

WasteDataFlow

WASTEDATAFLOW NORTHERN IRELAND USER GROUP MINUTES

MEETING HELD 5th July 2007

14:00 Room G3 Klondyke Building, Belfast

Attendees:

Michael Lavery **ML** (Antrim BC),
Ricky Burnett **RB** (arc 21),
Clive Catterson **CC** (Ards BC),
Liz Drew **LD** (Armagh City & DC),
Nigel McKeown **NM** (Ballymoney BC),
Brendan Murray **BM** (Belfast City Council),
Tim Smith **TS** (Castlereagh BC),
Jonathan Wilson **JW** (Coleraine BC),
Mark McAdoo **MM** (Cookstown DC),
Paul Topley **PT** (Craigavon BC),
Gavin Mannix **GM** (Fermanagh DC),
Petrina Cassidy **PC** (Larne BC),
Noeleen O'Malley **NO** (Lisburn City Council),
Tara Cunningham **TC** (Newry & Mourne DC),
Lisa Mayne **LM** (Newtownabbey BC),
Jean Stewart **JS** (Carrickfergus BC)
Lynsey Daly **LDa** (Arena/Strabane).

Claire O'Neill **CO** (EHS)
Adrian Fitzpatrick **AF** (EHS)
Stephen Gracey **SG** (EHS)
Sean Campbell **SC** (EHS)

Apologies:

John Murtagh (Magherafelt DC)
Julie Hannaway (Derry City Council)
Steve Wright (Down DC)
Keith Ferguson (Dungannon & South Tyrone BC)

1. Welcome and Introductions

CO welcomed everyone to the meeting and complimented the good attendance which highlights both the need and desire for such a group.

2. Terms Of Reference

Terms of reference for the User Group were circulated to the group prior to the meeting. CO invited feed back on the draft including the group membership and frequency of meetings.

WasteDataFlow

The group agreed to meet on a quarterly basis which would as much as possible coincide with the Operational Group Meeting.

The group felt that a representative from each district council and each WMG should be invited to each meeting which was subsequently agreed.

ML requested that the TOR should reflect the DCs desire for good reporting outputs from WDF and how this is taken forward.

CO informed the group that NI now has a DC representative on the OG. ML is now part of the WDF OG and MM will step in if ML is not available.

- **Action: CO to amend TOR to reflect agreed actions.**

2. WDF Development

CO gave a presentation to the group on WDF developments. This included the new kpi spreadsheet.

RB inquired as to whether these reports would be available on a monthly basis as arc21 would be encouraging DCs to input data monthly. CO hi-lighted that to date very few, if any, are inputting data on a monthly basis but will enquire about the feasibility of monthly reports.

- **Action: CO to enquire about monthly reports**

CO presented the group with the option of opting into the 'automatic email notification' for data rollup.

The group informed CO that the email rollup when data is submitted from level 0 to level 10 has disappeared.

RB enquired about email notification when data is rejected as he needs to know which way to send data – CO to investigate.

The group agreed they would like the data rollup facility implemented.

- **Action: CO to implement email notification facility**
- **Action: CO to investigate data rejection email notification**

Some members of the group informed EHS that when query forms are sent to them, it is not clear whether their data has been rolled back. AF agreed to include this information on the query form.

- **Action: AF to modify query form**

ML queried the difference between DCs BVPIs and kpis. MM informed the group that the PIs are generally the same and he would forward the details of DCs BVPIs to CO.

- **Action: MM to forward BVPI detail to EHS**
- **Action :CO to review DC BVPIs for WDF reporting**

WasteDataFlow

ML requested historical data be available on the kpis reports, particularly waste arisings. CO informed the group that this is planned and will be completed ASAP.

- **Action :CO plan input of historical data on kpi reports**

The group discussed the reporting requirements / desires of DCs. CO invited the group to forward suggestions as to what reports they would like. RB requested that CO send through a list of planned reports and they would add to it. CO agreed, but hi-lighted that WDF does have resource limitations and requests will be prioritised through the OG.

- **Action :CO to send suggested reports list to group**
- **Action: Group to submit suggestions before 17th August 2007.**

ML raised a concern about different sections of EHS requesting data, particularly regarding CA site waste, that DCs have already reported in WDF. CO informed the group that data requested under licensing regulations would be site specific whereas data reported in WDF is collective data for all CA sites.

RB suggested that it would be useful to report CA site data monthly and per CA site for various reasons. A debate ensued as to whether DCs want to report per CA site in WDF with some members expressing concern over the accuracy of data from particular sites which don't have weigh bridges etc.

CO agreed to investigate, at the next OG, the reporting of waste per CA site. CO hi-lighted that the reporting per CA site would involve a lot of extra data input which would also be subject to audit under NILAS, she said it will basically be like another Q19. BM suggested that if WDF was set up to accept data for each CA site there could be an 'opt out' option for DCs. CO said it would be her opinion if this was implemented it would be a requirement for all, particularly if it were to support license reporting requirements. The group agreed to give this whole issue more consideration within their groups.

- **Action :CO to investigate CA site data reporting**
- **Action: Group to discuss and feed back at next meeting on CA site reporting**

3. Validation Process

AF made a presentation to the group on the validation process. AF hi-lighted the need for DCs to generate the summary report and use this in their own validation processes before submitting data. The functionality will help DCs find errors in reporting which can easily be resolved before data is submitted. This in turn will result in less queries from EHS and save time for everyone in the long run.

RB suggested we need to think about terminology i.e. Recovery, regarding the "waste framework directive" as well as the 5 different category streams for WEEE.

WasteDataFlow

LM suggested that garden waste should not be queried as it was obvious this would increase in the summer. CO advised that as this is the first step in the audit process we may ask for confirmation on such issues as assumptions cannot always be made. CO explained that particularly with green waste EHS will compare tonnage with previous year to take account of seasonality.

BM enquired as to the margin of error before a query is raised. AF advised this was normally $\pm 25\%$ and $\pm 10\%$ for waste to landfill.

The group then discussed the reporting of final destination information. CO informed the group that under NILAS DCs must report the destination of the final reprocessors. CO said MRFs are not final reprocessors and the acceptance of waste at these facilities is not confirmation that the waste has been reprocessed/ recycled.

JW advised that he experiences a bottleneck with contractors supplying info. Furthermore companies' bulk up so the materials could be in a shed and not at a final processor, as well as this information could be deemed commercially sensitive

CC said it takes him a month to get data from his contractors and he has been given wrong info before.

TC said companies tell her that they already supply this info to EHS so why are councils requesting it.

RB advised a statutory notice could be served on the contractor to supply the information.

TS commented that reporting requirements can be included in contractual arrangements.

CO agreed to talk to WMG representatives regarding how we move forward will improving final destination information.

- **Action: CO to talk to WMG representatives regarding final destination information.**

4. Mass Balance

CO presented a worked example of the mass balance report, explaining to the group how they may monitor their BMW to landfill on a quarterly basis. CO hi-lighted the use of the calculated residual biodegradable % and how this may be above the 71% mark depending on how much BMW had been diverted. This is more likely to occur in a non-growing season.

MM enquired as to whether rubble is included in the kpi recycling rate. CO confirmed it was included in municipal recycling rate but obviously not household.

5. AOB

Household numbers

ML enquired as to how household figures are worked out and what the current figures are.

CO informed the group that housing figure were derived from census data with new builds data but would confirm the detail of this to the group. CO advised that the source of household numbers can be obtained from various sources, each varying slightly. CO confirmed that, through the Data Task Force, the current source for household numbers had been agreed and this took several months to agree so it was not something which should need revisited.

6. Date of Next Meeting

Paul Topley agreed to host the next meeting in Craigavon on the 28th September 2007 at 11.00.

- **Action :PT to confirm exact location for meeting**