

WasteDataFlow

**REPORT OF THE SIXTH WASTEDATAFLOW
USER GROUP WORKSHOP
5th March 2008**

Contents

1. Purpose & Structure of the User Group meeting.....	3
2. Planning the Next Development Phase	3
3. Calculating the new National Indicators	4
4. Report on EA LATS work (Peter Marris)	5
5. Finance statistics	6
6. UG members representing authorities	6

REPORT OF THE WASTEDATAFLOW USER GROUP WORKSHOP 5th March 2008

1. Purpose & Structure of the User Group meeting

This was the sixth meeting of the WasteDataFlow (WDF) User Group (UG), consisting of waste managers from local authorities and representatives of local authority groups, Defra, the Environment Agency and Enviro. A full list of attendees can be found in appendix A. The main topics for discussion were:

- Planning the next development phase
- Calculating the new National Indicators through WDF
- Representing local authorities: sharing experience and processes

2. Planning the Next Development Phase

– Presentation by Gary Armstrong, Enviro

(All slides available on the WDF website)

A series of development tasks have recently been completed on WDF and now is the time to begin planning the development phase. A long list of potential development ideas has been compiled from feedback from GO meetings, helpdesk enquiries, national authority requirements and ideas from the development team. Resources are not available to complete all of these items and therefore priorities need to be agreed.

The User Group was invited to provide their view on development priorities.

Specific questions which came up during discussions were:

Would users like the format of Questions 19 and 35 to be changed so that it is presented by material, with each destination being selected under each material?

Do users want more materials added to the list and are there any materials that they want taken off the list?

Summary Report screen: Do users want pre defined groups of local authorities (e.g. family, partnership) and to be able to create their own groups?

Would users like to be able to create monthly datasets, as well as quarterly, so that reports can be based on monthly data? This could encourage users to enter the data monthly and use to WDF as a data management tool rather than having their own systems.

Roy Barton asked if access can be given to view reports to people such as planners. Yes, access can be given to view reports only without data entry access too.

Action: Gary to send a copy of all the development ideas to user group members for them to rank in order of preference, having first consulted the users they represent.

Action: For user group members to get feedback from the users they represent.

There was some discussion on reporting of WEEE. Many authorities are experiencing significant delays in receiving data from the contractors on what they've receive and how much of it has been recycled.

Action: Peter Marris to raise it at the EA and see that an agreement is drawn up with contractors to supply data more quickly.

3. Calculating the new National Indicators

The new National Indicator technical guidance now available on DCLG website.

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/localgovernment/nationalindicatorupdate>

All of the waste indicators (NI 191, 192, 193) will be calculated from data entered by authorities into WDF. Defra will provide the national data sets directly to CLG/AC.

Defra and Enviros have translated the CLG guidance into WDF questions and calculation methodology. This was circulated to LAs prior to the meeting and Defra went through the proposed calculation.

Points of clarification were:

Bottom ash isn't included in either landfill figures or recycling figures.

NI 191 is to be measured per household, not per person.

Reuse is to be included in NI 192.

NI 193 (% MSW to landfill)

The calculation assumes that all recycling/reuse rejects at the point of collection (in Qu10, 11, 12, 14/16, 17, 33, 34) are going to landfill. This is generally a very small amount, but local authorities need to be aware of this and if significant amounts are not going to landfill, these should be reported in Qu19 with the appropriate destination identified.

No incinerator outputs will be included in the landfill figures or the recycling figures.

NI 192 (% household waste recycled, reused or composted)

This calculation starts with the amount of municipal waste sent for recycling/reuse/composting in Qu19/35. In order to exclude the amount of non-household waste sent for recycling etc, all rubble is excluded and the tonnages entered in Qu11 (recycling collected from non-hh sources) are excluded.

Question 18 covers household and non-household waste. As the total of Qu18 is included in Qu19 (by material), the non-household column from Qu18 must also be deducted. However, as rubble has already been excluded from the total 'hh' recycling in the calculation from Qu19, any rubble reported in Qu18 non-hh column would be deducted twice. Therefore, it is proposed that the cell given by the row 'other method of waste/material capture' and the non-household column should contain all of the rubble tonnages contained in Question 18 and all of the tonnage entered in this cell should also appear in the rubble row of Question 19. Only the non-hh waste in the other two rows of Qu18 will be deducted from Qu19 in the calculation of the numerator.

For residual household waste (Question 23), the following rows are included in household waste: All collected household waste (regular collection, street cleaning, bulky waste & other), CA site household, gully emptyings and separately collected healthcare waste.

Note that 'gully emptyings' should only include waste arising from sweeping gullies. Waste from emptying drainage pots under the Highways Act should be reported as "Highways Waste" as this is not household waste under the CLG guidance.

The CLG guidance is silent on asbestos waste. In the BVPI calculation this is currently excluded from the total of hh waste. There was some debate in the group as to whether this was household or non-household waste.

Action: Jane would verify the classification of asbestos with Defra policy colleagues and ensure this is included in the NI FAQs.

NI 191 (Residual household waste per household in kg)

Valuation Office figures are used for numbers of households. 2008/09 figures will relate to the end March 2009. By using a national dataset we can ensure that all authorities' NIs are reported on a consistent basis.

4. Report on EA LATS work (Peter Marris)

The EA LATS audits were temporarily put on hold during the earlier part of the year. Those that were scheduled to have an audit in 2007/8 but have not yet been contacted will be audited early in 2008/9 financial year.

Many authorities who were audited in 2006/7 have completed their 6 month reviews. The Agency needs to publish these.

Action: EA to put 6 month reviews on the web.

The EA had sent out a questionnaire on MRFs to all disposal authorities; 61 questionnaires were sent to 43 WDAs of which 34 have been returned; and 190 questionnaires were sent to 155 WCAs of which 52 have been returned. The plan is that all questionnaires are returned by mid April. This is to provide the EA with more information about reject rates in MRFs and how these are being reported in WDF.

5. Finance statistics

Response rate to the CIPFA questionnaire is now so low that it is not statistically valid. Three years ago there was a 60-70% response rate. That is now down at 30%. Roy & Jane sit on the CIPFA Stats Working Party and have been asked to discuss with Local authorities possible reasons for the low response rate.

Some comments from LAs were that as resources were being tightened, provision of data for CIPFA is one of the tasks that has been dropped.

Due to CIPFA statistics being dealt with by finance officers and our working with waste statistics officers we are now not in contact with the people who do work on CIPFA statistics.

Being able to see financial information for authorities is useful so as to see which ones are most cost effective, spot best practice and use this as an example for others.

Roy thanked authorities for their feedback and said he would take this to CIPFA and also target authorities' finance departments for information.

6. UG members representing authorities

A new more formalised process for UG members to represent all local authorities in England had been put in place. There was mixed feedback on the extent to which this opportunity had been taken by other LAs. Six UG members were contacted by the users they represent with questions for the UG. Appropriate questions/feedback were not always provided and the UG members were reassured that they were not to provide an alternative to the WDF Helpdesk.

Generally the group was positive about their function and were keen to be more proactive in this role. In future, the UG reps would be responsible to circulating the Agenda, any papers and reports on the UG to their group.

Action: to send links to reports on WDF to UG reps. for them to forward to users.

AOB

Once all the GO meetings have been completed, the Q&A will be put on the WDF for users to view.

The next meeting will take place on 10th September 2008.

Appendix A

List of attendees, WDF User Group 5th March 2008

Confirmed attendees

Jane Hinton
Isabella Hayes
Gary Armstrong
Victoria Hook
Peter Marris
Carolyn Partridge
Dave Hawes
Kevin Glaze
Neil Conway
Eva McClelland
Calum Clements
Karen Smith
Roy Burton
Dawn Humberstone
Justin Lomax
Andrew Baker
Shah Faisal
Nicole Garrett

Apologies

Jenny Line
Julie-Ann Thompson
David Langley