



Reference group meeting 2 - Minutes

Nordic textile commitment – Part 2 Implementation

Place: Ramböll, Skeppsgatan 5, Malmö

Date: 2016-02-11

Participants:

Kaj Pihl	UFF Denmark	Denmark
Tina Winberg	City of Copenhagen	Denmark
David McKinnon	Copenhagen Resource Institute	Denmark
Nikola Kiørboe	DAKOFA	Denmark
Steen Trasborg	Trasborg	Denmark
Ergun Arkin	Trasborg	Denmark
Minja Huopalainen	UFF Finland	Finland
Frode Nilsen	Fretext	Norway
Cecilia Askham (via link)	Østfoldforskning	Norway
Ellen Halaas (via link)	Avfall Norge / City of Oslo	Norway
Emma Enebog	Myrorna	Sweden
Susanna Winblad	City of Malmö	Sweden
Ida Nordin	City of Malmö	Sweden
Klaus Rosinski	Returtext/HumanBridge	Sweden
Elisabeth Dahlin	Röda Korset Sverige	Sweden
Anna Fråne	IVL Svenska Miljöinstitutet	Sweden
David Palm	Ramböll	Sweden
Yvonne Augustsson	Naturvårdsverket/NAG	Sweden
Stefán Gíslason	Environice	Iceland

The minutes was 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.

Note that content of the Powerpoint presentation used during the meeting is needed to be able to follow the notes.

10:00-10:20 Welcome and status of the project

AF introduced the agenda and went through a quick roundtable presentation of all meeting participants.

AF introduced the collectors' way to certification and current project activities.

The name for the certification has changed from "code of conduct" to "Standard for transparency and environmental performance". This since criteria are focused on environmental performance and not social and other criteria normally found in a code of conduct.

ST disagrees with the name change since a standard can be considered to be on a lower level of commitment.

AF explained that it may be changed again further on if social criteria become part of the standard at a later stage.

AF explains what Miljöfyrtorn, who has performed two of the trial audits, is and why it has been included as an auditor. Miljöfyrtorn is similar to ISO 14001 and the most common environmental management standard (standard and organisation have the same name) in Norway.

Fretext, Myrorna and UFF DK have this far been audited. When a new version of the audit checklist is available, H&M Norway will be audited to be able to evaluate if changes made have made the checklist clearer.

10:20-11:20 Experiences from the trials

- Danish

DM gives some experiences from the Danish trial.

Bureau Veritas spent a whole day with UFF and visited a warehouse to confirm figures and processes.

There were two key issues identified:

- System boundaries – where do we draw the line between the collectors and their partners? Who is the end user?
- UFF had already done a lot of work documenting the management of their textiles which aided the process significantly. A complex management creates a complex audit. The audit was a time-intensive process, but a follow-up will be significantly quicker. Time needed for the audit is also dependent on adjustments based on the experiences and discussions in this meeting. It may not entirely be a bad thing as it is a good run-through of the business.

In Denmark, textiles are now commonly treated as waste regardless of condition. Collectors need to pay fees for collection. This can affect the certification, but it is too early to tell.

Bureau Veritas had commented: The documentation that is needed needs to be clearer already from the start. Also it can be an idea not to set the bar to high initially similar to ISO9001 and ISO14001.

AF: A difference between ISO and the Standard is that ISO is entirely process based and the Standard has clear goals.

KR: Did UFF DK find it difficult to find the answers for the certification?

KP: Yes it was difficult, but that is a good thing.

YA: How time-consuming is it compared to an ISO audit?

DM: I will ask Bureau Veritas how demanding the process is compared to an ISO14001.

ST: How long time did it take?

KP: One month in total. Actual working time was around two weeks, only with the certification. The audit was invented in the process, which took a lot of work rather than a clear checklist. Next time will be significantly quicker.

AF: The level of detail on what is actually possible to audit is in a learning process since we did not know exactly what was possible to require.

KP: Actors have different preconditions. The combination of the project teams theoretic knowledge, the collectors' practical knowledge and auditors' certification knowledge creates a very good quality.

SG: Time needed for an audit is difficult to say at this time, but will be clearer in the future. It is still in a learning process.

KP: To add on SG. Very varying complexity depending on which actor is audited. UFF DK is very complex due to its size.

- Norwegian

CA: The audit was made over two days in late January. A longer time of preparation together with a consultant was done before the audit. A document list was created to make it more practical during the process. This could be further developed.

Gathering information for the first time was time-consuming, but will be easier the next time. Data was available but was not always easy to find. The process gave good input to improve on Fretex routines.

The template needs to be clearer and provide simpler questions. The template was made from a theoretical standpoint which needs to build on input. Fretex agrees with comments on making it simpler.

How deep into documentation should the auditor go?

FN: Is accepting textiles (but not actively asking for) in stores automatically in-store collection?

KP: "everything that increases the stock". Regardless of advertising

Consensus: everything that increases the collected textiles as part of store operation will be considered as in-store collection.

CA: Is it OK to have a plan of action for criteria not yet fulfilled? (This is followed up on later in the meeting...)

FN: Used some time to figure out what the criteria meant? It was a good process to look at it together with a consultant that performs audits for other organisations.

DP: Energy recovery is NOT recycling. We follow the EU definition.

- Swedish

AF:

It is important to define the level of detail for where weights should be recorded. Several boxes are collected at once and weights are averages over these boxes at the reloading/sorting. Scales are available at various levels. Several systems are available among the different collectors and criteria needs to be clear on requirements.

It was agreed to send out the checklist to the reference group. It will when revised also be available for anyone on the website.

YA: How much time was needed?

EE: 2 weeks. Some time was spent on how to use the document and translate it to the reality. It was a good experience to acknowledge that they previously did not follow the textiles through the entire value chain. Standard can also be used as a tool for continuous improvement.

KP: It is important to have an independent auditor. It was tough and should be.

ST: Miljöfyrtårn seems to be more helpful than BV, which might not be a good thing.

FN: The auditor and consultant used to help were two different people, from two different companies, even though both are approved Miljöfyrtårn auditors.

Miljøfyrtårn does not use their own employees for audits, but approved consultants from different firms.

EE: Good with help before the actual audit.

11:20-12:00 Proposed changes to the certification process

- Presentation of proposed changes followed by discussion

AF: Full compliance or approval with action plan?

Alternative 1 is cheaper, but alternative 2 can expedite issuing certifications.

ED: How could this affect an organization with many small branches? Costs?

AF/DP: Sample checks will be made and depending on the results additional checks might be needed. The cost for audit is hard to define.

KP: It is important that the mother organization creates routines to ensure that all branches comply. E.g. to ensure scales in all collection

YA: which option is preferred?

AF: the second one seems to be most used in other systems.

SG: Minor non-conformities can also be required to be adjusted before a certification is issued. This is to ensure that the certification is black and white with either Certified or not.

Several: Option 1, but of course the CSO and certification committee may adjust this or the criteria further on.

SG: We should have a time limit for corrective actions after an audit before a new audit needs to take place. This to not risk that an audit is made and corrections are done after several years when the rest of the organization may have changed significantly.

Group: Alternative 1 is to prefer, but insert a maximum time of three months to correct minor deviations.

Scales: Should it be obligatory to use verified scales?

KR: The sector has problems with lack of data partly due to bad scales.

DP: Can humidity be an issue? KR, KP: no.

SG: It is a matter of reliability rather than exact figures.

KP: BV stepped on the scale and stated that it showed to high weight... :)

EE: Should this be a criteria directly from the system start or come later?

KR: It should be correct from the start?

DM: Industrial scales are most likely already verified. May be more difficult for smaller shops?

FN: Is it only for reloading stations or also in stores?

AF: Reloading comes from criteria to require weighing at the reloading station.

KR: Problem might be for actors that do not use reloading stations.

ED: Will solve it for our organization but will be difficult.

Group: Scales should be used, but does not need to be verified. They should be used also in stores.

12:00-12:40 LUNCH

Cont. from before lunch...

Where does the responsibility end?

AF: Will it be one step after the org.?

ST and more: Possible to follow until C1-C5 (flow chart), but not longer.

Group: It was agreed that the system boundaries should end by the input to C1-C5 in the flow chart. The project group will come up with a proposal of how to formulate it in the criteria.

How to calculate reuse and recycling rate:

ALL: original clothes

KP: We need to ensure that e.g. in-store collectors do not "pre-sort". They must accept everything.

AF: Original may create a difference between in-store (and clothing bank) collection) and container collection as the clothes is manually inspected in stores. This would lead to a higher reuse rate for collectors having in-store collection only.

SG: It can create a negative incentive to accept everything.

ST and KR: We need to accept everything.

NK: It's only about how we measure whether or not an actor meets the targets.

SG: To have both the number for collected textiles and original. Calculate from the collected textiles.

ALL: Agree on number one. Non-textiles contaminants shall not be included in the recycling rates. Original textiles amounts should simply be reported.

Certification committee:

DP: It is possible to accept international participants (non-Nordic) in the committee. BIR is a possibility.

12:40-13:40 Proposed changes to the criteria

- Presentation of proposed changes followed by discussion

C2.1: Remove, all agreed.

C2.2: Decision already made above.

C2.3: All agreed.

C2.4: All agreed.

C2.5: All agreed, not only reloading stations but also shops.

C3.3: All agreed, "clean" should also be removed

Comment from MH not to be forced to collect all textiles, but only high quality textiles. This is not agreed on by the rest of the group.

C3.4: All agreed, because everyone will fail the first time around otherwise...

C3.5: Remove, all agreed.

C3.9: All agreed.

C4.1: New phrasing to include: Collectors should require an assurance from their sorters that they do not accept illegally collected textiles.

C4.2-4.5 All agreed, rephrase.

C4.6: Remove, all agreed.

C5.1: Remove, all agreed.

C8.1: Remove, all agreed.

C8.2: Keep it, but keep a close eye on it for the future.

C8.X: All agreed, but change phrasing to "According to the waste hierarchy"

Social benefit:

Isobro can be a Danish counterpart to Svensk Insamlingskontroll.

Iceland?

Finland?

Criteria are fine, but are they possible to verify?

The project team should get feedback from the auditors.

13:40-14:00 Coffee

14:00-14:30 Requirements for third party auditors

Option 2 was agreed upon. Cert. committee should of course require documentation to support any auditors request for approval.

14:30-15:00 Communication

This part was not discussed in detail. Communication by trial certified actors should be made with care and after approval from the project team.

A separate meeting with the municipalities to discuss their communicative role will be organised.

15:00 – 15:30 Questions and next steps

What happens next?

The project runs until September with a final reference group meeting. Then the project team leaves it to NAG and hopefully to a system operator. NAG seeks approval from the Nordic governments and the system will hopefully be operational in January 2017.

The document, especially the checklist, will be adjusted and tried on H&M Norway. Others may self-evaluate using the updated checklist when available.