



Reference group meeting 3 - Minutes

Nordic textile commitment – Part 2 Implementation

Place: Nordenskiöldsgatan 17, Malmö

Date: 2016-11-30

Participants:

Kaj Pihl	UFF Denmark	Denmark
David McKinnon	Copenhagen Resource Institute	Denmark
Steen Trasborg	Trasborg	Denmark
Ergun Arkin	Trasborg	Denmark
Antti Tuominen	UFF Finland	Finland
Frode Nilsen	Fretex	Norway
Cecilia Askham	Østfoldforskning	Norway
Ellen Thomsen Halaas (via link)	City of Oslo	Norway
Emma Enebog	Myrorna	Sweden
Susanna Winblad	City of Malmö	Sweden
Sofia Tärneberg	City of Malmö	Sweden
Levi Möller	Human Bridge	Sweden
Eva Maria Rudbäck	Röda Korset Sverige	Sweden
Anna Fråne	IVL Svenska Miljöinstitutet	Sweden
Xue Kullenius	Sysav	Sweden
Yvonne Augustsson	The Nordic Waste Group	Sweden

The minutes was taken by David McKinnon and Cecilia Askham. The PPT used on the meeting should be looked at to better understand the notes. The questions posed on the reference group meeting will be discussed in the project group, and be answered in the project summary report.

1. Certification process

Certification committee

Question: Definition of “textile recyclers” (list of committee members), do we mean “sorters”.

This term should perhaps be changes to “sorters and recyclers” (additional comment to Anna & David from CA “or” perhaps, not “and”, so that we don’t expect that the committee member need to represent both types of activity).

Question: Conflict of interest could be an issue with collectors on the board and also deciding who should be authorised auditors.

Needs to be clarified that all members of the board need to “operate in good faith” – to avoid and state conflicts of interest when they arise.

Question: How to avoid conflicts /differences of opinion within the group.

There will need to be a mechanism in place to overcome these issues. If there are disagreements what is the mechanism to deal with these?

Question/comment: Most actors will have some kind of conflict in this – only the authorities will not (should not have). It is similar for other kinds of steering groups.

Question: Should there also be local authorities represented in the certification committee?

From floor: no – keep the national authorities only. It will make it more complicated to include local authorities, but we could include national waste organisations like Dansk affaldsforening (Avfall Norge / Avfall Sverige).

Question/Comment: There should be a balance between commercial and charitable actors in the certification committee. Maybe. Mixed opinions.

Question/Comment: It would be sensible to add a requirement in order to achieve a spread of committee members from the different Nordic countries, such that the members represent a balanced spread of Nordic views.

Question: How long should the certification committee sit?

Question/Comment: The mandate of the Certification Committee and its role in relation to the CSO role should be clear.

Comment: The CSO should be able to give input on competence that is missing from the Certification Committee.

Auditors

Question: Different countries – one in each or central office for CSO.

The CSO will have one office (although nothing to stop international organisation operating as the CSO). Meetings could take place wherever.

Question: Consequences for not fulfilling requirements once taken on (e.g. conflict of interest).

Consequences must be explicit in the agreement between CSO and the auditor, e.g. authorisation will be withdrawn and the auditor cannot be approved by the CSO in the future.

Question: Auditors need to know about the system, but doing so could introduce a conflict of interest. Difficult to solve. Potential workshop for potential auditors? This could be a good idea, but difficult in practice. Perhaps materials for auditors. The Bureau of International Recycling (BIR) could have suggestions. This is the kind of activity that the CSO would have to consider as part of their future activities (e.g. existing systems for EPDs offer courses for verifiers – at a cost).

Criteria

Internal municipality waste companies in Finland – agreements could be made with waste companies rather than individual municipalities.

Two bins, one for textiles for reuse and one for textiles for recycling could be problematic for many reasons. Criteria have to be flexible as we have so many different collection methods.

We have no idea which of the two certificates that the collectors will apply for. It could be that all collectors that collect textiles in containers go for the reuse/recycle and all shop – personal collection go for reuse.

Certification process

Trial collectors will not be certified within the project.

Logos/stickers

Disagreement about the printing/ distribution of logos. Some would like to have the chance to find the cheapest printer. Others think it will be easier to make the CSO contract printing.

General comment on communication – needs more work by the coming CSO. The logos need to be worked on further. A CSO would need a communication package / strategy.

CSO needs to manage communication and control distribution of the stickers. Dates of validity are important. What system will be in place if “approved” containers are no longer “approved” (date only, or sticker removal?)

Supporters’ logo needs to be controlled as well. The logo is the main thing – the small details on the label are less important.

Check the French system. Municipalities are in position to promote the system generally. The system will be useful for municipalities to inform inhabitants about approved collectors.

There is a risk to potentially exclude some smaller actors – particularly when promoted by municipalities. Perhaps the municipality needs to invite all actors for a workshop meeting or something to help support small collectors.

2. Legal assessment of the criteria

Yvonne Augustsson presented the ongoing legal assessment of the criteria carried out by Energi & Miljø on behalf of NAG. The results are not finalised, but will hopefully be sent to the project group in the beginning of December. The report can later be sent to the reference group.

Question: Will the legal assessment show differences between legislation and practice? Possibly, but it is not certain.

3. Certification system operation

NWG will probably put the CSO role out in an open tender process. Initial funding from NWG will cover the costs for setting up the system, and adapt it to the CSO's ordinary business. The money is nearly confirmed, but not the exact amount.

Decision was made that the CSO should be not-for-profit, and that it should be clearly stated in the tender. Three parties have already indicated interest and would like to meet NWG. Communication is important, but how to do it. The CCO shall decide.

4. Specific issues

Reuse rate for certification for reuse only: 80 percent

Could be an idea to add 90 percent reuse and recycling to not allow for more disposal than the reuse and recycling certificate.

System fees:

Seem to be OK. Changes of fees should be approved by the certification committee.

It is important to specify what is included in the fees (e.g. logo/sticker costs are they additional?)

The project team will look into how to differentiate the registration fees. Should they be differentiated?

Municipalities should be able to use the supporter logo even though they are not using certified collectors. Distinguish between second-hand shops that are collectors and the ones that are only buying certified textiles. The collectors shall be required to inform the CSO if status changes.

Site visits:

Ok with numbers suggested. Should there be some additional requirements the CSO should add about geographical spread? Types of channels (shops etc.)?