



Reference group meeting 1 - Minutes

Nordic textile commitment – Part 2 Implementation

Place: Ramböll, Skeppsgatan 5, Malmö

Participants:

KP	Kaj Pihl	UFF Denmark	Denmark
TW	Tina Winberg	City of Copenhagen	Denmark
NK	Nikola Kiørboe	Copenhagen Resource Institute	Denmark
MH	Minja Huopalainen	UFF Finland	Finland
SN	Sari Nikkola	Kontti/Finish Red Cross	Finland
HD	Helena Dahlbo	Finnish Environment Institute, SYKE	Finland
TH	Timo Hämäläinen	The Finnish Solid Waste Association	Finland
BBE	Benedicte Brinchmann Eie	H&M	Norway
FN	Frode Nilsen	Fretext	Norway
KE	Kåre Edvardsen	Halden kommune	Norway
SR	Synnøve Rubach	Østfoldforskning	Norway
EE	Emma Enebog	Myrorna	Sweden
SW	Susanna Winblad	City of Malmö	Sweden
IM	Ingela Morfeldt	VA syd	Sweden
KR	Klaus Rosinski	Returtex/HumanBridge	Sweden
ED	Elisabeth Dahlin	Röda Korset Sverige	Sweden
JJ	Jørn Jensen	Bureau Veritas	Sweden/Denmark
AF	Anna Fråne	IVL Svenska Miljöinstitutet	Sweden
DP	David Palm	Ramböll	Sweden
YA	Yvonne Augustsson	Naturvårdsverket/NAG	Sweden

Not present

Steen Trasborg	Trasborg	Denmark
Jonas Eder-Hansen	Danish Fashion Institute	Denmark
Kenneth Skov-Andersen	Frelsens Haer	Denmark
Ellen Halaas	Oslo kommune (previously Avfall Norge)	Norway
Sara Winroth	Lindex	Sweden

The minutes were taken by David Palm and have been shown to the project team for comments before publishing. The comments shall NOT be used as cited statements from actors since the notes are limited to the summarized interpretation by DP. If questions arise, please contact the project team.

10:00-10:30 Welcome

The meeting started at 10:05 with a welcome by project leader AF. AF presented the project consortium and all meeting participants presented themselves and their expectations.

Expectations:

NK: In 1-2 years see an active certification

SR: Get comments from the participants in the meeting on the work done and move on to the trial part.

FN: Looking forward to certification process. Looking forward to dealing with illegitimate actors.

KE: Agrees with FN.

KR: Looking forward to go into the operational stage with impact in the field.

BBE: Agrees with previous comments. Important to both increase awareness on collection in general and legitimate collection.

JJ: Expect to give input from previous certification systems.

SW: High expectations to move towards sustainable clothing.

ED: Looking forward to certify all Kupan-shops.

IM: Agrees with SW.

KP: Setting high standards for the Nordic region.

TW: To use certification as tool for collection within Copenhagen.

YA: Great expectations to scale up pilot test to full scale.

DP: To revolutionize the reuse and recycling of textiles in the Nordic region.

HD: Expect a good system to revolutionize textile recycling.

TH: To be able to follow textile waste.

SN: New to the commitment.

MH: Cooperation in the field.

AF: Agrees with DP. Looking forward to fruitful discussions during the meeting.

10:30-11:00 Presentation of the project

Presentation by AF

See PowerPoint

The website for the commitment is not yet finalised, but will be: www.textilecommitment.org

A question from HD: What is the role of included organisations? AF replied: to be audited during the trial and used to get a reality check on the criteria.

11:00-12:00 Certification system and actors' roles

Presentation by AF

See PowerPoint

The voluntary commitment (VC) is in principal open to all actors including municipalities, importers, retailers and more.

The Code of conduct (COC) and certification is aimed for actors working with flows of used textiles in practice.

The Certification system operator (CSO) is responsible for management of the voluntary commitment and the certification, but not for auditing. IVL acts as CSO during the trial.

Auditors are accredited organisations and individual verifiers appointed by the CSO.

Certified organisations and organisations seeking certification are actors meeting criteria specified in the COC. Certified organisations have successfully completed the auditing.

Comment by JJ: Important to make the certification process streamlined and simple. The proposed structure seems very common. Three years as time for valid certification is common, but with smaller checks every year. It is possible to simplify using only accredited auditors initially.

A short discussion on fees followed. It was underlined that the aim is to create a non-profit and streamlined organisation. The Certification system operator (CSO) will not charge fees for the trial period.

ED: How will the system manage an organisation with several legal entities?

How to make it easier for an umbrella organisation?

KR: A certification will always lead to some exclusion.

DP: A smaller actor should be able to cooperate with a larger actor for a certification.

JJ: It is often managed by checking samples to limit the number of site visits with larger organisation responsible for internal audit. Common criteria are that the mother organisation has a Common management system, an internal auditing system and processes need to be

similar at the different sites. Mother company needs to convince the auditor that the internal audit is sufficient. Auditors sample checks verifies.

KP: UFF have different legal bodies, so not applicable. They will seek certification separately.

ED: Organisations are different for the different countries, but should be coordinated nationally.

Supported by SN

12:00-12:45 LUNCH

12:45-13:45 Which actors in the value chain should be certified?

Presentation by NK

See PowerPoint

There are often very complex chain of actors from separate collection and forward. Which should be able to seek separate certification? The proposal from the project group is Collectors and Sorters.

FN: Important to certify all actors to the end

ED: Where is the end? Sorting should be included. Where should certification end?

KR: Partnership with local authorities is also needed to stop the non-certified collection.

FN: Should municipalities be allowed to collect. Is there a conflict of interest?

What is the municipalities' role?

KR: It is often not allowed to collect, but illegal collection is common.

SN: Finnish Red Cross exports textiles as aid. This must be added to the certification scheme as a certifiable option.

Some of the actors collect used textiles in their second-hand shops: then they are a collector. It was agreed that the action steers the certification.

The discussion took a sidetrack into the issue of waste and donations. National definitions might differ here with Norway possibly different to Denmark and Sweden. In DK and SE it is down to the intent of the donor if it is a donation or waste. (Added by DP to notes: The COC manages the issue from a legal standpoint by clearly stating that national law supersedes the COC but cooperation with the municipality should be sought for to eliminate the issue.).

However, it was pointed out that if we call it waste, we could jeopardize today's very good attitude and practice. In addition, normally a collector of used clothes is not allowed to collect waste. An action point for the project group is to check the EU legislation (and interpretation of it in each country).

Back to the main question: Should only collectors and sorters be certified? All parts needs to be checked. For transports, there is already a permission system, so criteria can be for collectors.

JJ: In a normal chain of custody certification the collector needs to be able to verify contacts before and after their part and documents for transportation. How to manage the reuse level may be more complicated and maybe not possible to answer before trials.

ED: How should we consider new clothing from retailers directly going to “second hand”?

NK and more: it should go into the regular flow.

KR: There is no need to publicly specify where textiles come from, only to the auditor.

It was agreed that certifying the sorters will make the system easier, as several collectors can use the same certified sorter. In addition, it already exists a certification system for sorting facilities in Europe.

BBE: Should we include levels of excellence with a score that can differ between certified actors?

DP: This has been discussed in the initial development and may become an additional part of the certification in revised versions. To make the certification manageable and streamlined it will not be included for now. JJ supported this decision.

The general consensus was that collectors and sorters should be able to seek for certification.

13:45-14:00 Coffee break

14:00-15:00 Protocol templates to be used for certification

Synnøve Rubach presented

See PowerPoint

A template draft has been produced for a collector with all subsequent stages (e.g. Fretex).

JJ commented that the drafts are to be elaborated.

KR: Look into replacing “textiles” with original (textiles). Supported by UFF DK.

DP: Possible consequences on targets and statistics need to be checked. (DP added to notes: Original (textiles) can be added as an additional indicator for collection)

TW: How to manage non-textiles?

DP: Originally excluded in current version of COC

FN: Must be careful with terminology

BBE: First step of the template could be to describe the audited organisation value chain.

SR: Already included.

EE: Recycling – what do we mean by hazardous substances?

AF: Currently only to describe what is done, no specified criteria. (DP added to comments: This part will be relevant to update when a clear method for sorting and a list of substances can be produced. Not for the current version)

KE: How to defend the certification to the inhabitant when criteria are sometimes “missing”?

DP: Municipalities can always include additional demands on top of the certification.

SR: Recycling rates are difficult to compare. A common calculation method is proposed to ensure comparability.

SR: Difficult criteria (C8.6), basically “do you follow ISO14001?” KP and KR positive and see these kind of criteria as inevitable for the future.

DP: Possible to include answers for further development of criteria in the COC.

The website was initially aimed to have a map with collection points but this could be an issue for the map of collection points to provide a guide for illegitimate actors. A suggested change is to give the nearest location to the donor. This is a topic for future debate to find a balance between easy for the donor and not to make life easier for illegitimate actors.

SW: What information do collectors want to have communicated and what should not be communicated?

NK: CSO provides basic information which can then be adapted for the specific context.

A final issue was raised by AF to clarify if it would be possible for collectors to provide annual data updates for collection volumes and similar to allow for follow-up. The general consensus was that this should not be a problem.

15:00 – 15:30 Questions and next steps

JJ: Important to create a clear standard and improved guidelines for the organisations seeking certification. A step by step guide is planned for the website with references to relevant documents. A case could also be included in the guidelines.

The website must clearly state/explain the trial period – and that the system can change due to input from the project.

An additional question was raised by the Finnish participants joining by video. They jointly oppose combined collection of textiles with worn, torn and incomplete textiles since this is collection of textile waste. DP gave an answer by text that this was extensively discussed and that it is not considered possibly for the average person to differentiate between reusable and recyclable textiles with reference to among others a study in Stockholm. There is a question of reusable for whom, since preferences differ heavily between different geographical areas. The question will be further discussed with AF and added to the Q&A section of the website.

The second reference group meeting is scheduled for October.

The meeting ended ahead of schedule at 14:30.