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Central government has placed considerable pressure on local waste disposal authorities to consult a variety of stakeholder groups prior to the development of their Municipal Waste Management Strategies. Despite this pressure, central government has issued very little guidance as to how a waste disposal authority should go about its consultation programme. Through a series of telephone interviews with county council waste strategy managers, this thesis appraises the existing consultation practice of waste disposal authorities in terms of their ability to effectively inform integrated waste management decision-making. The results show that waste disposal authorities are generally consulting ineffectively and going about it in completely different ways. Elements of good practice are drawn together and a best-practice framework is produced with the aim of facilitating better consultation practice amongst local waste disposal authorities.
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1.1 The Municipal Waste Management Problem in the UK

Municipal solid waste (MSW) is defined as:

“All waste collected by or on behalf of the local authority, and includes all household waste, street litter, waste delivered to council recycling points, municipal parks and garden wastes, council office waste, civic amenity waste, and some commercial waste from shops and smaller trading estates where local authority waste collection agreements are in place” (DETR, 1999).

As the DETR (2000a) point out, around 27.9 million tonnes of MSW was produced in 1998/99. Of this total around 83% was landfilled, whilst 9% was recycled and 8% was incinerated with energy recovery. This is highly unsustainable because land filling waste MSW is a waste of a resource, there is insufficient space to continue using landfill for waste disposal; and landfill is a major source of methane (a greenhouse gas) therefore contributing to climate change. In order to deliver a more sustainable economy the DETR (2000a) state that more must be done with less, making better use of resources through recycling and recovery.

1.2 Drivers for Change

European Union (EU) legislation constitutes perhaps the most significant driver for change. Of particular significance is the EU Landfill Directive (1999/31/EC) which sets the following targets for the UK (DETR, 2000a):

- By 2010 to reduce biodegradable municipal waste landfilled to 75% of that produced in 1995
- By 2013 to reduce biodegradable municipal waste landfilled to 50% of that produced in 1995
- By 2020 to reduce biodegradable municipal waste landfilled to 35% of that produced in 1995
Biodegradable municipal waste is defined as “waste that is capable of undergoing anaerobic or aerobic decomposition, such as food and garden waste and paper and cardboard” (CEC, 1999). The UK faces hefty fines from the EU if these targets are not met. However, as the Strategy Unit (2002) points out, meeting these targets is going to be a very difficult task. The amount of municipal waste produced in England each year is growing by 3-4% per annum (one of the fastest growth rates in Europe) and at this rate the amount of municipal waste produced in England will double by 2020, with the cost of managing municipal waste doubling from £1.6 billion to £3.2 billion. A range of economic and social factors lie behind this growth rate including rising household incomes, changing lifestyles, advertising and the growth in sales of pre-packed goods.

On the back of EU legislation such as the landfill directive, central government produced its “Waste Strategy 2000” document (DETR, 2000a) which constitutes the main driver for change in waste management policy for England and Wales. The Waste Strategy 2000 builds upon the EU landfill directive targets by setting the following national targets:

1. The proportion of Municipal Waste recovered should be:
   - 40% by 2005
   - 45% by 2010
   - 67% by 2015

‘Recover’ means to obtain value from waste through recycling, composting, other forms of material recovery, or recovery of energy (DETR, 2001)

2. The proportion of household waste recycled and composted should be:
   - 25% by 2005
   - 30% by 2010
   - 33% by 2015
In order to meet these targets the government identifies a number of ‘levers for change’ in the Waste Strategy 2000 document, with a significant amount of emphasis being placed on the role of local authorities.

### 1.3 Local Authority Responsibilities and the Requirement to Consult Stakeholders

There is a ‘two-tier’ waste management system in the UK whereby most local authorities are either:

1. Waste collection authorities (WCAs), which are responsible for collecting the waste from households. These are typically District Councils.

2. Waste disposal authorities (WDAs), which are responsible for the disposal of the waste collected by the WCAs. These are typically County Councils.

A considerable onus has been placed on the WCAs and, in particular, the WDAs to play a leading role in delivering change and ensuring that the national targets are met. Central government has set statutory household recycling and composting performance standards for each WDA and WCA and is also going to issue tradable permits to local authorities to restrict the amount of biodegradable municipal waste landfilled (DETR, 2001). Central government has also placed an emphasis on the importance of moving to a fully integrated waste management system that is based on active partnerships between local authorities. WDAs and WCAs are expected to produce a ‘joint municipal waste management strategy’ which will act as the formal framework for each of these partnerships (DETR, 2001).

In addition to the WDAs and the WCAs the following stakeholder groups all have a significant role to play if the UK is to move towards a more sustainable and integrated municipal waste management system (DETR, 2000; Strategy Unit, 2002):

- Householders
- The waste industry
- Local businesses
- Local community groups
• Companies that provide markets for recyclables
• Regulatory bodies
• Non-government organisations (NGOs)

The role of each of these stakeholder groups is discussed in more detail in chapter 2. Each stakeholder group has its own agenda and clashes of interest occur. Considerable pressure is placed on the WDAs to consult each of these stakeholder groups, raising awareness of the waste management problem and seeking to understand their competing interests and strike a compromise in the municipal waste management (MWM) strategy that they produce in partnership with the WCAs (DETR, 2001). Further pressure to consult is placed on the local authorities by their statutory requirement to operate waste management functions in accordance with the duty of ‘Best Value’ (DETR, 2000a). As Adams et al (2000) point out, the Best Value regulations legally oblige local authorities to consult local people on their services over a 5-year cycle, review and report on how they have performed against targets, and embrace quality within their services. The central government document “Waste Strategy Guidance: Best Value and Waste Management” (DETR, 2000b) offers guidance on how the Best Value regulations should be applied to MWM strategy development. It places an emphasis on the need for Local Authorities to “consult local taxpayers, service users, partners, current and potential service providers and the wider business community in the setting of new performance targets”. Significantly it requires local authorities to implement ongoing consultation mechanisms in order to facilitate ‘continual performance’.

1.4 Aims and Objectives of the Research

Aims of the dissertation

This dissertation focuses on the WDAs of England and aims to appraise the effectiveness of their current stakeholder consultation practice and draw-together their different experiences in order to develop a best practice framework for stakeholder consultation. It is hoped that the outcome of this will be more effective consultation by WDAs in the future, enhancing the prospect of the EU Landfill Directive and Waste Strategy 2000 targets being met.

These aims are achieved through addressing the following objectives:
Objective 1

To identify what consultation techniques the English WDAs have been using.

Objective 2

To appraise the relative effectiveness of the consultation techniques identified (in terms of their ability to facilitate integrated MWM strategy development).

Objective 3

To identify the key barriers to consultation experienced by the English WDAs and to establish the means through which these barriers might be overcome in future.

1.5 Report Structure

The remainder of this thesis is split into 4 chapters. Chapter 2 reviews the background to this research topic. Chapter 3 describes the methodology used to address the aims and objectives of this study. Chapter 4 addresses the objectives of the research through a discussion of the results. Chapter 5 concludes the findings and addresses the overall aim of the research, i.e. the production of a best-practice framework for stakeholder consultation in a waste management context.
CHAPTER 2: THE RESEARCH CONTEXT

2.1 Introduction

As stated in chapter 1 of this thesis, central government has placed an emphasis on the importance of moving to a fully integrated waste management system that is based on active partnerships between local authorities. This chapter discusses what an integrated MWM system might consist of on a local scale, the reasons why each of the key stakeholder groups need to be consulted and the techniques that might be used to consult them.

2.2 Integrated Municipal Waste Management Strategy

Figure 1 illustrates what an integrated waste management system might look like at the local level:

Figure 1: A Local Integrated Waste Management System

Source: Adapted from Foxall (2003)
Waste disposal authorities, waste collection authorities, local householders, the waste industry, local businesses, local community groups, companies that provide a market for recyclables, regulatory bodies and NGOs all have a role to play if an integrated MWM system like the above is to be effectively developed. The government regards the provision of kerbside and brings-site collection facilities as a key measure in improving national recycling rates (DETR, 2000a). As Figure 1 illustrates, householders need to play a vital behavioural role in an integrated local MWM system by separating recyclables such as glass, plastics and steel from non-recyclables and biodegradable waste (which can be composted at their home) and placing them in a green kerb-side box or taking them to a local bring-site (Strategy Unit, 2002). It will be the responsibility of the waste collection authorities to provide home composting, kerbside and bring-site facilities to householders. This waste will be taken away and separated into individual waste streams by a contracted waste management company such as Biffa or Shanks. The waste disposal authority is responsible for negotiating this contract. Ideally it will also negotiate contracts with companies that provide a market for the recyclables in order to make provisions for their requirements when writing their MWM strategy.

Not all municipal waste items can be recycled and there will be a certain amount of ‘residual waste’. The waste disposal authority must decide how this residual waste should be managed and must chose between such options as incineration, pyrolysis / gasification or mechanical biological treatment (MBT). A description of these different options is provided in appendix 1. Each of these options can use waste for the creation of energy, a more sustainable practice than landfill. Nonetheless, landfill may still be considered as an option because a limited amount of landfill can take place through the permit system (DETR, 2000a) and it may constitute the ‘Best Practicable Environmental Option’ (BPEO) to decision makers in some instances. The BPEO is explained below.

A new decision-making framework for local authorities

The Waste Strategy 2000 sets out a decision-making framework that requires local authorities to focus on the concept of the Best Practicable Environmental Option when appraising the relative merits of potential waste management options. The BPEO is defined by the Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution as:

“The outcome of a systematic and consultative decision-making procedure which emphasise the protection and conservation of the environment across land, air and water. The BPEO
procedure establishes, for a given set of objectives, the option that provides the most benefits or the least damage to the environment as a whole, at acceptable cost, in the long term as well as in the short term.”

In determining the BPEO central government expects local authorities to take account of the ‘Proximity Principal’ and the ‘Waste Hierarchy’. As the DETR (2000a) points out,

“The Proximity Principal requires waste to be disposed of as close to the place of production as possible. This avoids passing the environmental costs of waste management to communities which are not responsible for its generation, and reduces the environmental costs of transporting waste.”

Figure 2 summarises the ‘Waste Hierarchy’. It is a conceptual framework consisting of four possible waste management solutions and acts as a guide to decision makers for ranking the waste management options being considered (DETR, 2000a).

**Figure 2: The Waste Hierarchy**
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(Source: adapted from DETR, 2000)

The solutions decrease in general desirability as the decision maker moves down the hierarchy. Solution one, **reducing** the amount of waste generated, is considered to be the most desirable, followed by **re-using** products and materials for the same, or a different purpose. **Recovering** value from waste through recycling, composting or energy recovery is considered the third most desirable solution. Local authorities may only consider the forth type of solution, **waste disposal**, if they can demonstrate that neither the reduction, re-use nor recovery options offer an appropriate solution (DETR, 2000a).
It is considered by the government that an integrated approach to waste management will embrace all the key stakeholders and it will constitute a mixture of waste management options, since “it is unlikely that one approach will represent the Best Practicable Environmental Option” (DETR, 2000a). A range of social, economic, environmental, land use and resource factors will need to be considered when deciding upon whether or not ‘reducing’, ‘re-using’, ‘recovering’ or ‘disposal’ constitutes the BPEO for each given waste stream. The only way to gain a full appreciation of all the social, economic, environmental, land use and resource use factors is if the WDA, as the principal decision maker, to embark on an extensive consultation programme with the relevant stakeholders, raising awareness of the waste management problem, and gaining as much feedback as they can on the potential waste management solutions.

The Audit Commission (2002) defines consultation as “a process of dialogue that leads to a decision” and notes that consultation, being a dialogue, implies an ongoing exchange of information as opposed to a one-off event. Dialogue also implies two or more parties listening to and taking account of one another’s views.

In the following section the specific role that each stakeholder group will need to play in an integrated waste management strategy is evaluated in detail, focusing on the need for effective consultation and drawing upon existing research that is pertinent to the aims of this dissertation.

**The Role of Waste Collection Authorities (WCAs)**

There is considerable pressure on WDAs to consult effectively with WCAs. The government has set statutory performance standards for each WCA and WDA at a level to ensure that each authority contributes proportionately to the achievement of the national targets set out in Waste Strategy 2000. The government will monitor performance and the DETR (2001) guidance paper on the development of municipal waste management strategy specifically states that “the MWM Strategy should set out a programme agreed by both the collection and disposal authorities, and should demonstrate how they will work together to deliver the targets”.

Waste collection authorities have a significant role to play in an integrated municipal waste management system through raising awareness of the waste problem in their communities and providing home composting, kerbside and bring-site facilities to householders (Strategy Unit, 2002). It is important that WCAs are consulted by, and work in close partnership with, the
waste disposal authorities because the WCAs know what waste management measures they can afford to implement in their communities, what is logistically feasible and what recycling and composting performance levels they are likely to be able to achieve (Beach, 2003 \(^1\)). This last point is particularly important because the level of waste not recycled or composted will determine whether or not the WDA will reduce the volume of waste landfilled to a level that will enable them to sell their allocation of landfill permits to other WDAs, providing them with extra revenue. The volume of waste that is not recycled or composted is also likely to determine which of the options for dealing with residual waste the WDA can consider. Incinerators can process larger volumes of waste than MBT, for example, and MBT may cease to be an option in an area where the WCAs anticipate a low level of recycling and composting performance. This may have a knock-on effect in terms of how the WDA goes about consulting the waste industry.

Effective consultation between the WDA and WCAs is made particularly necessary because of the two tier waste management system adopted in the UK (refer to chapter 1, Section 1.3). As the Strategy Unit (2002) point out, the split between collection and disposal authorities is relatively unique in Europe and it leads to inefficiencies that will make it hard for local authorities to meet their targets. The WDAs will face penalties if they exceed their landfill allowances and their ability to divert waste from landfill will depend upon district councils' progress on recycling and composting. There has been some concern that there may be a lack of co-operation between the WDAs and the WCAs given the two-tier system (ENDS, 2003a) and a considerable amount of pressure has been placed on central government to make the production of joint municipal waste management strategies by WDAs and WCAs a statutory requirement; and at the time of writing a bill is being passed through parliament to make it so (ENDS, 2003b).

**The Role of Householders**

Householders have a vital ‘behavioural’ role to play if sustainable waste management is to be achieved through buying products which will produce less waste, buying products made from recycled materials, separating wastes for recycling and composting kitchen and garden waste (Audit Commission, 2002; DETR, 2000a). However there is no statutory requirement for householders to recycle and householders have the choice to opt in or out of a recycling scheme (bring or kerbside) providing them with the power to determine whether or not Local Authorities meet their mandatory targets (Perrin and Barton, 2001). The Strategy Unit (2002)

---

\(^1\) Nicola Beach, the Waste Strategy Manager at Essex County Council was interviewed as part of the background research for this thesis.
has identified a lack of public information and awareness as one of the most significant barriers to sustainable waste management in the UK. The public have generally been unaware of the seriousness of the waste problem in the UK and how their individual actions can improve the situation. Hence, raising awareness of the problem is vital if the long term behaviour of householders is to change and the government has placed a key emphasis on this in the Waste Strategy (DETR, 2000a).

Perrin and Barton (2001) stressed the need for kerbside recycling schemes to be tailored to suit local circumstances and it is therefore vital that the WDA consults householders effectively and early-on in the decision making process so that specific local circumstances and needs can be discussed in their consultation with other stakeholders and use them as the basis for the development of the MWM strategy. If householders can see that their views have been taken on board they are more likely to ‘buy-in’ to the final strategy, increasing the chance of householders taking personal responsibility for their waste disposal habits. (DETR, 2000a; Petts, 1999).

Prior to any public consultation programme an awareness and information campaign should be conducted so that those consulted are able to offer an informed opinion (Audit Commission, 2002). A significant amount of research has been carried out on the various techniques that can be used to inform the public and raise awareness and Appendix 2 provides a summary of these techniques. Informing householders is particularly important with regard to consulting the public about the options available for the treatment of residual waste because there has been a long standing public perception that new waste management facilities of all kinds may be damaging to health. This has been identified as another significant barrier to the development of sustainable waste management strategy in the UK by the Strategy Unit (2002). Planning applications for new facilities have frequently been turned down owing to public concerns over the effects of these developments on property values, traffic levels and health. This has discouraged innovation and the development of new technologies because of the high risk developers now attribute to financing a project proposal (Simmons, 2003; Strategy Unit, 2002). Incineration, in particular, has had a poor level of public acceptability owing to negative media coverage about the possible links between dioxin emissions and cancer although it has been argued that recent improvements in technology have resulted in lower emission and “today’s infinitely cleaner plants must pose negligible health effects” (Porteous, 2001). Since the government are expecting energy from waste incineration to form part of the BPEO for many WDAs (HCETRAC, 2000) it is important that the WDAs inform
householders on the reasons why energy from waste (EfW) facilities need to be developed and provide what Porteous describes as a balanced “level playing field of factual data” that will enable householders to reach informed, rational conclusions as to which is their favoured option for dealing with residual waste. However it may be that their favoured option is not that favoured by the waste industry or WCAs. For this reason it would appear desirable for WDAs to thoroughly consult all the stakeholder groups in a manner that enables stakeholder groups to gain an understanding of each other’s viewpoints, agree a compromise and buy-in to the final strategy.

**The Role of the Waste Industry**

The waste industry is expected to support innovative recycling initiatives, develop new waste management technologies and offer a flexible and diverse range of services to local authorities. They are also expected to give advice on better waste management practices (DETR 2000a, Strategy Unit 2002). Hence there is a significant need for WDAs to consult the waste industry in order to develop a good understanding of their relative cost and feasibility of implementation. In addition to their existing contractors, the Best Value legislation strongly recommends that WDAs consult potential contractors in order to promote competition and efficiency amongst service providers and to attain a broad view of the different service delivery options available to them when writing their waste strategy (DETR 2000b).

**The Role of Local Businesses**

Under Best Value, local authorities must set targets for waste reduction, separate from recycling targets, and make waste reduction a priority wherever practicable (DETR 2000b). DETR (2001) states that authorities should “consider how wider partnerships with local commercial and related organisations such as supermarkets, packaging compliance schemes, and with the community sector, can help to achieve waste reduction targets”. The language is perhaps too weak here. WDAs need to do more than merely “consider” partnerships with local retailers and producers. Retailers and producers should be thoroughly consulted by WDAs in order to identify what measures could be incorporated that would help them to display the ‘extended producer responsibility’ advocated in the waste strategy 2000. Under the principal of ‘extended producer responsibility” producers need to develop a ‘cradle to grave’ appreciation of both economic and environmental costs and benefits when developing their products. As Coggins (2001) points out, ‘integrated product policies’ are required whereby products are designed and/or packaged with ease of re-use and recycling in mind. Read (2001) Argues that products should be made from recycled materials whenever
practicable, giving rise to the possibility of developing “cyclical” integrated systems on a local level in which recyclate collected locally is reprocessed and used by local firms in their next batch of products. The householders subsequently recycle the materials and the cyclical process starts again. WDAs should consult local retailers effectively because they could prove a useful catalyst for cyclical systems of integrated waste management through conveying ‘shop smart’ messages that promote the sale of products made locally from recycled materials (ENDS, 2000b).

**The Role of Local Community Groups**

“The community and not-for-profit sector has consistently shown its ability to be innovative, commitment to change and willingness to facilitate partnerships…through a range of kerbside recycling, composting, re-use and waste education schemes, the community sector has tested many of the techniques and ideas now becoming mainstream as we seek greater diversion from landfill” (DETR, 2000a)

Effective consultation with local community groups should be a high priority for waste disposal authorities as they develop their waste strategy because these groups carry out valuable work in educating householders in waste minimisation, motivating public involvement and increasing participation in recycling and composting schemes (DETR, 2000a; DETR, 2001). They can be effective in approaching the public and getting messages across in situations where the local authority might struggle if it has a history of being mistrusted by local residents (Audit Commission, 2002). They can also approach ‘hard to reach’ groups such as ethnic minority groups or the elderly (Audit Commission, 2002); or householders with small gardens who might prefer compost taking their waste along to a local community project rather than doing so themselves (DETR, 2000a). Composting is an activity in which community-based schemes that collect and compost organic material on a co-operative basis have been particularly effective. Hence effective consultation and partnership building with local community groups may be critical if local authorities are to achieve their statutory recycling and composting targets.

**Companies that may provide a Market for Recyclables**

As Read (2001) points out, “Statutory recycling targets will only be achieved if there are long-term sustainable markets for the materials recovered”. The DETR (2001) guidance paper states that “the MWM Strategy should set out what local authorities can do to support markets for recycled materials” but the language is weak here and none of the guidance documents
make a specific, mandatory requirement for local authorities to consult with local companies that may provide a market for recyclables. Over time, the reprocessing industry has developed in a way determined by the market in terms of capacity and location. As a result reprocessing facilities for some materials are only located in one part of the county (DETR, 2000). This has profound implications for waste management strategy because certain types of recyclate may have to be transported to reprocessors the other side of the country. The transport emissions produced may mean that recycling ceases to become the BPEO is some instances. This is clearly undesirable.

The government has set up a dedicated body, the Waste and Resources Action Programme (WRAP), to overcome market barriers to promoting re-use and recycling, focusing on developing markets and end-uses for secondary materials and promoting an integrated approach to materials resource use through promoting investment in reprocessing (DETR, 2000a). The WRAP has invested in a number of projects but these tend to be at a regional level (Watts et al., 2001). It is difficult to see how the concept of the ‘proximity principal’ can be achieved in waste management strategies unless markets are developed at a local level as part of a ‘cyclical’ waste management system. The ability of the WRAP to develop markets is perhaps hindered by the fact that it is under scrutiny from the European Commission concerning the rules on state aid for industry (ENDS 2003c).

These problems could be solved if local authorities play a more active role in engaging potential markets for recyclate. For example, Watts et al. (2001) highlights the role local authorities can play by engaging local small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in market development programmes. SMEs represent a high proportion of UK businesses and their increasing contribution to the economy stems from their ability to innovate adapt to changing markets and other demands. Hence, SMEs have the potential to provide a diversity of applications for recycled materials if WDAs consult them effectively and raise their awareness of the waste management problem. As part of an integrated waste management strategy the WDA could perhaps instigate voluntary agreements between SMEs and local retailers whereby local retailers promote the products of those SMEs incorporated under the strategy, subsequently acting as a further catalyst for ‘cyclical’ waste management systems. The WDA might be able to use financial incentives to stimulate cooperation between these two stakeholder groups.
Regulatory Bodies and Non-Government Organisations

The Environment Agency is the principal regulatory body that the WDA should consult. As DETR (2000a) points out, the primary task of the Environment Agency (EA) in terms of waste management is to ensure that waste management activities do not cause pollution to the environment or harm to human health by issuing waste management licences and can offer expert advice on waste management techniques and technologies. It also has tools that will help local authorities determine the BPEO. Hence the WDA should consult the EA to give them a more thorough understanding of the options that are available to them, which are more likely to constitute the BPEO and which are the more likely to be given regulatory consent. The EA also provides information on waste management to regional ‘Technical Advisory Bodies’ and waste planning authorities. Hence it is also important that WDAs consult the EA in order to establish how their strategy will fit into the broader, regional context (DETR, 2000a; Strategy Unit, 2002).

Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) should be consulted because such organisations as Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth can have a considerable influence on public opinion. If they are consulted effectively and can see that their concerns have been addressed in the final strategy produced by the WDA and WCAs it will boost the chances of them ‘buying in’ to it. This may have two types of benefit. Firstly it will prevent them from stirring up public opposition to development proposals which may hinder implementation of the strategy. Secondly, they may be willing enter into partnership with to help raise public awareness of the waste management problem and promote participation in any kerbside or bring-site recycling schemes (Strategy Unit, 2002).

2.3 Potential Consultation Techniques

A variety of different stakeholder consultation techniques can be used by local authorities. A number of authors have conducted some general research on the relative merits of the different consultation techniques available for consulting the public and these are appraised in table 1:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Juries</td>
<td>Small group of people to make informed judgements.</td>
<td>• Participation as opposed to consultation.</td>
<td>• May not be representative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can consider issues in detail quickly.</td>
<td>• Can be difficult to find volunteers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants can learn and reflect on issues before being asked to express views.</td>
<td>• Delegates may become so well informed of local authority processes that they will cease to become truly representative of the general public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Advisory Groups</td>
<td>Small group of people representing specific interests. Can be used to solicit the views of interested local residents and other stakeholders on a range of waste management issues.</td>
<td>• Participation as opposed to consultation.</td>
<td>• Requires considerable planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Access key stakeholders and community leaders.</td>
<td>• Time-consuming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Promotes trust.</td>
<td>• Expensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Promote learning.</td>
<td>• May not be representative and may be elitist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can operate on an ongoing basis to help monitor performance after the strategy has been completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Documents</td>
<td>Formal document that clearly lays out the issues to be addressed and seeks the views of stakeholders.</td>
<td>• Can be posted on the internet.</td>
<td>• May not get read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can reach people who would not attend more formal meetings.</td>
<td>• Too expensive to post to every household.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meetings</td>
<td>Formal Gathering.</td>
<td>• Useful way to meet the community.</td>
<td>• Difficult to control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Poor method of information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Do not encourage dialogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadshows</td>
<td>Engaging the public by taking the consultation out into the local community.</td>
<td>• Can reach people who would not attend more formal meetings.</td>
<td>• Time-consuming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Gathers information from people who would not attend meetings.</td>
<td>• Needs staffing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys and Interviews</td>
<td>Methods to obtain information and opinions. Survey's can be supplemented by an information leaflet and can be distributed by post, via the collection service or at Civic Amenity sites. Door-to-door or telephone interviews are also an option.</td>
<td>• Identifies different values and concerns.</td>
<td>• Time-consuming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Gathers information from people who would not attend meetings.</td>
<td>• Can result in bias.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Poor response rate likely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• May not be representative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops and Focus Groups</td>
<td>Meetings for a few participants. Can be used to solicit the views of interested local residents and other stakeholders on a range of waste management issues.</td>
<td>• Relatively easy to organise.</td>
<td>• May not be representative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Targets specific stakeholders.</td>
<td>• Delegates may become so well informed of local authority processes that they will cease to become truly representative of the general public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilitate mutual understanding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Allow more feedback than public meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Can operate on an ongoing basis to help monitor performance after the strategy has been completed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Objectives 1 and 2 of this thesis (refer to chapter 1) are to identify which consultation techniques have been used by the WDAs and appraise their relative suitability for informing an integrated waste management strategy. Table 1 summarises the general research that has
been carried out on the techniques that can be used to involve the public in decision making and as part of objectives 1 and 2 this thesis aims to identify which of these are the most suitable in the specific context of waste management. This thesis also aims to identify what techniques are the most appropriate for the consultation of stakeholder groups other than the public, because at the time of writing no such research could be found.

### 2.4 Principals of an ‘Effective Consultation’ Programme

In synthesising the work of Webler (1995), Petts (1999) and the Audit Commission (2002) it is possible to gain a good idea of the theoretical principles that should be adopted if an ‘effective’ consultation programme is to be carried out. These are listed below:

- **Consultees should be given a fair opportunity to consult, both in terms of being invited to participate and in terms of being given sufficient information to do so effectively.**

- **If a local authority has insufficient internal expertise to design and carry out their own consultation work, the services of an external consultant should be sought.**

- **Consultation exercises should include all demographic groups because different sections of the community, particularly minorities, may have needs or views that are different from those of the majority and, if they are not consulted effectively, these needs or views may not be considered when decisions are made.**

- **Literature should be printed in ethnic minority languages so as not to exclude minority groups.**

- **In the interests of securing a representative sample of opinion, respondents should be systematically targeted and not ‘self-selecting’.**

- **It should be demonstrated that the consultation is being used to inform decisions. Consultation should take place early in the decision making process and the outcomes of the consultation should be communicated to the consultees. Explanations should be given when the authority has made decisions that conflict with consultee opinions.**
• The consultation needs to be flexible and iterative. Evaluation of the effectiveness of the consultation should be carried out during as well as after the consultation process and revisions made to the programme before it finishes, as appropriate.

2.5 Existing Guidance for Local Authorities

Guidance on the methods of consultation that should be used by local authorities prior to the development of their joint waste strategies is very limited. Despite emphasising the need for effective consultation, the DETR (2001) document on waste management strategy development does not issue any guidance on how local authorities should actually go about their consultation programme. DETR (2000b) does offer a brief description of the consultation techniques that “may be suitable” within the waste management context including surveys, meetings, roadshows, focus groups and consultation documents but offers no specific advice on how to use them. Instead it refers the reader to the Audit Commission (2002) document but this only addresses the theory behind good public consultation and addresses none of the other stakeholder groups. The lack of government guidance on how to conduct an integrated consultation programme is perhaps a symptom of the fact that there is no published academic research on how theories of good stakeholder consultation practice translate to the specific waste management context in practice. This dissertation aims to fill this gap in the research, producing a practical model that can be followed by WDAs in future.
Qualitative data from the English county councils (CCs) was required to meet the aims and objectives of this thesis. Initially, it was intended that a survey would be sent to the Waste Strategy Manager (or equivalent position) at each of the English CCs by email or by post, in order to gain an insight into WDA consultation processes. A pilot survey was produced containing questions that were specifically geared to addressing objectives 1 – 3 (refer to chapter 1 for details). A face to face interview was arranged with Nicola Beach (the Waste Strategy Manager at Essex County Council) in order to gain a broader understanding of the research context and to pilot the survey. The pilot survey had been kept as brief as possible in order to minimise the effort that would be required by the Waste Strategy Managers when they filled it in, increasing the prospects of gaining a good response rate. However, when piloted, it became apparent that the survey would not adequately address the aims and objectives of this task as it was inflexible and did not provide the detail necessary to develop a best practice model for stakeholder consultation. With regard to likely response rates, Nicola Beach admitted that if she had received the survey by post it would probably have gotten lost under a pile of paperwork on her desk. She also said that emailing the survey to county councils may not secure a good response rate as council staff get many emails each day and the survey may remain unopened in people’s inboxes.

Therefore it was decided that the original survey would become more comprehensive and that the principal research method would be changed to a series of telephone interviews. Telephone interviewing constituted a more proactive method of research because Waste Strategy Managers could be directly contacted in order to arrange a convenient time in their diaries for the telephone interview to take place. It was hoped that this would lead to a better response rate. The telephone interview sheet is detailed in appendix 3. It made provisions for a more detailed assessment of the consultation process by asking specific questions about the consultation process with each of the stakeholder groups individually. Conducting the survey verbally also meant that interesting answers could be probed further, installing a greater degree of flexibility into the survey process.

**Obtaining a list of contacts**

Tagish (2003) provides a link to each of the county council (CC) websites in the UK. From each CC website the general switchboard telephone number was obtained. The switchboard at
each council was telephoned in order to obtain the direct telephone number for the waste management department who were subsequently asked about whom would be the most appropriate person to interview and to arrange a time to do so, if they were willing. The results of the telephone interviews are discussed in chapter 4.

### 3.2 Data Quality

The quality of the data was limited by the fact that the responses would be the views of one person involved in the consultation process at each CC and may not fully reflect the consultation process with total accuracy. Significantly, Waste Strategy Managers may not be willing to give any answers that point to any failings on the part of the council and may consciously attempt to portray the council in a good light. In order to address this limitation in the data quality, the questions on the telephone interview sheet were worded in manner that would encourage the respondent to openly convey their views rather than simply choose from three or four set options. Such an approach might have enabled the respondent to simply choose the option that portrays the council in the best light.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS, DISCUSSION AND SYNTHESIS

4.1 Introduction

Telephone interviews were successfully conducted with 12 of the 33 county councils of England (a response rate of 36%). The names of those interviewed are listed in table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Council</th>
<th>Waste Strategy Manager (or equivalent position) interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bedfordshire</td>
<td>Andy Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire</td>
<td>Bernard Warr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheshire</td>
<td>Jill Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumbria</td>
<td>Nigel Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>N/A (wished to remain anonymous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>Annette Dentith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorset</td>
<td>Adrian Pollar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>John Wade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Nicola Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td>Adrian Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>Adrian Tyas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland</td>
<td>Peter Jefferies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was not possible to secure telephone interviews with the remaining councils because they were either unwilling to comment; too busy to comment or the person responsible for the consultation had since left the council. Two councils requested an email copy of the survey with the intention of filling it in their own time and faxing it back when ready. Neither did so (perhaps vindicating the decision not to distribute the survey via email or post). 36% is considered to be a big enough sample from which to draw conclusions about the way in which WDAs have been consulting stakeholders. Conducting telephone interviews led to a better quality of data than could have been attained from a postal survey because some of the people interviewed were willing to go into considerable detail about their consultation and a few of the interviews were over 45 minutes in duration. Having the flexibility to ask questions spontaneously was particularly beneficial. For example, Derbyshire CC had yet to begin their consultation programme at the time of interview and have recruited an external consultant to plan it for them. The telephone interview sheet in appendix 3 was not valid in this instance and a spontaneous line of questioning was adopted from which the consultant (who wished to remain unnamed) offered a candid and unbiased insight into council attitudes towards consultation based on her experiences of advising two other councils prior to Derbyshire.
In the interests of comparison, a telephone interview was conducted with George Chase of the Rutland Unitary Authority (an authority which does not work on a two tier basis and has sole responsibility for the collection and disposal of waste).

In the interest of clarity, the remainder of this chapter adopts a similar structure to that of chapter 2 and that of the telephone interview form (appendix 3) whereby each of the stakeholder groups are discussed with individually, under separate headings. For each stakeholder group, the results are synthesised with the discussions of chapter 2 and geared towards addressing objectives 1 - 3 of this thesis (refer to chapter 1 for details).

---

**4.2 The Consultation of Waste Collection Authorities**

As discussed in chapter 2, there has been considerable concern that there may be a lack of cooperation between the waste collection and disposal authorities given the inefficiencies of the two-tier system (ENDS 2003c). The results of the telephone interviews would suggest that these fears were unwarranted to a certain extent. Each council interviewed stated that they had entered into a formal partnership with their waste collection authorities, working closely from the outset and writing strategy drafts in conjunction with each other. Consultation typically takes place through meetings between CC waste management officers and representatives from each of the WCAs in their area. In the majority of cases these meetings take place under the umbrella of a formal board or steering group that has been set up, such as Durham’s “Waste Management Partnership Board” or Norfolk’s “Norfolk Waste Group”. These management boards meet frequently to facilitate ongoing dialogue between the WDA and the WCAs. Cambridgeshire and Northumberland CCs have taken things a step further, securing high level interest and setting up a member forum consisting of senior managers from their CC and from the district councils. These meet quarterly.

Unfortunately, getting everyone around a table does not necessarily guarantee cooperation. Durham CC, in particular, found the two-tier system to pose significant barriers to gaining cooperation form the WCAs because “politics plays its part” and district often have their own interests to address owing to local government review pressure. This results in them “flexing their muscles”, making cooperation difficult at times. Bedfordshire CC experienced similar problems and Cheshire CC stated that whilst “everyone was committed to the partnership and could see the benefits…questions of independence always arise when money is involved”. Northumberland CC found a “not in my back yard” attitude amongst WCAs to be a problem whereby they were reluctant to permit energy from waste facilities to be developed in their locality owing to fears over public acceptability (perhaps not appreciating the fact that if they consulted effectively with the public then this would, in theory, cease to be a problem).
By contrast Devon CC experienced no barriers to gaining the cooperation of WCAs because “joint committees” have been in place between Devon CC and Devon’s district councils for 10 years and a long term culture of cooperation over a range of issues had already been established. Cambridgeshire CC sited the natural problems of “human beings working together” as being the only real barrier to consultation, but was quick to stress that the management board and member forum provided a successful means through working through any difficulties. Essex CC found their management board meetings to be particularly effective at breaking down barriers (such as the perception of WCAs that working in partnership with the Essex WDA would reduce their power), facilitating a good working relationship.

George Chase of the Rutland Unitary Authority was asked during his interview whether or not he felt that Rutland had an advantage over the two-tier authorities. Interestingly, whilst admitting that it was “nice to have total control” over collection and disposal it was not considered to be an essential prerequisite for sustainable waste management.

| 4.3 The Consultation of Householders |

**The effectiveness of awareness-raising techniques**

The results of the telephone interviews suggest that many of the awareness-raising techniques appraised in appendix 2 have been ineffective as a means of stimulating public interest in the waste management problem. Bedfordshire CC for instance, placed advertisements in the local press and put notices up in public libraries in an attempt to raise awareness of the problem and to encourage people to come forward with their views on the subject. Only 108 responses were received. Dorset CC carried out a comprehensive campaign of street interviews, radio advertisements, press releases and roadshows in order to raise awareness and encourage people to request a copy of the consultation document that they had produced or to download a version that they had published on the internet. Only 180 people requested a copy by post or downloaded it from the website. Dorset CC also sited a lack of knowledge as a significant barrier to consulting the public effectively at the workshops they held; noting that a lot of time was spent explaining the technical options such a Pyrolysis. This also led them to conclude that their extensive awareness-raising campaign of radio adverts, press releases, roadshows and placing leaflets in public places had been ineffective.

These findings appear to complement the work of ENDS (2000) who reported that the "Slim Your Bin" initiative to raise awareness in the East Anglia region has yet to change shopping
or recycling behaviour and has actually lead to a doubling of the number of people who say that recycling and composting are too difficult.

In contrast, Cheshire CC tried no specific awareness raising initiatives apart from a press release at the start of their consultation. Instead, leaflets consisting of information about the waste problem and a questionnaire were sent to every single household in Cheshire. The questionnaire could be returned by freepost and an incentive for doing so was offered in the form of entry into a prize draw. 26,000 responses were received (a response rate of 7%). This was considered a good response rate by Cheshire CC, with 2% or above being the criteria used to determine a “good” level of response. Cumbria CC attained a 9% response rate from their postal questionnaire (sent to every household) despite no prior awareness campaign being conducted apart from a press release at the start of the consultation process. Cambridgeshire CC attained a 5% response rate from their explanatory booklet and questionnaire that was sent to every household. Again a freepost address was provided and the incentive being added to a prize draw for a balloon trip was offered. However, not all door-to-door leafleting/questionnaire campaigns were this successful. Durham had a response rate of less than 1% from their leaflets but they did not offer any incentive to respond and they also experienced problems with the contractor that they hired to oversee the delivery of the leaflets. A significant number of leaflets were addressed with the wrong postcode and ended up being delivered in the Tyne and Wear area instead of their own. Northumberland CC also attained a response rate of less than 1% from their leaflet/questionnaire campaign. However, they did not provide any incentive to respond and also failed to establish a free post address resulting in the householder having to pay the postage if they wanted to reply.

**Focus Groups and Workshops**

Of the waste disposal authorities interviewed, Cambridgeshire, Cheshire, Devon, Hampshire, Norfolk and Northumberland CCs all used focus groups or workshops to supplement their postal leafleting and questionnaire campaigns. Dorset, Bedfordshire and Essex used workshops or focus groups to consult householders on the back of their awareness-raising campaigns. Cumbria and Durham did not make use focus groups or workshops. Workshops or focus groups enabled WDAs to provide more detailed information to the public and to involve them in the decision-making process more directly. The majority of the councils that ran workshops invited representatives from the other stakeholder groups in order to establish an integrated forum of debate in which stakeholders could directly interact with each other and gain a first hand appreciation of their competing points of view.
Cambridgeshire, Dorset and Essex CCs hired external consultants to facilitate their focus groups. Essex CC recruited Weber Shandwick (a public relations company) to carry out their entire consultation programme and they wanted to remain completely detached from the focus group process in order to create an “air of independence”. Weber Shandwick subsequently arranged a series of “mystery focus groups” whereby the attendees were not told what they were going to be asked about prior to the focus group; and at no stage were they informed that Weber Shandwick were working on behalf of Essex CC. A socio-economic mix of people were targeted and invited to the focus groups with a particular emphasis being placed on recruiting influential “opinion makers” throughout society. Delegates were paid £25 each and given a buffet lunch. Some higher earning delegates were paid £50 for their time. Any consultation that has an ‘air of independence’ clearly has its merits, but it is surely undesirable for local authorities to hide behind the veil of an external consultant because local authorities are required to establish ongoing consultation mechanisms as part of the Best Value legislation (DETR, 2000b; Adams et al., 2001).

**Gaining a representative sample of opinion and targeting ‘hard to reach’ groups**

The CCs that were interviewed varied in the extent to which they sought a representative sample of householder opinion. Devon CC maintain a data base of householders who have either been consulted before or who have expressed a willingness to be consult on a variety of subjects. From this database a representative group of people were invited to attend their focus groups. Dorset CC selectively invited householders in a manner that would “mirror the demographic split” of the county. Cumbria CC compared their survey results to those from a previously conducted citizen’s panel that consisted of 3500 volunteers selected to be representative and found that the two sets of results were similar. The remaining council’s were less convincing in their belief that they had attained a representative sample of public opinion. Cheshire CC for example, felt that their consultation was representative purely because they had attained a response rate of more than 2%. Conversely, Durham CC maintained that their consultation was representative despite attaining a response rate of less that 1%. Despite gaining the views of only 108 householders during their consultation, Bedfordshire CC were satisfied that their householder consultation was representative in that it represented the views of “those who had shown an interest” in the waste management problem. It is difficult to see how a sample of people “who had an interest” can be representative of householders as a whole.
The Councils interviewed were generally quite poor at targeting ‘hard to reach’ groups such as remote rural communities, ethnic groups, disabled people and the elderly with virtually all of the county’s interviewed making no specific effort to reach these groups with their consultation. For example, Devon CC did not feel it necessary to go “down to the nth degree” of being representative and Cumbria and Northumberland felt that the “blanket approach” of sending leaflets to every household covered these groups. However neither produced leaflets that were tailored to the specific practical needs of these groups nor did they publish any leaflets in ethnic minority languages. Only Durham targeted representatives of the hard to reach groups, utilising the “Local Agenda 21 round table process”. Cambridgeshire also targeted representatives of these groups, inviting them to attend their workshops.

The stage in the decision making process when householder consultation took place

As stated in chapter 2, in order for consultation with the public to be effective it is desirable for it to take place early in the process. However, of the 12 county councils interviewed, 6 consulted the public “at a stage when different options were presented for comment” (question 2.6 of the survey, refer to appendix 3). Dorset CC consulted their householders at a late stage when a “three stream policy” had already been developed in partnership with the waste collection authorities and householders were consulted with the aim of establishing how difficult it was going to be to implement. Only Bedfordshire, Cheshire, Devon and Norfolk conducted their householder consultation at “an early stage before any options were formulated”.

Devon CC took an interesting approach to consulting their householders at an early stage in the decision making process. Their questionnaire consisted of questions such as “What would make you change your waste disposal habits?”, and “Do you support energy from waste as means of dealing with residual waste”. An open ended line of questioning like this is beneficial because it forces the responder to start thinking about the problem pragmatically and express an unprompted point of view. The responses could also be used to identify areas where the public need more information. More specific questions such as “would you prefer to be charged for the collection service or be provided with a kerbside recycling service?” were also asked by Devon CC and the results from questions like this can be fed directly into the decision making process.

Bedfordshire CC consulted their householders at an early stage in order to gain a “good insight into the public perception of waste management issues, placing specific emphasis on
door-step recycling services and how they may be used most effectively”. For Cheshire CC, consulting early was necessary because householder views on recycling and composting were regarded as the “basic building blocks of the strategy”. It is difficult to see how an integrated waste strategy can be developed unless this kind of an attitude is adopted by waste disposal authorities. As Coggins (2001) points out, “the household is the ‘operational unit’ in terms of waste management” and it is critical to find out what kind of recycling and composting schemes are likely to yield the best participation rates and then build the strategy around this, using the results of the householder consultation as the basis for finding suitable contractors to provide the collection and recyclate separation and distribution services. It seems an illogical and inefficient use of resources to develop a strategy only to run the risk of finding out that the practicalities of the strategy at ground level are not those favoured by the public.

**Barriers to effective consultation with the public**

Householder apathy was sited as the most significant barrier to effective consultation by most of the councils interviewed. Bedfordshire CC found that it was difficult to get people interested in “dry, abstract issues” but found that people were more willing to comment on specific proposals and practicalities that would directly impact on them. Devon CC conducted a series of roadshows to raise awareness prior to their consultation and found that the majority of people they spoke to were only interested in finding out about recycling initiatives and were not interested in the strategy as a whole. Cambridgeshire also found that people were largely unwilling to comment and also felt that the only way to get a good response from the public is to consult them on the practicalities that affect them like kerbside collection schemes. This notion appears to be supported by the fact that the Rutland Unitary Authority only surveyed people who lived in the area where they had introduced a pilot kerbside scheme and a response rate of 55% was attained. Cambridgeshire CC also emphasised the need to charge householders for the collection of their waste according to how much they throw away as a means of raising the profile of the waste management problem and getting people to change their waste disposal habits. This is interesting because at present local authorities do not have the power to charge householders for their waste collection service. The Strategy Unit (2002) highlighted the need to charge householders according to the volume of waste that is not recycled in their critique of the Waste Strategy 2000. This ‘variable charging’ technique is widely practised in other Countries, yet the government recently side-stepped this issue when announcing which of the Strategy Unit’s recommendations it would be taking on board. The decision has disappointed organisations such as Friends of the Earth and the Chartered Institution for Wastes Management, which recently published a study calling for
the introduction of variable charging (ENDS 2003d). Research conducted in Canada has shown that householders who bare the cost of waste disposal generally purchase products with less packaging, recycle more, and reduce their contribution to landfills (Salkie et al., 2001).

In addition to the fact that many of their leaflet were sent to the wrong addresses by their distributor, Durham CC sited a lack of resources as a significant barrier to consulting householders. Durham had the smallest consultation budget of all the council’s interviewed (£30,000) which perhaps suggests that there was a lack of high-level commitment to the consultation. Durham also lacked human resources. For example, no one was recruited as a dedicated ‘Waste Minimisation Officer’ who could work solely with the public.

### 4.4 The Consultation of Local Businesses

The councils interviewed were generally very bad at consulting local businesses. Cheshire, Devon, Durham, Essex, Hampshire and Northumberland chose not to consult any businesses at all. Norfolk did invite local businesses to their “area forums” but did not consider it particularly necessary to do so as part of a municipal waste strategy. Dorset CC used the Dorset “Business Link” and “Federation of Business” groups to target businesses to invite to their workshops but no feedback could be obtained because the businesses contacted either said that they were too busy to attend or did not believe that they were relevant to the development of a strategy for municipal waste. Cumbria attempted to involve the local representative of the CBI in their steering group but this person felt that “anything involving politicians would be unproductive”. Cambridgeshire produced a baseline consultation document and circulated them around local businesses but received a “poor level of response”. This was again because the businesses did not see their relevance to the municipal waste strategy. Only Bedfordshire felt that they had successfully consulted local businesses. The “Bedfordshire Green Business Network” and the “Local Chamber of Commerce” were utilised in order to identify and invite local businesses to their design workshops. Interestingly, in stark contrast to Cambridgeshire and Cumbria, Bedfordshire did not consider there to be any barriers to consulting local businesses.

### 4.5 The Consultation of the Waste Industry

All of the councils interviewed consulted the waste industry to some degree but varied in terms of the techniques that they used and the stage in the decision making process that consultation took place. Norfolk invited representatives from the waste industry to attend workshops at a late stage when they were asked to appraise draft strategy documents.
Consultation of waste industry representatives is of merit because it enables other stakeholders to appreciate their viewpoints and vice versa. Cambridgeshire, Cumbria and Essex all consulted members of the waste industry at a stage when a set of options had already been established and were presented for comment in the form of a consultation document. Dorset consulted the waste industry at a late stage, consulting the major waste management companies through face to face meetings after they had already developed their “3 stream policy”.

Whilst Devon and Durham both consulted the waste industry at an early stage before any options were formulated, they only consulted their existing contractor. Of all the councils interviewed, only Bedfordshire CC consulted a variety of existing and potential contractors at an early stage before options were formulated. If the WDAs and WCAs develop a series of options by themselves, or purely in partnership with the Environment Agency, it is difficult to see how a truly informed set of options can be presented for comment. Yet virtually all of the councils interviewed elected to do just this, a practice which conflicts with the strong emphasis placed on local authorities by the best Value legislation to consult potential and existing contractors in order to secure an informed choice (as discussed in chapter 2).

### 4.6 The Consultation of Local Community Groups

Overall, the councils that were interviewed have been quite active in consulting local community groups (LCGs) and used a variety of techniques. Hampshire and Norfolk for example, all invited LCGs to attend their workshops and experienced no barriers to consultation. Cumbria, Devon and Essex opted to consult LCGs by sending out copies of their consultation document. Durham consulted LCGs through the Local Agenda 21 round table process. Only Northumberland chose not to consult LCGs at all, which is quite astonishing given the emphasis placed on consulting them in the guidance documents because of the useful role that they can play in an integrated waste management system (as discussed in Chapter 2).

The stage in the decision making process that the councils consulted LCGs varied considerably. Bedfordshire invited LCGs to attend their “design workshops” at an early stage in the decision making process before any options had been formulated. Dorset invited representatives from LCGs to attend their workshops, but these were held after their “3 stream policy” had already been written. Cambridgeshire CC invited LCGs to attend their workshops at a stage when different options had already been established and were presented for comment. When asked question 5.2 on the interview sheet (appendix 2) ‘what have you
gained from consulting local community groups’ the response was that “it makes you realise some of the things you are doing are not as popular as you think”. This statement perfectly encapsulates the necessity to consult Local Community Groups (and most of the other stakeholders for that matter) early on in the process. It seems a very inefficient use of time and resources for the waste disposal and collection authorities to develop a series of options or a draft strategy prior to embarking on a consultation programme only to discover that elements of it are rejected straight away. In addition, a better, more informed draft strategy will be produced if LCGs are consulted early because the community sector has tested many of the techniques and ideas now becoming mainstream through a range of kerbside recycling, composting, re-use and waste education schemes (DETR, 2000a).

Surprisingly, some of the telephone interview results seem to disprove the belief of the DETR (2000) that the community sector has “consistently shown its willingness to facilitate partnerships”. Cambridgeshire found some difficulty in getting LCGs to attend their workshops, stating that some “arm twisting was required”. Cheshire set up a “community waste action programme” which was used to identify interested groups but found that a number of those identified didn’t want to be involved. Cheshire felt that this was a difficult barrier to overcome because all depends on the number of “activists” that have taken the initiative and formed a local community group.

### 4.7 The Consultation of Companies that might provide a Market for Recyclables

Norfolk CC and the Rutland Unitary Authority were the most active of the council’s interviewed in terms of consulting companies that might provide a market for recyclables. Norfolk invited a number of such companies along to their workshops with the aim of finding out what kind of recyclate they would be looking for and how they wanted them to be packaged and delivered. Rutland Unitary Authority has a policy of constantly going out into the market and trying to find the “best deal available”. They have successfully found local markets for a number of different forms of recyclate, including glass and paper although they have found it very difficult to find markets that will actually pay them and they usually have to pay the reprocessor a gate fee. Bedfordshire also consulted “one or two” reprocessors by inviting them along to their workshops but experienced geographical barriers to consulting them because they were not situated locally. Devon and Essex held face-to-face meetings with ‘South West Remade’ and “Remade Essex” respectively. These bodies are regional equivalents of the WRAP and have been established in order to create new markets and secondary uses for recycled materials in these regions. Devon CC made a representative of South West Remade a member of their steering group and this is a commendable measure as
it ensures that consideration to the potential markets for recyclate is given early on in the waste strategy development process.

Cambridgeshire, Cheshire, Cumbria, Durham, Hampshire and Northumberland did not consult any companies that might provide a market for recyclables. Cambridgeshire and Durham both felt that the waste management company(s) contracted to collect and dispose of the waste should be responsible for finding markets for the recyclate. Unless waste disposal authorities devote the kind of commitment displayed by Rutland or Devon it is difficult to see how they can develop a truly integrated waste management strategy that promotes the ‘cyclical’ systems discussed in chapter 2.

### 4.8 The Consultation of Regulatory Bodies and Non-Government Organisations

All of the county councils that were interviewed consulted the Environment Agency (EA), with the majority inviting EA representatives to attend their steering group meetings. All of the councils interviewed found no barriers to consulting the environment agency and they all stated that they had received valuable expert knowledge and assistance from them with the exception of Northumberland CC who found that the EA did not have any great input into their strategy.

The majority of councils interviewed consulted non-government organisations (NGOs). Friends of the Earth and Greenpeace were the most commonly consulted NGOs. Consultation was either carried out through posting consultation documents or through inviting representatives to attend workshops. No barriers to consultation were experienced. Rutland Unitary Authority have gone a step further and entered into partnership with Friends of the Earth who have sponsored a trial ‘blue bag’ recycling scheme and carry out educational schemes in schools. It is surprising that more of the councils did not enter into partnerships like this with NGOs because it is very much in the county’s interest to secure ‘buy-in’ from NGOs for the reasons discussed in chapter 2.

### 4.9 General Points about the Consultation Process

The councils varied in terms of the amount of resources that they allocated to their consultation programmes. The financial budget for the consultations varied from Durham CC’s £30,000 to Essex’s £150,000. Whilst some authorities have more constituents and more finances than others this does suggest that some county’s enjoyed a greater degree of high-level commitment than others.
The way in which the councils went about funding their consultation programme varied. Cheshire, Cumbria, Devon, Hampshire, Norfolk and Northumberland CCs all financed their consultation by using internal funds. Dorset, Durham and Essex all funded their consultation in partnership with the waste collection authorities. Essex, for example, felt it was beneficial to do so because it secured buy-in and commitment from WCAs by forcing them to “sign on the dotted line” and commit themselves to the whole waste strategy development process from the outset. By contrast Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire CCs were able secure funding for their consultation programmes through the landfill credit scheme.

When asked question 8.4 on the interview sheet (“please rank in order of importance, the stakeholder groups whose views were most important when you were developing your waste strategy”) Cambridge, Dorset and Hampshire all stated that the views of the householders were the most important. Durham and Essex both felt that the views of the WCAs were the most important, although Essex made sure that the results from the public consultation were fed into their discussion in order to identify areas of consensus with the WCAs. Bedfordshire, Cumbria, Devon and Norfolk all stated that they felt the views of all the stakeholder groups were equally important. Devon felt very strongly about this because they have adopted the ‘triple bottom line of sustainability’ concept as their framework for decision making whereby a compromise must be sought between the competing factors of ‘cost’ ‘environmental’ and ‘social’ factors and only through listening to the views of each stakeholder can an informed compromise be found. This (combined with an early consultation of stakeholder groups before any options have been formulated) would appear to be an excellent principal to follow if local authorities are to produce an informed waste management strategy that all stakeholders will buy into. As stated in chapter 2 it is strongly recommended that decision makers communicate the reasons why certain choices were made to all the consultees, highlighting where their opinions have been used and explaining why certain viewpoints were not taken on board (Audit Commission, 2002).

When asked question 8.5 on the interview sheet, the majority of councils stated that they did invite the stakeholders to appraise draft strategy documents. This was carried out in a number of ways such as placing the documents on display in public libraries and on the internet so that the householders may pass comment on them. Other councils either sent copies of the draft strategy to stakeholders via post or invited stakeholder representatives to appraise it at steering group meetings (depending on the consultation methods employed by the council in question). Cambridgeshire held a second round of workshops once the draft strategy had been produced and invited back all the delegates that attend them before. This provided a forum
where all the stakeholder groups could appraise the strategy and discuss conflicting opinions of it an attempt to reach consensus. Such a measure is of particular merit because, having been consulted twice the delegates in question might willing to take place in the ongoing consultation exercises that the Best Value legislation requires local authorities to instigate.

As stated in chapter 2, an effective consultation, in theory, should be iterative and flexible. I.e. those carrying out consultation should periodically review the success of the consultation programme and make amendments to it as necessary before it has finished. However, there was little evidence of this taking place in practice. Durham and Bedfordshire CCs, for instance, made no attempt to improve upon their poor public response rates of less that 1%. Essex CC, however, did show some flexibility. Their policy of running an awareness-raising campaign and encouraging people to order or download the consultation document that they had produced meant that the consultees were inherently ‘self-selecting’ (something identified as being undesirable in chapter 2, section 2.4). The nature of the responses was analysed by Essex CC and having identified that they were not representative of the population as a whole they asked their external consultant (Weber Shandwick) to embark on telephone interview campaign. This successfully helped Essex to attain a more representative set of results, although perhaps this was a luxury that only Essex could afford given the fact that they had the largest consultation budget of all the councils interviewed.
A number of significant conclusions can be drawn from the results discussed in chapter 4.

1. The inefficiencies of the two-tier system can be overcome through creating steering groups at officer and senior management levels. It can be particularly advantageous to secure funding from the WCAs towards the cost of the consultation in order to secure their long term cooperation.

2. Awareness-raising campaigns using such methods as radio advertisements, newspaper articles, press releases, posters and roadshows have been largely ineffective at stimulating public interest in the waste management problem and therefore represent money misspent.

3. Door-to-door delivery of leaflets and questionnaires can be a relatively successful means of raising awareness and attaining a good level of householder feedback, but only if a freepost return address is provided and there is some kind of incentive to respond (such as a prize draw for example).

4. Workshops and focus groups provide a good forum for different stakeholder groups to discuss each other’s concerns and to reach consensus. They can also bring stakeholders closer to the decision making process. Delegates can be selectively invited in an attempt to secure a representative sample of public opinion. If delegates are willing to come back to future workshops then this can be a useful way to invite stakeholders to appraise waste strategy documents, issue feedback on how their comments have been included in the final strategy (subsequently enhancing the prospects of stakeholder ‘buy-in’ occurring) and installing the ongoing consultation mechanisms which the Best Value legislation requires local authorities to implement in an attempt to secure continual improvement in service provision.

5. Consultation documents are a less effective stakeholder consultation technique because they usually evolve WDAs and WCAs developing a series of options (or even a whole draft strategy) by themselves and inevitably stakeholders are not consulted at an early stage in the decision-making process, leading to an inefficient use of consultation resources and the possibility of re-drafting.
6. External consultants can be recruited to help with the planning of consultation exercises, although it may be undesirable to get consultants to facilitate workshops as local authorities need to break down any barriers between themselves and the other stakeholder groups in order to address the Best Value requirement to install ongoing consultation mechanisms.

7. Generally, the councils interviewed have been very poor at targeting ‘hard-to-reach’ groups in their consultations. As a result it is difficult to see how their strategies can make specific provisions for providing a waste collection service tailored to the specific needs of ethnic minority groups or remote rural communities.

8. The majority of councils interviewed have failed to appreciate the crucial role that local businesses and companies that provide a market for recyclables can play in a ‘cyclical’ and integrated MWM strategy.

9. The “triple bottom line of sustainability” concept adopted by Devon CC provides a particularly good framework to base the final decision-making around as it can facilitate a good communication programme to justify the reasoning behind the final choices that are made.

5.2 The Best Practice Framework

It is clear from this study that the WDAs are going about their consultation process in different ways. This may serve to increase the disparity in waste management performance between authorities because those who have consulted more effectively will (in theory) produce better strategies. Synthesising the results of the study, the literature review of chapter 2 and the work of Evison and Read (2001); Thomas (2001) and Williams and Kelly (2002) it is possible to develop a step-by-step best-practice framework that can be implemented by WDAs in future consultations, hopefully resulting in better consultations and more effective waste strategies. This framework is outlined below:

**Step 1 – Establish ‘Member boards’**

Establish a waste management board consisting of officers from both the WDA and the WCAs and hold monthly meetings. Establish an executive board consisting of senior management from the WDA and WCA. Securing high level commitment is vital in order to
gain as big a consultation budget as possible and a flexible time-frame for the programme. The consultation budget should be partially funded by the WCAs in order to secure their long term commitment.

**Step 2 – Assess ability to design an effective consultation programme**

The WDA should assess its ability to design and implement an effective consultation plan. Recruit the assistance of an external consultant if necessary.

**Step 3 – Leafleting (wave 1) and analysis**

Do not embark on an awareness campaign of posters, radio adverts, bus backs, videos, roadshows or newspaper articles. This money would be better invested in other aspects of the consultation. Instead, conduct a householder consultation exercise through the distribution of an information leaflet and questionnaire to every household in the county, working on the principal that ‘everybody should have the opportunity to consult’. The questionnaire should be brief, consisting of open ended questions geared towards appraising current awareness amongst householders. Include a freepost return address and an incentive to respond. Use the results to identify areas where more information is required.

**Step 4 – Leafleting (wave 2)**

Send out a second leaflet and questionnaire to every household, publishing the results of the first wave of questionnaires and how they have been taken on board. This should demonstrate to householders that their views are being taken seriously, facilitating trust and a better response rate the second time around. This is the principal reason for conducting two waves of leafleting. Research by Williams and Kelly (2002) has found that periodic leafleting is required to maintain awareness and reach the ‘hearts and minds’ of householders indefinitely.

Provide information on this second leaflet geared towards addressing the areas where knowledge was lacking before. The wording of questioning should be geared towards attaining quantitative data that can be used directly in decision making. Questions about the practical aspects of waste management that directly affect the householder (for example “would you prefer a green box or a blue bag?”) should be asked ahead of questions about ‘dry-strategic issues’ whenever possible. Include questions geared towards appraising the specific needs of ‘hard-to-reach’ groups. Leaflets should be published in ethnic minority
languages and a freepost return address and an incentive to respond should be provided using the money saved through not conducting an awareness-raising campaign. It should be made clear on the leaflet that this is the householder’s opportunity to participate in the decision making process and that respondees may be invited to express their views at a ‘design workshop’.

**Step 5 – Evaluate the effectiveness of leafleting campaign and adapt the consultation as necessary**

Consultation via leafleting means that the people who are consulted are ‘self-selecting’. Once the second wave of questionnaire results have been collated, establish whether or not a representative sample of results has been attained. Follow-up the leafleting campaign with a series of targeted telephone polling or doorstep interviewing if necessary. Maintain a database of respondees.

**Step 6 – ‘Design workshops’**

Hold a series of design workshops, using the database of respondees to invite a representative sample of the public. Invite representatives from all the other stakeholder groups to attend. These workshops should be used to gain a good understanding of stakeholder viewpoints and to gain an idea of the waste management options that are most feasible. Debate should be stimulated between stakeholder groups, helping them to develop an understanding of each other’s views. A particular emphasis should be placed on bringing stakeholders together in a manner that will facilitate the development of ‘integrated product policies’ and ‘cyclical’ waste management systems.

**Step 7- Write a draft strategy**

Use management and executive board meetings to write a draft waste strategy, inviting the Environment Agency and representatives from the waste industry to attend as appropriate. Draw together all the information from the design workshops and the leafleting campaign and draw a consensus of opinion from all the stakeholder groups. Use the ‘triple bottom line of sustainability’ and the BPEO principal as the framework for decision making as these can be used as the basis of a communications strategy justifying the decisions made.
Step 8 – Seek feedback on the draft through the workshop process

Hold a second round of workshops, inviting back all the previous delegates. Gear the sessions towards gaining feedback on the draft strategy from all the stakeholder groups.

Step 9 – Write the final strategy and communicate the reasoning behind it

Use the board meetings to write the final strategy. Publish it on the internet and in local libraries alongside a consultation report that communicates the reasons why certain stakeholder views were excluded from the final strategy. These documents should be posted to other stakeholder groups as appropriate. Summarise the strategy and consultation report on a leaflet and send one to every household in the county, providing details on how the strategy will affect them.

Step 10 – Ongoing consultation and service improvement

Conduct periodic workshops with the original delegates in order to meet the Best Value requirements to consult stakeholders regularly and secure continual service improvement. Periodically send postal questionnaires to all households asking them about the practicalities of the kerbside recycling initiatives, seeking feedback on how they might be improved (Evison and Read, 2001; Thomas, 2001) Update the strategy as necessary.

5.3 Limitations of the Framework

This framework is limited because it draws upon the findings of the interviews conducted with 36% of the WDAs in England. Some of the authorities not interviewed may have used better consultation techniques and these are therefore absent from the framework. The data collected was also limited in that it represented the views of one person and may not be a completely accurate reflection of the consultation techniques that were adopted by that council.

As stated in chapter 4, Derbyshire CC’s external consultant was interviewed as part of the telephone interview process and this gave an interesting and independent insight into stakeholder consultation by WDAs. She felt that there was generally an insufficient level commitment to consultation from senior management at the councils. This was considered to be partially due to the fact that councillors are reluctant to have their power taken away from them and like to maintain a degree of autonomy in their decision making. She also felt that the
failure of to set the example and consult effectively on issues such as GM crops was a significant factor. Hence, the best-practice framework is limited in that it assumes a significant resource commitment to the cause, something that may not occur in practice until there is a significant cultural shift in consultation attitudes at both a central and local government level.

5.4 A call for Further Research

The ultimate test of a consultation programme is the success of the strategy that is produced on the back of it. It would be interesting to conduct some further research in 5 or 10 years time, contrasting the relative performance of each of the strategies produced by the councils interviewed in this thesis, linking strategy successes or failures back to the different techniques that they used at the consultation stage. Parfitt et al. (2001) has conducted some research on how the relative performance of each of the MWM strategies might be compared.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EfW type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fluidised Bed Incinerator</td>
<td>Straight ‘mass burn’ incineration of waste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrolysis / Gasification</td>
<td>Converts MSW to gases by pyrolysis, then hydrogen or carbon by gasification. Energy is then recovered by combusting these gases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Biological Treatment (MBT)</td>
<td>MBT systems consist of a mechanical stage, where recyclables and rejects (batteries, tyres etc.) are separated to leave an organic fraction that is then sent to the biological stage for treatment using composting and digestion techniques. Methane rich biogas is produced which can be combusted to generate electricity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 2: AN APPRAISAL OF DIFFERENT AWARENESS RAISING TECHNIQUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>Use of posters or bus backs to announce events or provide information</td>
<td>- Can reach a large audience</td>
<td>- Limited amount of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Cheap</td>
<td>- Will only reach those who read the advertisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Flexible in content and design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Provides information at various levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Can be viewed at a convenient time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitions</td>
<td>Exhibits or displays in a public area</td>
<td>- Flexible in content and design</td>
<td>- Limited attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Provides information at various levels</td>
<td>- May be misinterpreted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Can be viewed at a convenient time</td>
<td>- May require staffing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>Website to provide information</td>
<td>- Cheap</td>
<td>- Not accessible to all members of the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Potentially convenient access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflets</td>
<td>Written material to convey information</td>
<td>- Can reach a large audience</td>
<td>- Can be treated as junk mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Cheap</td>
<td>- May be misinterpreted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>Written material to convey information</td>
<td>- Readily available</td>
<td>- May be biased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>articles</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Cheap</td>
<td>- Will only reach those who read the newspaper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Telephone number to get information or ask questions</td>
<td>- Easily accessible</td>
<td>- Limited flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lines</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not intimidating</td>
<td>- Staff may not have the technical knowledge necessary to answer questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television and</td>
<td>Used to convey information</td>
<td>- Can reach a large audience</td>
<td>- Expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Conveys powerful images</td>
<td>- One-off coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Innovative and eye catching</td>
<td>- Lack of editorial control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>Used to convey information</td>
<td>- Conveys powerful images</td>
<td>- Expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Innovative and eye catching</td>
<td>- Limited audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Can be used at viewer’s convenience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Complete editorial control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX 3: TELEPHONE INTERVIEW SHEET

Telephone Interview Sheet for County Council Waste Management Officers

County Council…………………………………………..

Name of interviewee ………………………………….

Position …………………………………………………

Section 1: Waste Collection Authorities

1.1 What techniques were used to consult with Waste Collection Authorities and why?

1.2 Overall, what have you gained from consulting the Waste Collection Authorities?

1.3 What barriers to effective consultation with Waste Collection Authorities did you experience, if any?

1.4 How do you think these barriers could be overcome in future?

Section 2: Householders

2.1 What techniques, if any, were used to inform the public and raise awareness prior to the consultation process?

2.2 What techniques were used to consult the public and why?

2.3a What was the total number of respondents? …………………

2.3b (If appropriate) What was the response rate? …………………

2.4 To what extent do you feel that a representative sample of the population was attained (and how do you check)?

2.5 What techniques, if any, were used to target minority groups (such as remote rural communities, ethnic groups, disabled people and the elderly)?
2.6 At what stage in the decision making process did consultation with the public take place? (Tick one box)

□ At an early stage before any options were formulated.
□ At a stage when different options were presented for comment.
□ At a stage when a single option had been chosen but there were several potential options for implementing it.
□ Other (please specify).................................................................................................

2.7 Overall, what have you gained from consulting the public?
...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................

2.8 What barriers to effective consultation with the public did you experience, if any?
...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................

2.9 How do you think these barriers could be overcome in future?
...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................

Section 3: Local Businesses

3.1 What techniques were used to consult with local businesses and why?
...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................

3.2 Overall, what have you gained from consulting with local businesses?
...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................

3.3 What barriers to effective consultation with local businesses did you experience, if any?
...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................

3.4 How do you think these barriers could be overcome in future?
...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................

Section 4: The Waste Industry

4.1 Whom within the Waste industry did you consult with and why?
...........................................................................................................................................
...........................................................................................................................................

4.2 What consultation techniques were used and why?
4.3 Overall, what have you gained from consulting the Waste Industry?

4.4 What barriers to effective consultation with the Waste Industry did you experience, if any?

4.5 How do you think these barriers could be overcome in future?

Section 5: Local Community Groups

5.1 What techniques did you use to consult Local Community Groups and why?

5.2 Overall, what have you gained from consulting Local Community Groups?

5.4 What barriers to effective consultation with Local Community Groups did you experience, if any?

5.5 How do you think these barriers could be overcome in future?

Section 6: Companies that provide markets for recyclables

6.1 What companies, if any, did you consult with a view to establishing a market for recyclables?

6.2 What techniques were used to consult with these companies and why?

6.3 Overall, what have you gained from consulting such companies?
Section 7: Regulatory Bodies and Non-Government Organisations (NGO’s)

7.1 What regulatory bodies or NGO’s, if any, did you consult?

7.2 What techniques were used to consult with these bodies and why?

7.3 Overall, what have you gained from consulting such bodies?

7.4 What barriers to effective consultation with such bodies did you experience, if any?

7.5 How do you think these barriers could be overcome in future?

Section 8: General Questions about the Consultation Process

8.1 What was the duration of the consultation?

8.2 How much did the whole consultation process cost?

8.3 How was the consultation process funded? (Tick one box)

square Internally
square In joint partnership with the Waste Collection Authorities
square Other (please specify)

8.4 Please rank in order, the stakeholder groups you regarded as the most important when developing your waste strategy, once the consultation process was over:

1
2
3
4
8.5 Which stakeholders, if any, were invited to appraise draft Waste Strategy Documents after the consultation process was over? (Tick boxes as appropriate)

☐ Householders
☐ Local Businesses
☐ Waste Collection Authorities
☐ The Waste Industry
☐ Local Community Groups
☐ Markets for Recyclables
☐ Regulatory Bodies

8.6 Were those stakeholders not invited to appraise draft strategies provided with feedback on how their views have been reflected in the final strategy? (Tick one box)

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Don’t Know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 9: Any Other Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>..................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>..................................................................................................................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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