

# STATES OF JERSEY

## SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

BLAMPIED ROOM, STATES BUILDING

### WASTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

-----

**Present:** Deputy Phil Rondel (Review Chairman)  
Senator Ted Vibert  
Senator Jean Le Maistre  
Deputy Rob Duhamel  
Deputy Bob Hill

**In attendance:** Professor Chris Coggins (Waste Management Consultant)  
Professor Jim Swithenbank (Sheffield University)

-----

#### EVIDENCE FROM:

MR DANIEL WIMBERLEY

-----

on

**Monday, 18th October 2004**

-----

(Digital Transcription by Marten Walsh Cherer Limited,  
Midway House, 27/29 Cursitor St., London, EC4A 1LT.  
Telephone: 020 7405 5010. Fax: 020 7405 5026)

-----

DEPUTY RONDEL: The Panel Members all have their names in front of them. Our Panel of

advisors are Professor Swithenbank ----

PROFESSOR SWITHENBANK: How do you do?

DEPUTY RONDEL: ---- and Professor Coggins. I believe you have met all the other Members at another time.

MR WIMBERLEY: I have met them, yes.

**(Short pause while recording was checked)**

DEPUTY RONDEL: Mr Wimberley, I have to read to you the following. It is important that you fully understand the conditions under which you are appearing at this hearing. You will find a printed copy of the statement that I am about to read to you on the table in front of you.

Shadow Scrutiny Panels have been established by the States to create opportunities for training States Members and Officers in developing new skills in advance of the proposed changes of government. During this shadow period, the Panel has no statutory powers and the proceedings at public hearings are not covered by Parliamentary privilege. This means that anyone participating, whether a Panel Member or a person giving evidence, is not protected from being sued or prosecuted for anything said during hearings. The Panel would like you to bear this in mind when answering questions and to ensure that you understand that you are fully responsible for any comments you make.

MR WIMBERLEY: Thank you.

DEPUTY RONDEL: I would like to thank you for your submission and if you would like to start off by enlarging on the submission you have given us and then we will put some questions.

MR WIMBERLEY: Well, I really only wanted to say two points, although my points tend to go on a few paragraphs, but anyway two points. The first is that the Government provides different kinds of services. Some are desirable, like they are things that are “good” (in quotes) such as education, for free. Everybody benefits and the understanding is that the reason that it is provided for free to everyone is because it is a benefit to society and to the individuals who take part. The same is true, for instance, of sports centres. Even though everybody doesn’t participate, the fact is they are provided by the Government because there is a perception that it is good for everyone to have those facilities. The same is true of many, many other cases.

But with waste disposal this is not the case. You, the Government, the authority's job is to do something that nobody wants basically. It is not a plus, it is a minus. You are cleaning up the mess. That is the job. Now, you are not actually dealing with the same sort of thing there. You are not providing a free service which is for everyone's benefit, you are providing a free service for something that is undesirable. Waste itself is undesirable for other reasons, for global reasons, and in Jersey it costs, it costs us. So you are not looking at the same thing. I think there is a sort of misunderstanding. The whole point is about fiscal policy. You are providing free, or the Government has decided to provide something free, for everyone, which is actually undesirable. So you are promoting an undesirable behaviour. It is not undesirable to go to school; it is not undesirable to go to a sports centre; it is not undesirable to take part in walks organised by the Environmental Services Unit; but it is undesirable to chuck loads and loads and loads of rubbish into the bin on other grounds. So that is the first thing.

There is a second point, which comes under the same sort of rubric of fiscal policy. If you make something that is like this free, you are in effect ... the people in society, the people out there who are doing their best to protect the environment subsidise those who don't. I don't think that is fair and it is not desirable either. If you put that on to the business level, I mean, that is the sort of moral case. If I, as an individual, take trouble to reduce the amount that is in the bin bag and someone else doesn't, I am subsidising their behaviour. Now, if you put that on to a business level, the irresponsible business subsidises the responsible business. That is not a level playing field. It is not good competition.

The States is getting round to things like employee protection for exactly the same reason, partly. Obviously employees need protecting, but the other side of it is that if you don't, the bad employer subsidises the good and in fact the States also subsidises the bad employer by paying rent rebate and so on because they are not paying their workers enough and so on. So there is that as well. But you have got the same thing. The reason you tackle employee/employer relationships, or part of the reason, is that you don't want the bad to subsidise the good because that is what happens when you have no regulation, which is what the situation here is: "Make as much rubbish as you like, we'll take it away and we'll deal with it for

you.” That is the first point in two halves. One is that you are encouraging, the States is encouraging, undesirable behaviour and the second point is that the good subsidises the bad. Now, that is within fiscal policy.

The second point I want to make, which is possibly more important, is the aspect of government and governed and how this problem is not primarily an engineering problem, it is a people problem. When I read the paper and when I read the letters that are going into the *JEP* and when I read what is coming out of this Panel, it seems to me that the emphasis is on engineering. You know, we have an incinerator, it is old, what do we do, how do we replace it? I would start from people and people’s behaviour. Rob is nodding, so maybe there is a people element in here as well, but I think the key to this is behaviour and looking at where the waste streams come and why it is that there is so much rubbish at Bellozanne in the first place. Ditch the word waste “recycling”, it is all about waste “reduction”, although you do talk about waste “management”, which is good.

When I see a headline like “*Everyone will pay another £80 to pay for the new incinerator*”, I think that that is not the way to win hearts and minds. What we need is a partnership between the Government or the elective representatives and their officers and the people, the citizens who put them there. It has to be a partnership. It can’t even be led in a way from Public Services. It has to be a genuine partnership, where the people are on board and driving waste reduction forward because it pays them and because they see the advantages.

Long, long ago in your minutes, three or four years ago, but that is a long time, isn’t it, there was a little minute in a discussion on waste management -- it may be in the paper, I am not sure -- that we cannot solve the problem of waste management in Jersey without the active participation of the citizens. It was something like that. I think it is in the paper there. That is absolutely true and, as far as I am aware, very little has been done in that field of bringing the public on board, of making this something that the public benefits from when we have a good waste management strategy and not something that we are clobbered for.

DEPUTY RONDEL:                   Have you read the latest Green Book from Public Services?

MR WIMBERLEY:                I haven’t read that one, no. No, I have read the little one.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Right. Deputy Duhamel?

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Yes. I was interested to note, I mean, your wife is German and, within the figures within the Green Book which have subsequently been changed, the figures were quoted for Germany in 1996 and the average recycling rate and composting rate together was, what was it, 48%.

MR WIMBERLEY: Hmm.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: The subsequent figures, the 2002 figures, I believe, actually show that Germany's recycling and composting rate is nearer 60%. Now, within the technical documents that accompany the green booklet it has actually been stated categorically that Jersey will never be able to actually achieve anything higher than a 35% combined composting and recycling rate.

MR WIMBERLEY: Yes.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL: Now, I was just interested to note what your comments would be in terms of the German experience, what is lacking in terms of that experience in Germany compared to what is coming out of Public Services and how we can actually address that problem?

MR WIMBERLEY: Yes, indeed. Well, about five or six years ago I picked up the sort of waste document that goes to every household in my wife's home town and there it all is. You know, you have to separate your waste. I have got the latest one in the van. I was in a bit of a hurry so I have left it there, but it is a little calendar of all the waste collection times that every householder gets and then it has about 10 categories on the back of the different kinds of waste and what you must do. But that "must do" doesn't come from a "beat you on the head" type of policy, I think it has been discussed 20 years ago. They have been doing this for years. So your poisonous waste, there is a special van that comes and picks that up. So that is not a problem. You phone up. Then you have your compostables. You do not give those to the authorities. You do deal with that and, if you do, then you take it to more or less like we do, take it to a green site. Then it just goes through the different categories. Metals, you are responsible for disposing of metal -- you are responsible for disposing of metal -- and so it goes on.

Now, when you sort of read that, you think "Crumbs, you know, Jersey people wouldn't stand for that" and my wife has actually taught German at Hautlieu for a while and one of her

topics was this. So she had a picture of the different waste, the sort of containers, and they just talked about it and the reaction was, apart from learning German, "I can't do that. They must be mad. How can they do that?" The reason they can do that is that they have bought into the concept. They have actually bought into the concept. A good way of buying into the concept is being told "Landfill costs so many Deutsch Marks a tonne and you will pay for it if we don't tackle the problem." "Oh right, okay, so much a tonne for landfill", because that is what they do, they just put it in holes and, of course, they are running out of holes. So, you know, that is it. So you bring people with you on a long process of explaining what the problem is. We know the problem is £85 million. So that is quite a big problem and I think you have got a big lever there to help people to come on board and then have it led by the community as to how we can reduce waste.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL:           So, do you think then -- perhaps this is putting words into your mouth -- that Jersey, Jersey and the population in Jersey, could actually come up to equivalent standards, as indeed we are being shown by ----

MR WIMBERLEY:           I can't see that we are more stupid on average than the Germans or, you know, more environmentally unfriendly or that we actually want to cause problems for ourselves, or we want to spend millions of pounds in taxes that we don't need to. I don't think that is the case. I just think that the marketing, if you like, of the concept has been not very good. The Germans have a history going back 20 years of green policies and so on, so there is a political difference. I mean, I understand that. But, no, there is obviously no reason why Jersey shouldn't come up to that standard, but I do think that you, the States, the Public Services, have to take on board this business about bringing the community on board. That headline did not help and many others like it. It is people's behaviour and to do that you have to ... and I would add that the perception of the States out there is very poor, as you are repeatedly told. This waste management area is a wonderful place to start redressing the balance, it really is. You know, you could save millions, you could have people on board and you could build the community all at once.

DEPUTY DUHAMEL:           Thank you.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Could you supply us with a copy of the calendar?

MR WIMBERLEY: Yes. I have got it in the van. I will just pop that through, yes.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Thank you. Senator Vibert?

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes, thank you. If I could just read to you the policy on waste minimisation and recycling which is in the Island Plan, I think this is what you are possibly referring to. It says *“The Planning & Environment Committee is intent on reducing the production of waste and in considering proposals for new development to seek to minimise levels of waste production and increase recycling, reuse and recovery of resources.”*

Now, in a submission given to us by Concern, which was a written submission, Concern say this, and I would like your comment on their view. *‘However, the fine words seem to have precious little in the way of firm strategy to accompany them. Policy WMI’,* which is the one I have referred to, *‘appears to relate to proposals for “new” development, so there appears to be no policy or strategy which actually details any plans to encourage recycling and waste reduction within the existing Island community.’*

MR WIMBERLEY: Yes.

SENATOR VIBERT: That is a view you basically ... that is really the point that you are propounding, I would say.

MR WIMBERLEY: I would agree with that and there are a couple of things I would like to add. We went on holiday recently to a German, what would you call it, it was self-catering, self-catering, and there were ... no, that is not the example. The example is my wife’s brother, who has a new house, admittedly a new house, in what was East Germany, near Berlin. You open underneath the sink and there are four different containers, all labelled, all structured so that it is easy to dispose of the waste in different ways. You know, that would be one tiny element. That would be bullet point No. 11 of a proper strategy, that the architects are building that in, that there is a list of suppliers who do this sort of thing and it is actually a requirement in the building regs. That is one little point because at the moment it is difficult, it is actually difficult for people to do the right thing and you have got to make it easy. I say “you”, but I think it is we together. I really do. I don’t think the amount of energy and ideas that you need is going to

come from the States. I am sorry, but I think it is going to come from the community.

I picked up on that word “*community*” in there. Community is made up of lots of communities. I think the way would be to start with a couple of pilots instead of starting with an £85 million incinerator. This is the problem. Basically a gun is being held to our heads, isn’t it? But that is your problem. That is the politics of it.

SENATOR VIBERT: You made the point about Germany. We have just come back from a trip to France, where for about the last year they have actually been carrying out similar things to what they are doing in Germany, where they are currently in Caen up to nearly 48% and this is something that only started a year ago.

MR WIMBERLEY: Interesting.

SENATOR VIBERT: We were told here, at this meeting, by the Chief Executive that it would take five years to start changing people’s opinions in Jersey.

MR WIMBERLEY: People’s opinions are already there. What we need is the structure to deliver.

SENATOR VIBERT: To actually deliver it.

MR WIMBERLEY: Yes, yes. I mean, in Germany in every railway station there are these bins designed with three holes in. I mean, you know, you think “You have a bin with three holes in?” Well, they are there.

SENATOR VIBERT: One for bottles, one for plastic bottles ----

MR WIMBERLEY: And one for paper.

SENATOR VIBERT: Yes. So basically what we have been told by one set of opinion is that the waste management section of the Island Plan is devoid of any policy on the recycling of waste.

MR WIMBERLEY: It is a fine sentiment, yes. Yes, I mean, it is going to be very unfortunate if we actually get to the position where we take the engineering decision without having addressed the people issue.

SENATOR VIBERT: Well, if I could put that to you. The important issue as far as it would appear to this Panel appears to be that there is a dichotomy happening with the engineers, because if the amount of waste that has to go into the incinerator is reduced as a result of

recycling down to, say, 40,000 tonnes as a result of recycling, it is almost uneconomic to have an incinerator to actually burn that waste. In other words, there is a point that you reach where it is just not worth basically spending the money to do it that way.

MR WIMBERLEY: Yes.

SENATOR VIBERT: And it would appear to us that that is the difficulty they are having to deal with, in that they have their Committee telling them, or their Executives telling them “We must incinerate because it is the only way and we must also recycle, but we mustn’t do too much recycling because, if we do, we are not going to be able to operate the incinerator.”

MR WIMBERLEY: Yes, yes. Please reduction is the name of the game. Recycling is the second string. The document from “Gütersloh” says there is a phrase “the bag is called” -- in the English translation -- “is called the residual waste”.

SENATOR VIBERT: Hmm hmm.

MR WIMBERLEY: You see, so all the words, all the language is couched in a way that reinforces this message, that “Residual waste is what is left that we have to pick up for you”, you see, and that is just a totally different mindset. But, as I say, I think people understand the issues. They are out there in front, they are sort of, you know, on their way in really, so ----

SENATOR VIBERT: They are waiting for leadership.

MR WIMBERLEY: And they would like their bills reduced. One method, the key method, and this was six years ago -- I don’t know how long it has been happening in Germany -- is that you pay per bin.

SENATOR VIBERT: Hmm.

MR WIMBERLEY: That is what I meant by fiscal. I thought someone would have asked me then “What do you mean by how can you reduce this subsidy element?” Well, people should pay for waste disposal because it is undesirable. But how you do that is it should be people saving money by doing less waste. I think, you know, the German thing is not quite clever, but

...

DEPUTY RONDEL: Yes. Deputy Hill?

DEPUTY HILL: Yes. I am just writing down “fly tipping”.

MR WIMBERLEY: Yes, interesting.

DEPUTY HILL: And one of the problems we have is if you are going to make it difficult for people to dispose of their waste, you will get people saying “Well, why should I go to that? I will go and just dump it” and that is always the concern. One has certainly had experience of that elsewhere and we occasionally get it in Jersey.

MR WIMBERLEY: You do.

DEPUTY HILL: I remember at St Ouen’s two or three years ago we had a load of fridges thrown out there because it is so much easier to dispose of it. Don’t you think there is a danger of how one would educate people to ----

MR WIMBERLEY: Yes, yes. The inert waste as well suddenly appeared down cliff faces, didn’t it, because the La Collette charge was increased and it hadn’t been thought through that “Well, if we are going to put a charge on that, then we are going to have to have the law in place about fly tipping and make a big public thing of it so that you don’t do it.” You know “Don’t think ----

SENATOR VIBERT: A £5,000 fine if you’re caught or something.

MR WIMBERLEY: £5,000, well, that’s not enough. You know, it is not enough. I don’t read that in Guterslow. I just don’t hear it. Maybe ... I obviously don’t read the Guterslow paper, but I would doubt that the Germans are sort of tootling off, but maybe they are, maybe they are, but you are always going to get that problem.

DEPUTY HILL: Because also one has only got to look around the street to see the amount of litter that we throw away.

MR WIMBERLEY: Yes.

DEPUTY HILL: I mean, if we are that careless are we going to be that particular when it comes to doing the waste? I do not want to be sort of pessimistic, but I think one has to be realistic because I think there is a certain amount of self-discipline. Whilst obviously sharing some of your concerns, I think there is also the aspect that there would be some people who would be so ill disciplined that they could not feel they should take part.

MR WIMBERLEY: Exactly. That comes under the rubric of the good subsidising the bad. If

somebody actually refuses the charge of what it actually costs to dispose of a car or a fridge or whatever and they go and put it in somebody's field, then the rest of us subsidise that behaviour. So that is extremely socially disruptive because people are opting out of the contract of being a citizen. So I think you have the right to .... £5,000 is ridiculous, you know. It is not enough.

DEPUTY HILL:                So would you have waste disposal police?

MR WIMBERLEY:            You don't need waste disposal police. I thought the Centenniers had their ears to the ground, you know. No, but the fact is that there is the States Police, there is the Honorary Police and there is the fact that lots of people in Jersey have their eyes open and lots of people overlook lots of fields and I am surprised ... I would be surprised if the level is actually very high. There are one or two places where people go, you know. Anyway, I am sure it can be dealt with, CCTV and web cams.

DEPUTY RONDEL:            Professor Coggins.

PROFESSOR COGGINS:        Just some observations, if I may, Chair. Obviously I have sympathy with an approach which is people-centred as well as technical-centred. I think certainly my experience in the UK has been that there are areas where it has been successful and there are other areas where, yes, 20% say they will never recycle and, of those, 20% will say that nothing will make them recycle. That is, you know, from a lot of questionnaire surveys. So you are always going to get that hard core.

But just picking up on some of the points you made, you may be interested that building regulations in the UK are currently being changed with provision, formal provision, for new houses to have recycling. It is a bit at odds with the other current debate, which is that Prescott wants, John Prescott wants, 120,000 new houses a year and they have been described as "*little boxes*". So we have this problem of smaller houses and then wanting more facilities.

You may be interested in this week I saw, watching the television, the launch of the UK's big recycling programme. It is their big recycle week and obviously £10 million is being spent to promote recycling. So it costs money. That is fine, yes, you mentioned about infrastructure.

The acronym I use for that is KIS, Keep It Simple.

MR WIMBERLEY:            Keep It Simple, yes.

PROFESSOR COGGINS: In other words, you can provide facilities, you can provide the calendar and you engage, and I think the comment with that that I mentioned in one of the documents I sent through is that Hampshire, moving towards its waste strategy, has spent 12 months -- workshops, briefing papers and dialogue -- with what they call the stakeholders.

MR WIMBERLEY: Stakeholders, yes.

PROFESSOR COGGINS: Before they actually come up with a strategy.

MR WIMBERLEY: And I would suggest that that was more intense in certain areas, like you do choose some pilots and you run it from outside the States, that it is driven from some community based organisation, so that you have actually got ... the ring is being held not by yourselves and then you get "Ah, well, we could do a deal here" and it becomes a more open forum rather than a kind of ... because you have got this baggage of "them and us" all the time unless you have someone to hold the ring and facilitate and make the thing work well.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Professor Swithenbank?

PROFESSOR SWITHENBANK: I would like to just comment on the overall philosophy because, first of all, I agree wholeheartedly that the first step is to minimise the sources, because obviously that is to everybody's advantage. When you come to the waste management below that, you have got to take a balanced approach. I think to dismiss the engineering is over the top.

MR WIMBERLEY: Oh no, no, it just comes after.

PROFESSOR SWITHENBANK: I would suggest that we need the balanced approach which is recycling, but you have to be knowledgeable in the recycling. Recycling is not necessarily cheap. It can cost you, for example, sending a glass bottle back to the factory that made it in the first place can be environmentally unfriendly and can be expensive. So the recycling has to be a rational recycling rather than, shall I say, a religious recycling.

MR WIMBERLEY: Yes. I fully agree and you can actually lose credibility by religious recycling.

PROFESSOR SWITHENBANK: It is over the top.

MR WIMBERLEY: Because some bright stick is going to point the finger.

PROFESSOR SWITHENBANK: And at the end of the day you will have to have a solution for

that part of the material which you cannot recycle. Now, if you get the public over enthusiastic and they say “Well, we just don’t want any technical solution that is going to get rid of that bit that we cannot recycle” and so on, you are alienating people. I think you have got to present to people an overall balanced approach, the right emphasis and that it will cost them and that they need to think carefully how much recycling is worth. Some materials it is profitable to recycle. Some materials it is good to recycle but unprofitable. Let us have an overall balanced programme.

MR WIMBERLEY: Yes. I think you will gain credibility by having that sort of approach. When you say “*it will cost you*”, yes, waste disposal costs us and the aim on both sides is to reduce the cost. So really there is a shared agenda, but it doesn’t feel like that and that is the big problem that we have to overcome. You know, it just doesn’t feel that like and, above that, the waste reduction is so important and on an island it is difficult. The stuff comes in on pallets. The pallets are great big things. They have got a great big plastic wrap because otherwise the thing will fall off and so there is an issue there. But I think if you drive it from the public’s point of view, if I pay more for two bags of waste than I do for one, I will take my stuff off ... I will take my wrapping off at the Co-Op and say “It’s your wrapping, I didn’t ask for this.” The Germans do it. They actually have places at the back of shops where you can leave your rubbish and it is all sorted, done. “I don’t have to take that home, I will give it to the supermarket.” I think attitudes would change fairly quickly if you had that kind of customer-led approach. You see, it is fun as well. We are going to show them that we don’t need all these little bags around the oranges, we don’t need these tags and we don’t need the rubbish. We will just leave it all with them.

PROFESSOR SWITHEBANK: Yes, but there are compromises that aren’t always obvious to the public. For example, we are now starting major programmes to generate energy from biomass in the UK in particular. What is biomass? It is largely wood, lignane, cellulose and so on. What is paper? Now, there has got to be a balance between should we be growing the wood, making paper and then getting the energy from the paper? Meanwhile, we are growing willow wood and burning it to get the energy without any carbon dioxide.

If you take plastic, there is almost a similar argument. A large amount of the oil which

comes into Jersey or anywhere is used for heating. Now, you have two choices what you do with that oil. You can either make plastic with it and burn the plastic and get the energy and that would release oil that you would otherwise have burned directly to make plastic and so you need to study the technology and the lifecycle analysis of all these things. It isn't quite as superficial as it seems.

MR WIMBERLEY: Well, there you do have an issue of credibility the other way, the business of plastic bags, the famous plastic bag. You know, Ireland, was it, put a 9p a plastic bag tax on them and suddenly the consumption went [makes noise].

PROFESSOR SWITHENBANK: Yes.

MR WIMBERLEY: Now, you go to Bellozanne and I think it is an incredible percentage of that waste stream is actually plastic bags, so, although you can say "Well, that is just petrol, you know, we just burn it and heat the houses with it", in fact that is a bad signal to send out.

PROFESSOR SWITHENBANK: No, minimise it at source.

MR WIMBERLEY: Minimise it, of course, you don't actually need all those plastic bags, so, yes, it is boxing clever, isn't it? But as long as the public believe that we are all on the same side, then I think they will accept people boxing clever and things they don't quite get but, okay, they will believe that. At the moment, I think that the gulf is so big and that is your issue, almost starting again and saying "Look, you're leading this. We're going to help you. Let's all do this together." It sounds a big clush, but, I mean, it is a big 60%. You know, that's the target, isn't it, if they can do it in Germany.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Can I call on Professor Coggins, please?

PROFESSOR COGGINS: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I would just make an observation again. I think certainly the plastic bag issue in Ireland is interesting. I think what you have to recognise as well is that if you look behind the data, then whilst the number of plastic bags has dropped markedly they have had to substitute them with heavier weighted paper bags, so, therefore, the overall balance is not as black and white as perhaps might be thought just to see the decline in plastic bags. There has been an increase in packaging because of that.

SENATOR VIBERT: Might people put it in their own string bag, which is what they do in

Ireland?

PROFESSOR COGGINS: Yes.

MR WIMBERLEY: Yes, or a very good plastic bag. I mean, when I went shopping in what was East Germany, I sort of grabbed a bag and she went “Oh that will cost you 10p” and went like that and added it to my bill. I thought “Wow, okay then”, but it was a solid one. You wouldn’t think of throwing that. Yes, obviously a cloth bag or something. But I think, you know, on that point, surely the public’s reaction would be “Wait a minute, paper is sustainable, we can grow forests until the cows come home. The petrol will run out and, depending on your point of view, it is going to be 20 years/50 years and brings with it in its wake political problems beyond count, so I think the move from plastic to paper has got to be a good one.” I think the public would see it as that.

PROFESSOR COGGINS: I think the only other comment is that the plastic bag issue has been seen as tackling symptoms rather than causes.

MR WIMBERLEY: Yes.

PROFESSOR COGGINS: It is good public awareness reasons.

MR WIMBERLEY: Yes.

PROFESSOR COGGINS: Because it is right in front of the consumers when they go shopping.

MR WIMBERLEY: Yes.

PROFESSOR COGGINS: Again, it is partly what you were saying earlier about engaging the stakeholder, public awareness and communication.

MR WIMBERLEY: Awareness and communication, yes, yes.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Senator Le Maistre?

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: Daniel, you have spoken largely about recycling and that obviously is

----

MR WIMBERLEY: Reduction.

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: And reduction, recycling and reduction and management. I mean, all these things are interesting terms. Perhaps light-heartedly I would say that that is the burning issue for you. But do you have any comment actually on the way you see the debate when we

look at the other elements which having reduced, having recycled you are still left with a problem or an opportunity, whichever way you look at it? Do you have any comments at all on how you see that issue being resolved?

MR WIMBERLEY: Not really. I think once you get down to your minimal, which is a function of the level of consumption, then you are looking at even bigger issues. But I think, with your residual waste, pass. What I can say is you can see the kind of improvement that is possible. I went to the metal works, the place up the road from Bellozanne, a few weeks ago and I couldn't believe it compared to what it was like three years ago, you know, where it was shambolic. I just thought "What a mess, nobody is sort of taking this in hand", you know, and now I think "Crumbs." I don't know if it is any better what is going on there, but it just shows what you can do. So that is interesting, but, no, on the technical side, pass. I mean, there is exporting waste and there is dealing with it and there is recycling it and tiny little factories that turn out little heating bricks out of paper and I don't know, I don't know what's economic and what isn't. But we are constantly told, aren't we, that it is too expensive to send it away.

SENATOR LE MAISTRE: Hmm.

MR WIMBERLEY: Pass. I don't know.

DEPUTY RONDEL: Are there any other questions? (**Pause**) If not, do you have anything else to add? If not, I would like to thank you. We have past your allotted time with the Panel and I would like to thank you for giving you time and thank you for your submissions.

MR WIMBERLEY: Right. Thank you.

SENATOR VIBERT: Thank you very much.

- - - - -