance including WG's preference for kerbside sort collections. The background to the review and the

legislative issues were fully explained in the report to Cabinet of December 2014

(<http://democracy.monmouthshire.gov.uk/CeListDocuments.aspx?Committeeld=144&MeetingId=617&DF=03%2f12%2f2014&Ver=2>).

4. The main issues the review needed to address are:

- Legal and policy compliance
- Different collection options and impact on economic productivity and analysis on whether further savings can be achieved
- How MCC can optimise performance (financial and environmental) whilst maintaining public buy in and satisfaction

### **Legal & Policy Compliance**

5. One of the key aspects of the review was the need to model MCC's current kerbside collection service (baseline), against WG's preferred 'collections blueprint'. Whilst the Blueprint is not mandatory it is Welsh Government's preferred policy and it sits underneath their statutory strategies – Towards Zero Waste and the Municipal Sector Plan to which LAs must have regard. The Blueprint has 23 criteria ranging from charging for garden waste, accepting reuse at CA sites, restricting residual and specifying how recycling at the kerbside should be collected. MCC is 78% compliant with the Blueprint. The only areas where there is deviation is regarding the 3 criteria relating to kerbside sort collections, the criteria for a CA site to receive bulky items for reuse and achieving 80% recycling at the CA sites. In time and with contract renewal and improvements at the CA sites MCC intends to comply with the two CA site criteria leaving only the items relating to collection methodology in dispute.
6. WG believe the blueprint of kerbside sort delivers the most economic and environmentally beneficial collection method and is fully compliant with EU requirements for 'separate collections'. This is the fundamental issue the review has been tasked to resolve.

The Waste Framework Directive Requirement for Separate Collections

requires local authorities to collect paper, metals, plastics and glass separately where:

- i) **necessary** to ensure waste undergoes recovery operations in accordance with the waste hierarchy and to protect human health & the environment, and to facilitate or improve recovery; and
- ii) where it is **technically, environmentally and economically practicable** (TEEP) to do so; and
- iii) to promote '**high quality**' recycling.

7. Under the **necessity** test, MCC must consider whether it actually needs to separate materials further in order to achieve high quality recycling. A simple benchmark for this test is by comparing the quality of MCC's materials, at the point that they are recycled, with 'good' kerbside sort authorities. Unfortunately, terms such as 'high quality' and 'good kerbside sort authority' are not defined in the legislation or the WG statutory guidance. MCC consider these to be fundamental points when considering whether we should switch from what is currently a highly effective, performing and efficient service which enjoys high levels of public satisfaction.
8. If it was found **necessary** for MCC to collect certain materials **separately**, it would also need to be consider whether it is **TEEP** to do so:
  - a) Technically practicable: Given that separate collections operate in counties similar to Monmouthshire – such as Conwy, it is likely to be concluded that such collections are also practicable within Monmouthshire.
  - b) Economically Practicable: The benchmark for whether collections are economically practicable is that they must not be 'excessive' in comparison to non-separate collections. The final whole life costs of the different options will need to be assessed fully to determine this. The Council will also need to consider the "cost of change" in light of other investment priorities that need to be delivered. The modelling reported below demonstrates that kerbside sort does not deliver significant savings and also incurs major capital investment, therefore should we need to consider this option further work would have to be undertaken on maximising value and opportunities
  - c) Environmentally Practicable: When looking at collection options consideration is given to fuel use and emissions (MPG and emissions) from fleet options. End destinations and final use of recyclates is also a consideration of environmental performance which also feature as part of the necessity test.
9. There is little guidance on how to address the necessity question, and what to compare collections to. As a starting point MCC officers compared the top destinations for MCC's recycling in 2012/13, to those used by Welsh kerbside sort authorities. The full results were reported to Cabinet in Dec 2014 and were shared with NRW and WG for consideration as to how we have approached these tests. Given at that time no concerns or comments were raised by either organisation we believe it is an appropriate tool for analysis and aiding decision making. The results showed that MCC's end destinations were comparable to kerbside sort authorities for a number of materials. With MCC's paper, although this is being sent to China, it is also being processed in a closed loop manner (comparable with kerb side sort authorities).
10. The main reason for recommending the separate collection of glass is based on an analysis of how glass is being managed through a comingled and MRF collection and treatment system. The recent analysis has highlighted that due to the decline in markets and also increased regulation on MRF processes more glass is being used within aggregate recycling which according to the statutory guidance on

applying the waste hierarchy<sup>1</sup> is worse than landfilling the material. Therefore consideration needed to be given to how the principles of separate collection and high quality recycling could be applied to MCC's recycling scheme. Given the performance of the scheme with high quantities collected and the end markets for other materials aligning with kerbside sort it is believed legislative compliance can be achieved by collecting glass in a different container.

11. Another compelling argument for retaining the principles of the current collection method is the amount of recyclate MCC collects compared to many LAs. Due to the success of the residual waste restriction MCC collects over 270kg per household per annum of dry recycling. In 2014-15 MCC collected the most kerbside dry recycling per household in Wales. Again there is little guidance on how LAs reconcile the issue of whether more recycling collected from householders and treated via comingled/MRFs is detrimental to the environment compared to *less* tonnage from kerbside sort. Also there is an assumption that kerbside sort automatically leads to closed loop recycling. This is not a given and depends on end markets, commercial opportunities and local priorities when determining end destinations of kerbside collected materials.
12. Although the above is compelling, it is important that MCC has a full understanding of the quality of its recyclable material, before a full conclusion can be made on the necessity test. With a new MRF contract starting in February 2016, a pilot to determine the impact of removing glass and a full study being undertaken by WG on the complexity of end destination reporting, it is anticipated we will be able to make a robust recommendation on material management and the necessity test in due course.

### **Collection Options – financial efficiency**




13. There have been a number of iterations of these options presented to Select Committee over the past 24 months and these have been reduced to a final 4 Options. The final 4 options were:-

---

<sup>1</sup> WG, (2012), Guidance on Applying the Waste Hierarchy

## MCC recycling collection review: Future service options

We are modelling 4 different methods of recycling collection for future use in Monmouthshire.

Service option	Description	Storage	Collection vehicles
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Red and purple recycling bags collected by a single compartment vehicle.</li> <li>Split collection for food and garden waste (Vehicle with two compartments to keep waste separate).</li> <li>Refuse collection on standard vehicle.</li> </ul>		  <p>Food and garden waste kept separate in a split compartment vehicle.</p>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mixed recycling in one bag (plastic or reusable) and glass stored separately in a box.</li> <li>Recycling collected by a split compartment vehicle.</li> <li>Garden and food waste collected by a split compartment vehicle.</li> </ul>	 <p>One plastic or reusable bag</p>	  <p>Food waste collected in front pod. Garden waste in rear.</p>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mixed recycling in one bag (plastic or reusable) and glass stored separately in a box.</li> <li>Recycling bag, glass and food waste collected at the same time with a triple compartment vehicle.</li> <li>Garden waste collected on standard vehicle.</li> </ul>	 <p>One plastic or reusable bag</p>	  <p>Split rear compartment for mixed recycling bag and glass. Food waste collected in front pod.</p>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Kerbside sort recycling collection. Each type of material stored and collected separately.</li> <li>Stored in trolley boxes or stackable boxes with a reusable bag for cardboard.</li> <li>Collected using a kerbside sort vehicle with multiple compartments.</li> <li>Garden waste and refuse collected separately to recycling.</li> </ul>	 <p>Or</p>   <p>Both options include bag for cardboard and food bin</p>	 

- The original modelling undertaken was at a high level and looked to ascertain the most financially viable service options moving forwards. Throughout this process MCC has worked with WRAP (Waste Resources Action Programme and WG's agents for supporting LAs with change and improvement in recycling/waste). WRAP have commissioned bespoke pieces of work (e.g. the MEL study to evaluate the impact of restricting residual) and have undertaken financial modelling on the best option for MCC. The modelling considers 'whole life costs', so treatment costs (the process after collection e.g. composting, anaerobic digestion, energy from waste etc.) have also been determined for each collection option.
- The recommendation to continue with the current collection service and include further separation of glass is based on Waste and Street Services evaluation of the financial data provided by WRAP and actual data being run through the existing MCC WebAspx route optimisation software.

Baseline	MCC Options	Option 1	Option 2		Option 3		Option 4	
	WRAP Options	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
£1,233,159	Staff	£1,197,616	£1,316,313	£1,375,469	£1,428,209	£1,580,782	£2,229,894	£2,499,881
£838,230	Vehicles	£950,746	£1,123,579	£1,131,220	£1,130,505	£1,194,863	£1,114,698	£1,198,284
£273,218	Containers	£273,218	£273,147	£196,873	£273,147	£196,873	£189,295	£330,592
£0	Dry Processing	£10,200	£20,400	£20,400	£20,400	£20,400	£182,777	£182,777
£704,405	Material Income	£704,405	£251,463	£251,463	£251,463	£251,463	-£536,998	-£536,998
£606,015	Kerbside Organics Processing	£403,381	£403,381	£403,381	£403,381	£403,381	£403,381	£403,381
-£270,000	Garden Waste Charge	-£270,000	-£270,000	-£270,000	-£270,000	-£270,000	-£270,000	-£270,000
£428,925	Kerbside Residual Disposal	£428,925	£428,925	£428,925	£428,925	£428,925	£492,825	£492,825
£627,630	Supervision	£627,630	£627,630	£627,630	£627,630	£627,630	£627,630	£627,630
£5,861	Pru borrowing depot	£16,133	£16,639	£16,639	£16,639	£16,639	£58,066	£58,066
£4,441,582	<b>Total</b>	£4,326,121	£4,191,476	£4,181,999	£4,310,298	£4,450,954	£4,491,568	£4,986,439
	Difference to baseline	-£115,460	<b>-£250,106</b>	<b>-£259,583</b>	-£131,284	£9,372	£49,987	£544,857
	capital transfer station works	239,500	247,000	247,000	247,000	247,000	862,000	862,000

\*Baseline: This is the cost of an optimised current service (i.e. the service after all collection rounds have been made efficient – a process currently being undertaken), but also with the assumption that garden and food waste is collected and treated separately.

16. With any collection method there is a recycling processing risk and this will be addressed through the trial to ensure these risks associated with recycling market fluctuations are reduced as far as practically possible. Currently our risk is based on there being MRF capacity at a cost which is affordable to the Authority. Members of Strong Communities Select Committee recognised that the authority had benefitted from strong MRF contracts and were concerned about the risk of managing material directly given the low volumes and also lack of expertise to undertake a competitive and strong market trading role. This recommendation was duly noted and is one of the reasons for the recommendation of a moderate change to the current scheme.
17. Separation of food and garden waste gives a tangible financial benefit. The reduction in treatment costs from using this method outweighs the increase in collection costs resulting from the need to use different vehicles and to achieve this saving a report is being presented to Council on 10<sup>th</sup> March recommending that MCC agrees the Heads of the Valleys AD Outline Business Case and Inter Authority Agreement.
18. In terms of cost modelling of dry recycling options, the most viable alternative options in comparison to the present service were:
  - a. The ‘twin stream’ option (option 2), whereby MCC continues to collect red and purple bags but separates glass. Extracting glass substantially reduces MRF cost and removes the glass issues with comingled collections.

- b. The Kerbside sort option (option 4) is the 2<sup>nd</sup> cheapest option, whereby most materials are collected separately, and a small sorting operation is run in Llanfoist to separate cans and plastics. At the moment (subject to review and the results of the trial) this option is not being progressed. However given it is WG preferred policy and the default position for the requirement for separate collections kerbside sort will always remain an option and be used as a benchmark for assessing other options for compliance and performance.

#### Our Public – Optimising Performance and Maintaining Buy In

19. MCC is in a very fortunate position with its recycling services with 2015-16 once more forecasting to return a recycling rate of c63% against a target by WG of 58%. Monmouthshire is not failing the statutory targets set by WG and therefore it was recognised that a very strong case for substantial change would need to be presented. The EU Directive calls for 'quality' and also '*quantity*' in recycling. The trial will allow us to continue to review the quality issue, and it cannot be argued that MCC does not achieve quantity given that we are such a high performer.
20. There is concern that a major change in recycling collection methods would result in a drop in performance thereby putting at risk MCC's reputation, public buy in and compliance with statutory recycling targets which come with fines. The modelling outlined above assumed a 10% reduction in participation. Whilst the restriction on residual waste should be a deterrent against such a change (and potential enforcement as reported to Select Committee in Dec '15) it is a risk that must be noted. Most recycling services are changed due to performance issues and therefore MCC does not have evidence or data to give members confidence that a major change would not affect our current performance. To aide decision making further officers public views have been sought on collection options and satisfaction ratings for the current service. At the time of writing the report the survey had just closed and therefore Cabinet will receive an addendum at the meeting advising on the outcomes of the public survey.

#### **The Benefits of Collecting Glass Separately**

21. To summarise collecting glass separately will ensure that glass to glass recycling can be achieved rather than glass to aggregate ensuring the high quality requirement in the Directive is achieved.
22. Glass can also be a problem within some MRFs as shards can disrupt the technology used by operators. Removing glass therefore will reduce operational MRF issues and this has a subsequent benefit of reducing potential gate fees. The initial quotes MCC has received has demonstrated that as much as a 50% reduction on the current gate fee could be achieved.

## **The Scottish Model**

23. Last month COSLA (the representative body of all Scottish Councils) announced that an agreement had been reached by all 32 LAs to move to a common collection method. The materials to be collected separately were:
- Glass
  - Paper/card (in red bag?)
  - Plastics / metals (in purple bag?)
  - Food
24. The vehicles they intend to use have not yet been finalised. This option is quite similar to the option being recommended for the pilot and we are keen to understand more particularly on operational efficiency and vehicle types. The key difference with this compared to ours is that food does not appear to be collected with garden waste and therefore gives more flexibility to how garden waste is managed in the future. Initial assessments by WRAP have identified that as much as £95k could be saved if garden waste was a stand-alone service and only collected at peak season (Mar-Oct). A separate garden waste service would also allow the charge to fully cover the cost of collection – something we are not able to currently do because we cannot charge for food waste. This is not a formal recommendation but has been highlighted as an alternative.
25. Given the potential alignment to our current method of collection our risk of legal compliance would be reduced as if Scotland believe this to be EU compliant then MCC could make the same argument. It is proposed that during the pilot further investigations into how this is to be implemented are to be undertaken and will feature in the final report through the Member process.

## **The Pilot**

26. The pilot will:
- a. Operate within the North of the County due to Llanfoist transfer station being able to receive the glass separately
  - b. Cover 7,500-8,000 properties
  - c. Try both plastic boxes and reusable bags. Members of Strong Communities Committee asked officers to investigate the provision of a 3<sup>rd</sup> plastic bag for glass or whether glass could be collected in the purple bag and all other recycling collected in the red bag to maintain the basis of the current collection system. Feedback from the market however has indicated that there would be no



appetite to receive glass in a bag and a bag splitter is not an option as it would crush the glass completely undermining the principles of collecting the glass separately in the first place.

- d. Assess the various vehicle options available to determine:
  - i. Operational productivity and crew assessments, and
  - ii. Cost and overall financial profile
- e. Engage with the public to determine their views and to help MCC develop key messages for managing roll out
- f. Assess the future end markets for glass
- g. Assess future material management for the red (2Dimensional / fibres) and purple (3dimensional / containers) and end markets
- h. Determine the capital works required at the transfer station
- i. Further understand the Scottish model and applicability in Monmouthshire

## **REASONS**

- 27. MCC needs to replace the fleet over 2016-18. Procuring vehicles commits the service for at least 7 years. Therefore MCC needs to ensure its service is future proofed both in terms of public acceptability, financial affordability, environmental performance and legal compliance.

## **RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:**

- 28. There are no immediate financial implications. The MTFP for 2016/17 highlighted the need to replace some of the existing fleet, this will be done hiring in vehicles for the duration of this pilot prior to full implementation.
- 29. Whilst indications on savings have been referenced in the report no figures for savings feature within the current MTFP as it would be premature to do so. The figures provided do not also take fully into account the capital investment required (e.g. it includes depot cost but not one off purchase of bags/boxes). However if a change was proposed the Business Case, in line with the principles on capital investment would need to explore the implications of using any savings to enable borrowing to fund this capital expenditure.

## **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:**

- 30. It is very important that the final recommendation for the recycling service is compliant with existing law and future proofed for any subsequent changes.

31. In particular, MCC will continue to review its service provisions to ensure that it meets its legal obligations including:
- the general obligation to encourage separate collection so as to facilitate recovery;
  - the general obligation to introduce separate collection so as to facilitate recycling;
  - the obligation to introduce separate collection for paper, metal, plastic and glass so as to facilitate recycling of these waste streams; and
  - the obligation not to mix waste of specific type or nature with other waste or other material with different properties,
32. subject always to the principle of proportionality (subject to the Article 10(2) of the revised Waste Framework Directive necessity and technical, environmental and economic practicability tests). Considering that the aim of separate collection is high quality recycling, the introduction of a separate collection system may not be necessary if the aim of high quality recycling can be achieved just as well with a form of co-mingled collection.

### **Sustainable Development and Equality Implications**

33. The proposal ensures that the authority is placing its 7 year recycling service within a long term context. It has considered social, economic and environmental impacts. The main positive is the certainty about the environmental impact/benefit of the service, particularly with the removal of glass and ensuring it is economically efficient and effective. The main negative is increased amount of recycling receptacles left on the street which may have a negative impact on street scene and mobility. These issues will be reviewed during the review and mitigated as much as possible.

### **Safeguarding and Corporate Parenting Implications**

34. There are no safeguarding or corporate parenting implications

### **Consultees**

#### **Strong Communities Select Committee**

35. The Committee considered the proposal for a pilot to separate glass at its meeting on 28<sup>th</sup> January. Members were in favour of maintaining the existing scheme believing it to be high performing and importantly well-liked by our public. Members asked that officers

review whether glass could be collected in a plastic bag rather than a box or reusable bag. The market however has determined that it wants glass presented loose which restricts collection options.

#### National Resources Wales

36. NRW are the monitoring/regulatory body on behalf of WG for compliance with the Waste Framework Directive. The Select Committee report which informed this report was sent to them for comment. No concerns were raised about the proposal. NRW have advised that the Council needs to continually look at the end destination data albeit recognising that there are current data limitations and caveats. They have asked that officers share the trial results with them for further review.

#### Welsh Government

37. The lead officer for waste within WG was sent the Select Committee report and no response has been received.

#### WRAP

38. MCC has worked closely with WRAP on the economic modelling. WRAP submitted MCC officers with a report which has been received but not accepted as we disagree on their calculations for option 3 – kerbside sort. This was shared with Members of Strong Communities Select Committee and they were content for MCC's analysis to be taken forward believing it to be robust and realistic.

#### Public

39. A public consultation and satisfaction survey was undertaken over January 2016. At the time of writing this report the results had not been analysed but an addendum to the report will be presented to Cabinet on the day.

#### Interested Stakeholders

40. Interested stakeholders (Friends of the Earth, Transition Groups, and key partners) were invited to a meeting with MCC officers to discuss the proposals. There was broad acceptance of the process and the recommendation for a pilot. There are some strong views in our community for the Council to adopt kerbside sort believing it to be more environmental beneficial. The report was also shared with Viridor, MCC's strategic waste and recycling delivery partner. They have advised on the appropriateness of the existing transfer stations

and what they can or cannot accommodate. They have advised on end markets and managing glass and will also be engaged through our CA Contract review and closer integration to the Blueprint on its CA site requirements.

### **Background Papers**

Cabinet Report Dec 2014

Strong Communities Select Committee Report Jan 2016

WRAP Report - Options Modelling

### **Report Author**

Rachel Jowitt

Head of Waste & Street Services

[racheljowitt@monmouthshire.gov.uk](mailto:racheljowitt@monmouthshire.gov.uk)

01633 748326 / 07824 406356



## Future Generations Evaluation (includes Equalities and Sustainability Impact Assessments)

<p><b>Name of the Officer</b> Hazel Clatworthy, Alan Burkitt, Rachel Jowitt, Carl Touhig, Laura Carter</p> <p><b>Phone no:</b></p> <p><b>E-mail:</b> Racheljowitt@monmouthshire.gov.uk</p>	<p><b>Please give a brief description of the aims of the proposal</b></p> <p>To propose a pilot to inform the future of the recycling service in Monmouthshire.</p>
<p><b>Name of Service – Waste &amp; Street Services</b></p>	<p><b>Date Future Generations Evaluation</b> 09/02/16</p>

*NB. Key strategies and documents that may help you identify your contribution to the wellbeing goals and sustainable development principles include: Single Integrated Plan, Continuance Agreement, Improvement Plan, Local Development Plan, People Strategy, Asset Management Plan, Green Infrastructure SPG, Welsh Language Standards, etc*


1. **Does your proposal deliver any of the well-being goals below?** Please explain the impact (positive and negative) you expect, together with suggestions of how to mitigate negative impacts or better contribute to the goal.




Well Being Goal	Does the proposal contribute to this goal? Describe the positive and negative impacts.	What actions have been/will be taken to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
<p><b>A prosperous Wales</b> Efficient use of resources, skilled, educated people, generates wealth, provides jobs</p>	<p>More employment opportunity, financially efficient, wealth generation through reduced costs of MRF and better end product</p>	

Well Being Goal	Does the proposal contribute to this goal? Describe the positive and negative impacts.	What actions have been/will be taken to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
<b>A resilient Wales</b> Maintain and enhance biodiversity and ecosystems that support resilience and can adapt to change (e.g. climate change)	Further glass separation means closed loop recycling of glass is more achievable and lessens the need for raw materials in glass production. Additional vehicles will create a bigger carbon footprint	When we undertake vehicle procurement we will go for most fuel efficient vehicles and limit journeys through route optimization.
<b>A healthier Wales</b> People’s physical and mental wellbeing is maximized and health impacts are understood		
<b>A Wales of cohesive communities</b> Communities are attractive, viable, safe and well connected	Keeping with the bag system will reduce fly blown litter from box or open bag collection systems. Additional box for glass but with heavyweight of material unlikely to cause litter.	We will try to align services to have same day collections and crews place receptacles back safe and securely to minimize effect on street scene.
<b>A globally responsible Wales</b> Taking account of impact on global well-being when considering local social, economic and environmental wellbeing	See Resilient Wales above. Although not achieving the full Collections Blueprint (full kerbside sort), the removal of glass will improve the overall quality of the recyclate and allow glass to be recycled closed loop. Recyclate is a global commodity and is sold by reprocessors at best price; this is not always into UK based manufacturing. Red and purple bag scheme participation is very high and this is unlikely to be seen in full kerbside sort.	Full kerbside sort is more expensive and substantially increases risk to local authority in trading commodities on the open market.
<b>A Wales of vibrant culture and thriving Welsh language</b> Culture, heritage and Welsh language are promoted and protected. People are encouraged to do sport, art and recreation		


Well Being Goal	Does the proposal contribute to this goal? Describe the positive and negative impacts.	What actions have been/will be taken to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
<b>A more equal Wales</b> People can fulfil their potential no matter what their background or circumstances	<i>This includes the protected characteristics of age, disability, gender reassignment, race, religion or beliefs, gender, sexual orientation, marriage or civil partnership, pregnancy or maternity</i>	

**2. How has your proposal embedded and prioritised the sustainable governance principles in its development?**

Sustainable Development Principle	Does your proposal demonstrate you have met this principle? If yes, describe how. If not explain why.	Are there any additional actions to be taken to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
 <p>Balancing short term need with long term and planning for the future</p>	<p>The changes for this proposal would last 7 years in line with vehicle leasing.</p>	<p>Planning longer term is difficult as waste arisings are changeable in both quantity and composition. The packaging market is light-weighting materials and types of material change with more shopping done on-line and increasing cardboard, more use of IT reduce paper usage and recycling.</p> <p>Global commodity markets fluctuate, improvements in technology increase the materials that can be recycled and therefore 7 years is optimum length of proposal to reduce changes for residents and secure best value in procuring vehicles and receptacles.</p>

Sustainable Development Principle	Does your proposal demonstrate you have met this principle? If yes, describe how. If not explain why.	Are there any additional actions to be taken to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
 <p>Working together with other partners to deliver objectives</p> <p><b>Collaboration</b></p>	<p>Established contracts in place for reuse with third sector not for profit organization.</p> <p>Close working relationship with WRAP and Welsh Government to inform decisions at a national level.</p> <p>Working with contractors to ensure we have the best data for end markets and contracts that encourage closed loop UK recycling.</p>	
 <p>Involving those with an interest and seeking their views</p> <p><b>Involvement</b></p>	<p>Participation and satisfaction surveys carried out to include questions on this proposal. Survey includes suite of Equalities questions.</p> <p>Full staff engagement with staff, frontline and office staff encouraged to take part in survey.</p> <p>Key stakeholders including Community Climate Champions, Youth Team, Older Peoples Forum, Friends of the Earth invited to stakeholder engagement event.</p>	<p>Ongoing communications with internal and external stakeholders and residents to ensure continued buy-in and participation.</p>
 <p>Putting resources into preventing problems occurring or getting worse</p> <p><b>Prevention</b></p>	<p>Separating glass prevents contamination of recyclate at the reprocessor and increases the value of all recyclables in the chain.</p> <p>Closed loop recycling of glass prevents use of natural raw materials and limits quarrying and disruption to natural environment.</p>	



Sustainable Development Principle	Does your proposal demonstrate you have met this principle? If yes, describe how. If not explain why.	Are there any additional actions to be taken to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
 <p><b>Integration</b> Considering impact on all wellbeing goals together and on other bodies</p>	<p>Environmental and economic benefits from this proposal. This proposal takes account of community engagement and feeds in to the “Monmouthshire Engages”.</p>	

**3. Are your proposals going to affect any people or groups of people with protected characteristics?** Please explain the impact, the evidence you have used and any action you are taking below. For more detailed information on the protected characteristics, the Equality Act 2010 and the Welsh Language Standards that apply to Monmouthshire Council please follow this link:<http://hub/corporatedocs/Equalities/Forms/AllItems.aspx> or contact Alan Burkitt on 01633 644010 or [alanburkitt@monmouthshire.gov.uk](mailto:alanburkitt@monmouthshire.gov.uk)

Protected Characteristics	Describe any positive impacts your proposal has on the protected characteristic	Describe any negative impacts your proposal has on the protected characteristic	What has been/will be done to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
Age	Creation of additional jobs will give benefits to residents of Monmouthshire.	Box collections may increase difficulties for elderly and infirm residents as they require both hands to hold.	Pilot will offer a reusable bag for residents that would prefer them so we can assess if there is an increase in assisted collections.

Protected Characteristics	Describe any positive impacts your proposal has on the protected characteristic	Describe any negative impacts your proposal has on the protected characteristic	What has been/will be done to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
Disability		As above.  Receptacles left on street following collection could increase mobility issues on narrow pavements.	As above  Ensure crews place receptacles back safe and securely to reduce obstructions on pavements.
Gender reassignment			
Marriage or civil partnership			
Pregnancy or maternity		See above.  Obstructions to pavements for prams from receptacles	See above.
Race			
Religion or Belief			
Sex			
Sexual Orientation			
Welsh Language			

**4. Council has agreed the need to consider the impact its decisions has on important responsibilities of Corporate Parenting and safeguarding. Are your proposals going to affect either of these responsibilities?** For more information please see the guidance

<http://hub/corporatedocs/Democratic%20Services/Safeguarding%20Guidance.docx> and for more on Monmouthshire’s Corporate Parenting Strategy see <http://hub/corporatedocs/SitePages/Corporate%20Parenting%20Strategy.aspx>

	<b>Describe any positive impacts your proposal has on safeguarding and corporate parenting</b>	<b>Describe any negative impacts your proposal has on safeguarding and corporate parenting</b>	<b>What will you do/ have you done to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?</b>
Safeguarding			
Corporate Parenting			

**5. What evidence and data has informed the development of your proposal?**

- Waste dataflow – tonnages and end destinations
- WRAP and MCC financial modelling on different collection options
- Public satisfaction surveys
- Staff engagement
- Compositional analysis of MCC’s waste
- Evidence from WG’s commissioned studies which informed the Collections Blueprint

**6. SUMMARY: As a result of completing this form, what are the main positive and negative impacts of your proposal, how have they informed/changed the development of the proposal so far and what will you be doing in future?**

The proposal ensures that the authority is placing its 7 year recycling service within a long term context. It has considered social, economic and environmental impacts. The main positive is the certainty about the environmental impact/benefit of the service, particularly with the removal of glass and

ensuring it is economically efficient and effective. The main negative is increased amount of recycling receptacles left on the street which may have a negative impact on street scene and mobility. These issues will be reviewed during the review and mitigated as much as possible.

**7. ACTIONS:** As a result of completing this form are there any further actions you will be undertaking? Please detail them below, if applicable.

What are you going to do	When are you going to do it?	Who is responsible	Progress
Give residents choices of bags and boxes	During pilot	RJ and team	
Additional training for crews to replace bags and boxes correctly	During pilot	NL and team	

**8. MONITORING:** The impacts of this proposal will need to be monitored and reviewed. Please specify the date at which you will evaluate the impact, and where you will report the results of the review.

The impacts of this proposal will be evaluated on:	Throughout and post-pilot – further cabinet report due March 2017 prior to full implementation of any changes
--	---

**9. VERSION CONTROL:** The Future Generations Evaluation should be used at the earliest stages of decision making, and then honed and refined throughout the decision making process. It is important to keep a record of this process so that we can demonstrate how we have considered and built in sustainable development wherever possible.

Version No.	Decision making stage	Date considered	Brief description of any amendments made following consideration
<b>1</b>	Cabinet March 2016	2 <sup>nd</sup> March 2016	

--	--	--	--