

1. Introductions

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

2. Update from Jacobs

2.1. Training courses – offerings and attendance – training courses provided to WasteDataFlow users focused on Qu100 validation spreadsheet, new users, fly-tipping and Qu100. Attendance was generally good however some training sessions saw a notable number of people registered but then not attending. LA reps to remind their individual LAs to give extended notice if they intend to drop out of a training session, to enable someone else to attend.

2.2. Qu100 Raw data download – the raw data download of the information held in Qu100 is currently being investigated to ensure that this information is presented in the most usable format as the current raw data download is not that accessible.

2.3. Internet browsers – analysis shows that some LAs are using old versions of internet explorer to enter their WasteDataFlow information. It is becoming increasingly difficult to support these internet browsers and we advise LAs to use the latest version where possible.

2.4. Selection list - deactivated sites are currently shown in red and the first locking deadline is the 26th August 2016. Those LAs with red sites should contact the Environment Agency as soon as possible as these updates can take up to 2 weeks to complete. A message has also been added at the top of Qu100 which outlines the locking of deactivated sites.

2.5. Process reject – LAs don't need to report any process rejects for source segregated material once it has been accepted by a facility, and this material should be included in the total amount of material sent for recycling. The exceptions to this including material sent to MRFs as we expect contamination within this material stream, WEEE due to the material composition of waste stream and wood waste which is collected for recycling but is used as biomass for incineration as no options for recycling is available.

2.6. Common validation queries – when the 'other material' category is used, it's important to state what this material is in the comments box while 'site details not known' should only be used if you don't know where the material is sent. When making amendments to any tonnages within Qu100, users need to ensure that these amendments are also made to any subsequent node to prevent imbalances. The 'moisture loss' category should be predominantly used for organic waste treatment facilities such as MBT facilities whereas 'process loss' will predominantly be used for incineration facilities.

2.7 Update on WDF developments –

- the category for TVs and monitors will be changed from ‘WEEE CRT’s’ to ‘WEEE TVs/monitors’ as the use of cathode ray tubes within this material stream has diminished.
- The auto-final destination function and new processes, such as treatment unknown and multiple sites, has been introduced for Qu100.
- A new material type has been added called ‘Aggregates’, as there is demand for this for Wales. For now this is currently only for use by Welsh LAs. Jacobs/Defra to seek LAs views in the next WDF newsletter/Survey Monkey exercise on use of aggregates for England in the future.
- Summary reports for BVPI and NI comparator calculations’ are available currently for LAs only and LAs can see and download reports of other LAs. The reports will be rolled out widely to public users once satisfied that they are working properly. One query on the reports was that the BVPI reports do not have the same breakdown as the previous reports which LAs found useful. Jacobs to investigate how the old report was structured in comparison to the new one and to consider how this can be addressed.
- Historical data from fly capture system is now available on WDF and LAs can download data from previous available years.

3. Update from Defra

- 3.1. **Fly-tipping module (FTM) Introduction** – the FTM has been present on the WasteDataFlow website for a year and the validation of data is underway. Quarters 3 and 4 queries are going to be sent to FTM users shortly, however some quarter 2 queries are still outstanding. The data entry section of the FTM is currently being reviewed in relation to common queries raised during the validation of quarter 2, mostly in relation to the number of incidents reported and the value of fines.
- 3.2. **Timeliness of reporting data** - late reporting is still a problem; Defra are continuing to provide support and guidance to those authorities who are struggling to adhere to the deadlines but Defra have recently sent letters to some LAs outlining their obligation under the WET Act to provide this information in a timely manner. Any delays in the submission of quarter 4 data may impact upon the ability of Defra to publish annual statistics (including the LA breakdown with NI and BVPI figures), on time in November 2016 so the timely submission of this data is pivotal. Potential ways to improve the timeliness of reporting are currently being investigated and any feedback from users is welcomed. Any local authority which believes that they might miss a deadline is asked to contact the WasteDataFlow helpdesk so that support can be provided. Jacobs can offer bespoke 1-1 training for LAs completing returns (resource may have to be managed, subject to the scale of demand) but the LAs will need to pay for the cost of the training. LAs interested in this type of training can contact the Helpdesk.

- 3.3. **EU Circular economy proposals** - Defra provided an overview of the Proposals, with further meetings planned to take place after the summer. Steady but slow progress is being made around the definitions/calculations of municipal waste and definitions remains open. There is further work to do to reach a consensus on the point of calculation of recycling, although agreement that it should be the same for all Member States. Defra are committed to taking an active role in discussions despite the result of the EU Referendum and continue to strongly engage in these meetings.
- 3.4. **Statistics consultation** – Five responses were received on the consultation exercise to which included the proposal to move away from quarterly statistical releases to an annual release. None of the responses raised serious objections to this. For the 2015/16 data, quarter 1 data had been published in March 2016 but the remaining data would be published as part of the annual release, hopefully in November 2016 if remaining data are submitted in time. The outcome of the consultation is expected to be published in August/September following Ministerial consideration of the draft report. The frequency of publication after the 2015/16 data was being kept open, dependent on reporting efficiencies and other demands.

4. Presentation from WRAP

- 4.1. **How WRAP use WasteDataFlow** – WRAP download and analyse information sourced from WasteDataFlow on an annual basis, and they mainly focus on ‘collection questions’ but do analyse data relating to the treatment and disposal of material. WRAP utilises this information in their LA Portal Benchmarking tool, and estimate the specific co-mingled splits through the use of material mixed derived from their scheme data, and utilises this. The information gathered through WasteDataFlow also enables WRAP to produce research and evidence on waste and recycling for each nation as well as the UK as a whole in order to support policy making decisions. WRAP also provided examples where information provided through WasteDataFlow waste used within their reports and their online resources. The data has been instrumental in the consistency of collections work and in supporting modelling and analysis in support of the CE package proposals and negotiations.
- 4.2. **Questions 4, 5 and 6 duplication** – WRAP provided an overview of their Local Authority Recycling Scheme Updater (LARSU) and described the similarities and differences between the data collected for this database and the data collected by Questions 4, 5 and 6 of WasteDataFlow. The most notable differences included the colour of receptacles which isn’t collected through WasteDataFlow, the ability to present additional information on collection schemes such as the need to wash items prior to placing them in receptacles on LARSU and difference between the categories for receptacle sizes. The current response rate on LARSU is between 70% and 80%. The proposal is for WRAP to continue to collect data through LARSU and to no longer ask LAs to complete this information in WDF Qs 4, 5 and 6 and for it instead to be populated from LARSU to avoid the duplication. There was some more detailed mapping work to be done but the aim is to have this change in place

for 2017 so LAs would be asked to provide data for LARSU in Jan-march 2017 and then not have to complete information in WDF in spring 2017.

- 4.3. **Material Facility (MF) Portal** – WRAP provided an overview of the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) (Amendment) Regulations 2014 (Schedule 9A) which came into force in October 2014. This Regulation applies to any MF which received more than 1,000 tonnes of mixed waste for sorting per year. WRAP analyses the data provided through this Regulation, produce a data commentary and publishes the data, with the next publication due mid-August. The main two main differences between this dataset and the information gathered through WasteDataFlow is that the MF Portal features MFs with an input greater than 1,000 tonnes are included with the MF Portal and output tonnages is by material, not by supplier, so WasteDataFlow provides additional data. Not all MFs used by LAs may report data through the MF Regulations. In terms of reject rates and use of output from MFs, the ideal expectation would be to see consistency between the MFs data published on WRAP website and the LAs data submitted on WDF. However, there was concern that while it may be easy to get output data from MFs, especially where a local authority is the only one using the MF, it is more difficult to get accurate output where LAs uses MFs that collects materials from different companies including commercial and private. Defra are interested in understanding the MFs output data and would carry out some analysis of the MFs reject rates in comparison to some selected LAs on WDF. WRAP to provide the link to the MFs data on the website.

5. LA feedback and queries

5.1. LAs were asked to send in feedback prior to the meeting and to provide feedback during the meeting. Feedback/comments received at the meeting were the following:

- A couple of LAs reported being chased for responses to 'for notification' queries or where explanations were already included in the comments boxes.
- LAs asked for the data entry section of the FTM to be updated to include a working total of the number of incidents reported relating to land type, primary waste type and size and estimated clearance and disposal cost.
- The ability to download monthly reports and annual data through the FTM would be beneficial. In response to a query on data download, it was clarified that annual download is possible by downloading quarterly data for the relevant 4 quarters and summing these to get the annual data.
- For Q100, LAs requested that the potential for comments to be carried forward from previous quarters to be investigated.
- Some authorities reported that contractors were unable to provide facility details/ information on destination as this was 'commercially sensitive'. Defra to check legislation on commercial sensitivity relating to destination data.
- A comment was made relating to having something like a level 25 on WDF to enable WDA to review the data entered by a WCA prior to it being validated by Jacobs.
- LAs requested that validation queries be expanded upon with specific examples of where the query related to and include images where possible.

- There was a suggestion for addition of a sum feature at the bottom of Qu100 which provides a working total of the tonnages currently entered in Qu100.

A comment made on the summary reports includes making the reports more transparent, with clearer breakdown of figures so that LAs can easily spot discrepancy where it arises. Defra stated that responses to all of the various feedback received would be provided to LAs. The Chairman thanked all authorities for taking the time to provide the feedback received which was very much appreciated.

6. Feedback from LAs on WDF

LAs welcomed the offer to run a survey monkey exercise to seek LAs views on certain issues on WDF likely topics included WDF system performance and usability, guidance/training/helpdesk provision, use of the data/reports and Q100.

7. Next meeting:

The next meeting is scheduled for January 2017. LA reps to inform their LAs and provide items to include on the agenda.

Action Point 1: LA reps to remind their individual LAs to give extended notice if they intend to drop out of a training session, to enable someone else to attend

Action Point 2: Jacobs/Defra to seek LAs views in the next WDF newsletter/Survey Monkey exercise on use of aggregates for England in the future

Action Point 3: Jacobs to investigate how the old report was structured in comparison to the new one and to consider how this can be addressed

Action Point 4: WRAP to provide link to the MFs data on the website.

Action Point 5: Defra to provide responses to all of the various feedbacks received.

Action Point 6: Defra to check legislation on commercial sensitivity relating to destination data.

Action point 7: Defra to seek LAs views on certain issues on WDF through a survey monkey exercise later in 2016.

Action point 8: LA reps to inform their LAs and provide items to include on the agenda.

Attendees

Name	Organisation
Frances Howe	Hampshire County Council
Nav Rai	Warwickshire County Council
Sunita Patel	Wolverhampton MBC
Alexandra Titley	WRAP
Chris Collings	Haringey LB
Clare Ayling	Reading Borough Council
Emma Thrift	West Berkshire District Council
Iain Stevens	Devon County Council
James Kirkham	East London Waste Authority
Joanna Lilley	WRAP
Julian Fox	Jacobs
Katie Martell	Enfield LB
Lorraine Beeks	Surrey County Council
Pat Thomas	Department for Environment, Food and Rural affairs
Rebecca Piper	Suffolk County Council
Steve Lewington	Oxfordshire County Council
Stuart Brown	Leicestershire County Council
Suzanne Phillips	Hertfordshire County Council
Vicky Pudner	WRAP
Andrew Clark	Sefton MBC
Andy Williams	Jacobs
Carole Taylor	Pendle Borough Council
Debbie Fillingham	Lancashire County Council
Jenny Carmichael	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
Lindsay Holmes	Department for Environment, Food and Rural affairs
Richard Booth	Greater Manchester WDA (MBC)
Robert Andrew	Jacobs

Apologies

Name	Organisation
Ben Eggar	Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames
Michael Richards	Cambridgeshire County Council
Paul Dobbs	Hackney LB
Clare Johnson	Wirral MBC
Lee Jones	Merseyside WDA (MBC)
Karen Bradley	Department for Environment, Food and Rural affairs