1. **PRESENTATIONS**

Slides from the presentations are attached separately.

2. **Q AND A**

Points raised by participants

Intensive agriculture and aquaculture are dependent on inputs (e.g. P and K fertilizer and feedstock) often produced/transported with significant biodiversity impact and high emissions. If these inputs could be reduced (and/or replaced by sustainably sourced, local equivalents), both the production and the supply chain would reduce emissions and improve biodiversity – both at home and in our footprint. What can the Circular Economy Bill and/or the route map do to address these unsustainable inputs to agriculture and aquaculture?

There appears to be a reluctance to set footprint targets due to uncertainty over data and how we would meet the targets. In the Netherlands, targets were set because they knew consumption of raw materials was much too high, and the Government then set about working out how to meet the targets. We know we urgently need to address consumption and shouldn’t delay in setting targets.

The focus and emphasis in the existing proposals is wrong, basically tinkering with existing products rather than disrupting the linear economy at the point where products are made. We need to start again with the CE proposals and focus on inputs, supply chains and design, rather than dealing with existing products.

Soil is one of the fundamental resources on which we rely and a key part of a circular economy and is missing from the current proposals. The circular economy proposals should include measures to ensure we nurture and regenerate our soils.

There is a need to further disincentivise the purchase of bags for life – observations suggest many people are purchasing them. In Ireland the charge is 70 pence (whereas in Scotland it has just gone up from 5 to 10p). Maybe a charge of £1 is needed to be effective in maximising re-use.

Would Hydrogen plants be included in the proposed banning of all new incinerators in Scotland (as outlined in the review) as most are a form of pyrolysis and classed as incinerators under the EU directive to which we are currently signed up to?

Why has the Scottish Government not included the introduction of a tax disincentive on incineration as proposed by the Welsh Government (and indeed a Scottish Green Party manifesto proposal)?
The construction sector needs a clear mandate from Government which requires them to do things differently:

- Amongst construction SMEs (80% of construction trades fall under this) this bill is our best kept secret. We need to publicise it better.
- We need to be more ambitious and less vague on target setting. Soft targets that are non-measurable will not take us forward at pace.
- We need some forms of legislation (positive tax breaks) particularly in the use of new materials that are proven to be circular.
- More ambition at the front end planning and design stage of any project including measurable content of circularity at the very least.
- We need to lose words like voluntary or guidance in any bill that is passed – No one adheres to voluntary and guidance never works.
- Finally, we need to support our SME’s transition to being more circular and sustainable with the support of the larger construction companies that engage their services. A form of accreditation would be a real step in the right direction.

To move to a circular economy requires system change. At the macro level, we need enabling conditions and reduced barriers through new / changes in legislation, policy and taxation. At the meso level, we need circular business model innovation – not just as individual organisations, but as integrated and optimized value chains. This is where servitisation, design for adaptability, repair and reuse come in. At the micro level we need increased individual literacy and common language to better understand the whole concept. Also, importantly, the circular economy offers economic opportunities.
3. **GROUP DISCUSSIONS**

*Table 1* took an overview of the priorities of a CE bill

There is a lack of proposals that deal with inputs to our economy and production / packaging.

To properly disrupt the linear economy, this is the starting point; rather than tinkering with the products we have.

There needs to be a vision and a plan of how to influence inputs and production.

*Table 2* made a number of observations on construction, procurement, servitisation, data access, destruction of reusable (as well as unsold) goods, and re-use hubs.
Table 3

- CE document doesn’t go far enough. Need holistic approach. What does success look like?
- Soil as a valued resource/raw material providing nutrients is missing from CE bill. Soil and food should feature more strongly in the EC Bill. Needs to be joined up with Agric and Environment Bills (and Biodiversity Strategy). Need to work with planners to design waste out. How far down the supply chain will reporting will go.
- Citizens need to be at heart of CE Bill. Change language of consumer, research behaviour change and follow success of Sweden (e.g. recycling). Need to join things up with regard to education, food, health, obesity. Households need support from local authorities (build on ‘20 minute neighbourhoods’, National Planning Framework).
Table 4 discussed the CE route map, its gaps and what needs to happen to make CE a reality.

1- We need a more holistic approach to policies and CE

Things are too often considered in silo.

- Chemical pollution: there is an urgent need to improve traceability of chemicals in order to dispose of them correctly and prevent them from damaging the environment. Note that a chemical strategy is being developed, but no mention of CE → We need to make bridges and links between the CE bills, route map and strategies like this one!
- The route map mentions charging and measures against single-use cups → Is singling out one item really efficient? Why not consider single-use in general, or plastics?

2- We need to consider the whole supply chain, and put more pressure on manufacturers!

- The route map focuses a lot on households, charging them for using single cups, recycling, reducing food waste. We need to look at the other end of the chain → design and manufacturers! Making sure the products entering the market are aligned with circular economy.
- On chemicals → make them aware and accountable for the types of chemicals they use in their products!
- With the current cost of living, adding charges would be another burden on households, especially the poorer ones and would be counter-productive! It will not help, but could make people resentful.

3- We need transparency about the data collected

- The route map proposes a lot of data collection, reviews, assessments etc. Who monitors the data? We need to make sure the data collected are transparent, accessible to the public, and properly monitored.
- One participant to the table discussion mention incinerating companies → data collected by companies are monitored and assessed by the companies themselves.
- Suggestion of an advisory group? Yes, but it has to have powers to put pressure on manufacturers.

4- More infrastructures are needed!

- Charging households and pushing for recycling is a thing, but we need to ensure the whole system is in place first! More bins, products on the market that are aligned with CE principles etc.
- Observations in Edinburgh: In a lot of places, there are not enough recycling bins, and bins in general. They overflow, people leave their bags on the streets etc.
- Participants welcomed the suggestion of standardising colours and codes → it is essential to keep things as simple as possible, clear and consistent throughout all local authorities.
- Participant also mentioned the example of electric cars and the different car chargers. The fact that there are several cars/ car chargers and charging suppliers make the system quite difficult.
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- International perspective good as quite specific. Looking for guiding principles linking Scotland to global impact especially for supply chain and waste management. Consumption targets and Carbon reduction targets important, not just food but other areas as well. Public sector and ethical spending – food commission and future generations. Policy coherence for sustainable development, trade-offs and compromises for prioritising sustainable development. Really educate people and communicate
- Suggestions can raise issues for individual communities, people living with sensory loss or dementia and other issues dealing with all of the changes.
- Piece on comms demonstrates myth busting. ‘What’s the point in sorting’. Standardising bins across the sector. Money for recycling eg for bottles
- Communication very important. Need to strengthen systems, re-use targets and hubs. Recycling centres are not ‘the dump’ and are an important solution to part of the problem. Right to repair is important for the public and companies need to consider product life span, reward positive behaviour, and everyone plays a part.
- Standardising waste collection, waste stream monitoring and data are important, tracking and supporting surplus materials and waste, building supply chains in all areas not just food but construction and other industries. Good opportunity for public sector to lead and build local circular supply chains using surplus materials.

Education and communication:
- School curriculum, colleges and higher education
- Sustainable development and circular economy definitions
- Tying up to other bodies and working together to make it inherent in public rather than requiring teaching/learning
- Ellen Macarthur definition of circular economy
- Consumption public campaign
- Simplifying definition and messages
- Take an international approach
- Look at people who do it well eg Wales seem to have good systems.
- Generally speaking make it easy to engage with and understand fully (it’s not just a coffee cup tax). Balance quick wins with complex processes
- Links to global citizenship – global sustainable development as individuals and communities and LA, about more than individual behaviour change. Need a big public awareness scheme – what people do makes a positive impact and tell them that
- Tasked ZWS with looking at circularity accreditation (cf eco green flags in schools really engaged school pupils)
- Spoke about myth busting – needs to be robust
- Common vision for future good living, not selling on its own but with wider message around health and jobs (fits in with UN sustainability goals)
- If a third of food is wasted, farming is limited, what will happen in future. Really try to stop food waste. Including soil waste in response would be useful. Nothing specific in documents about agriculture (a lot of discussion about food but not how it is produced). Does it require a whole separate planning and discussion policy.
- Accreditation is expensive
- Food hygiene is displayed, can we encourage display of low food waste (eg 5 for hygiene, 2 for food waste)
- Other ways to purchase – zero waste, zero packaging

3 key points:
• Communication
• Education
• Simplifying complex messaging
• Any policies need to be applied fairly