

TRANSCRIPT

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ENVIRONMENT AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

Inquiry into Recycling and Waste Management

Dunkeld—Thursday, 19 September 2019

MEMBERS

Mr Cesar Melhem—Chair

Mr Clifford Hayes—Deputy Chair

Mr Bruce Atkinson

Ms Melina Bath

Mr Jeff Bourman

Mr David Limbrick

Mr Andy Meddick

Dr Samantha Ratnam

Ms Nina Taylor

Ms Sonja Terpstra

PARTICIPATING MEMBERS

Ms Georgie Crozier

Mr David Davis

Mr Tim Quilty

Dr Catherine Cumming

WITNESS

Mr Robert Gibson, Manager, Environmental and Regulatory Services, Moyne Shire Council.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Meddick): Welcome back, after the resumption from lunch, to the public hearings for the Inquiry into Recycling and Waste Management.

I know, Robert, that you are the only one in the room, but there is a reader we have to read through so that you understand the proceedings. I extend a warm welcome to you, Robert from the Moyne shire, and I thank you for making yourself available.

The Committee is hearing evidence today in relation to the Inquiry into Recycling and Waste Management, and the evidence is being recorded. All evidence taken at this hearing is protected by parliamentary privilege as provided under the *Constitution Act 1975* and further subject to the provisions of the Legislative Council standing orders. Therefore the information that you give today is protected by law; however, any comment repeated outside of this hearing may not be protected. Any deliberately false evidence or misleading of the Committee may be considered a contempt of Parliament. All evidence is being recorded. You will be provided with a proof version of the transcript within the next few days.

Given that you are here on your own at the moment there is plenty of time to make whatever statements you want to make, and then the Committee members here will ask you some questions at the end of that before we wind up proceedings.

The ACTING CHAIR: Would you, just for the purposes of Hansard, make sure we have got a good recording? Can you just state your name, please?

Mr GIBSON: Yes, Robert Gibson.

The ACTING CHAIR: Good. Okay, fire away.

Mr GIBSON: Thank you very much for the opportunity to present to the Inquiry. I guess it is opportune that Moyne shire have this opportunity, because we were one of the first municipalities to be impacted by the initial China Sword policy. I suppose that dates back to just before Christmas, it would have been 2016, when our contractor—literally, probably, in the week leading into Christmas—came to us and said, ‘Things are about to take a turn for the worse. There’s going to be a problem’. And of course leading into Christmas, there is not a lot of opportunity to delve into what the problem is or at that stage even have a sense of how bad it may have been going to become. And then it was in pretty much the first week of 2017—or 18; I had better get my dates right here—that the impact was evident. That was when we had the first shutdown at SKM. We were one of the councils that, through our contractor, sent our material to SKM. That triggered a response by council in that we had to adjust our contract rates with the contractor. That was the first challenge to be overcome, because of our procurement issues around continuing to provide what is a critical service to the community but also adjusting a significantly valued contract without due process and transparency. So that was the first challenge, and obviously council procedure takes time to respond.

We were fortunate in that our contractor probably weathered the risk at that point in time and continued to provide the service without it being subject to extra costs. Taking the material to SKM at that time was going to cost more. Visy were not interested in negotiating with that company, so they could not get a response out of Visy at that point in time. So they paid the extra money, our contractor paid the extra money, to get the recycling into SKM at that point in time—at their own risk, in reality. Fortunately, I think for all concerned, the council acknowledged that this was a widespread problem by this time; adjusting the contract with our existing contractor was a sound, appropriate and probably prudent course of action. That probably added an extra \$130 000-odd to the value of the contract per annum at that stage, and the dust settled. So things went back to normal for a little bit, and the problem was simply resolved by paying extra money.

That was short-lived, and then there was the second problem with SKM that led to us having to have another look at it. And back in June this year there had been another SKM closure—and that was the EPA-driven one—that led council to look at exploring the fourth bin option. So at this stage it became evident that glass was the

primary contaminant that was impeding the processing of the rest of the recycled material; the paper and plastic was not able to be efficiently processed while it was contaminated with broken glass. So our council took the decision that it would trial a fourth bin in Kororoit, which was picked because it is roughly about 10 per cent of the shire's population. It is not affected by the tourism fluctuations that perhaps Port Fairy is, and it is also close to where the likely glass storage processing facility was going to operate from. So in June they resolved to proceed with that trial and then in July, it must have been, SKM went into receivership—either late July or early August or whenever it was that they went into receivership—and that has sort of I suppose exacerbated the problem. We have come to the conclusion that it is not going away. It was going to happen. On I suppose intermittent occasions we would get these shutdowns and we needed to have a longer term approach to it, and the trial was looked at as part of that process. We have got a bit of time. We might have a few ups and downs along the way, but we can actually have a look at it and engage with the community and try and work out a way through this. Then SKM went into receivership and changed things again. So as you have probably already gathered through your Inquiry, things are happening at a pretty rapid rate and probably moving exponentially, it seems.

The council has a report going up this month, which is actually looking at not going ahead with the trial per se but actually rolling out the purple bin, the glass bin, to everyone in the shire pretty much as soon as we can get our hands on the bins to do this.

Ms BATH: At what cost?

Mr GIBSON: Significant. So Moyne Shire is, you would probably appreciate, a smaller rural shire, and it is going to be roughly speaking a \$250 000 outlay to roll those bins out to the community. I have only been at Moyne Shire for six years, and in that time I have come to realise that they kind of run at the pointy end of the waste pack, if you like, in that when I got there they already had the green bin running and they had little kitchen caddies to encourage people to make good use of the FOGO bin. And then we renewed our contract and council was I think progressive in terms of also now providing—and I digress a little bit from the recycling matter in itself—the cornstarch green caddy bags that make it easy for people, because the problem with FOGO of course is it is messy and it stinks. So by providing these—they are compostable; they do not just break down, they actually decompose because they are made of cornstarch—you can actually put that in your little kitchen caddy, which then encourages people to make use of that, and then just throw that in the FOGO bin. That eliminates the mess and the gunk that gets stuck at the bottom of your little kitchen caddy in the kitchen. So it has been very proactive in the six years that I have been there, and I think if council resolve to move forward on this next Tuesday, this will be another example of where a small rural council has put itself at the front of the pack, at the pointy end of the pack, and just gone, 'We've got a long-term problem here. It's not going away'. Glass is the problem. This is a solution that does not just deal with the immediate problem of it going to landfill. It has got a longer term view to it or approach to it.

So that will be a matter for council to consider next Tuesday when it meets, and if that occurs, well then obviously that will need to be funded and council will have to draw on its resources to roll that out, which probably brings me to the point around government assistance in terms of helping out with that kind of thing. At the moment obviously the Government has provided a sum of money to assist council with the immediate cost of sending their recyclable material to landfill. That comes with a pretty narrow window of opportunity and a few caveats with it that do not make it all that appealing in some cases. Given that it is only going to come from July through to November it obviously helps cover the short-term costs of landfilling. For us it is probably in the \$30 000, \$40 000 ballpark figures compared to the \$250 000 that it is going to take to solve the problem. So we have got the present situation, which is assistance with dealing with the immediate cost of landfilling, as opposed to a strategic move towards having us reduce the probability of that material going to landfill and increasing the likelihood of it being recycled by changing our kerbside waste management systems to incorporate the fourth bin and get glass out of the recycling, get that moving in the right direction and then look at where the glass can be used. Because at the moment there is a proposal on the table that it will go to a road-making company who will crush it and use it in road making. Obviously not a high order use of that glass, but if that is the difference between everything going to landfill and getting the best gear to go to recycling, then that is probably not a bad outcome in the immediate term. That is where it is heading from our perspective.

The other thing that Moyne shire is looking at—so there is a fairly strong economic development focus with our council at the moment and presently everything operates particularly in this western half of the state on the old hub-and-spoke model where everything just gets fed into Geelong or Melbourne. Obviously you have got transport costs and inefficient transport costs too, because everything is bulk hauled in its uncompact form so you can obviously process it when you get it to where it is going. Perhaps an opportunity, and sometimes it takes a drama to put the spotlight on opportunity, is to encourage more investment in regional Victoria on MRFs that can process and pack it into its bales in its sorted format, which then also has the added benefit of more efficient transport because it is bulked up and compressed and the paper goes to paper and plastic goes where plastic needs to go and the cans go where they need to go rather than being loose fed in a B-double where you get the volume but not the weight. There are efficiencies to be gained there.

Obviously the introduction of more investment in MRFs in regional Victoria provides an opportunity for jobs in places like Mortlake, for example, which sits on the junction of two key highways and puts it within an hour of the likes of Ararat, Hamilton, Port Fairy, Warrnambool and even Colac and Camperdown. So looking at opportunities to fill that market void, if you like, and provide opportunity diversifies the number of companies operating in that space and creates a bit of competition and stability. If one does happen to go under, at least there are others in the market that we can turn to. That, I suppose in my mind, is raised through the whole issue of market failure, which we are potentially vulnerable to in regional areas where, whilst we do not produce an insignificant volume of waste and recycling material, it is not necessarily the volumes that make it viable for a private company to come in and invest. If you are looking at whether it is batteries or e-waste or mattresses or whatever it is—those other products—it is not worth setting up a business to collect 50 mattresses from around here, but still you do not want them going to landfill. If government has a role, it is obviously where there is market failure. In regional Victoria we are probably more exposed to those market failure complexities than perhaps metropolitan councils are. If there is an opportunity for longer term, bigger picture investment, it is probably around trying to come up with those government-industry-sector partnerships that facilitate the investment in rural areas to encourage that material to be processed locally and then shipped off in its separated, more compact format. It makes everything a bit more viable from a transport perspective at least.

The ACTING CHAIR: All done?

Mr GIBSON: I do not know if I have got much else to add, but I am very happy to take any questions because I will have missed something, I am sure.

The ACTING CHAIR: Fantastic, Robert. Thank you so much for your presentation here today and for your submission on behalf of the shire. You raised a very relevant point here. I am sitting here and I am listening to everything you are saying, and it is not dissimilar to all the other regional shires that have presented across the board in that most of the initiatives and most of the advancements are being led by the shires themselves. They are taking proactive action. Do you feel to a certain extent then that there is a bit of a lack of leadership perhaps at a state level and further then at a federal level in that they are slow to respond so you are having to take up the mantle and do it yourself? When we delve down into that, because we talk about the money that you have had to take away—this extra \$130 000 or whatever it is—I am interested in the impact that that has had on the other council services. Have you had to reduce other services in order to take that up? Is there or has there been a backlash from the community as a result of that?

Mr GIBSON: First question, the financial side of it, probably not so much so. Moyne shire, in my view, has managed its waste resourcing pretty well. We have some other liabilities that need to be responded to in the 10-to-20-year time frame, one being an unlicensed landfill that will need to be rehabilitated at some point in time, and we also have a somewhat infamous closed landfill that sits right on East Beach and has been known to deposit rubbish onto the beach. They are two ongoing liabilities that the council is aware of and it has managed to reserve to keep some funds aside should there need to be an immediate response to any of those risks. The council has drawn on those funds to help maintain the service to the community at the kerbside level. So the impact on the community has been minimal, but probably through pretty prudent financial management from the council in the past. So they have probably set themselves up for success, I think, and that \$130 000 was not an insignificant sum of money. Because it is set aside for waste purposes, it has enabled the council to be fairly fluid in how it responds to crises. Whether it has been the East Beach landfill or the Killarney rehab that has needed to happen or whether it has been a spike in the kerbside recycling or services, they have been

able to respond. Nonetheless, now that \$130 000 is not sitting there earning interest or whatever it is that it could do to help advance us in the future, so it is not without some implication. The second part of your question I have completely forgotten.

The ACTING CHAIR: Whether there is enough leadership from both the state and federal level?

Mr GIBSON: There was that, and there was also the backlash from the community. So—pretty good. We have tended to maintain communication with the community, and I think because of the broader scale of the problem, everyone has an understanding that this is just not a failure by Moyne shire to deal with the issue; it is a failure across the board and a systematic breakdown that everyone is dealing with. So the backlash has not been severe by any means, but that is not to say there is not concern amongst the community about, ‘When is our material going to stop going to landfill? When are you going to get it back on track?’. So I think there will be a lot of interest in the council meeting next Tuesday when they are considering the introduction of the purple-lidded glass bin because that would be I think seen as a significant step, because once that gets rolled out there will be no need for people to have their recycling go to landfill.

But I should add that the big part of that that I have not touched on is the significant community education component that is going to need to go with that. As a ballpark figure, if we are going to do it well, we would probably be looking at \$50 000 to try and really get a strong, meaningful community engagement education program in place that helps eliminate confusion—‘That will go with this’, ‘What’s this fourth bin about?’, ‘How often do I have to put it out?—because it is going to be on a different collection regime to everything else. So there is a lot to explain. Then there are other little nuances—like, for example, we may only have a landfill bin and a recycling bin in our public places. There is not going to be a purple-lidded bin in the streets anytime soon, so how do we explain to people that ‘There is now no glass in the yellow bin here. There is a purple bin for it at home. You can put it in the garbage bin when you are out on the street, but you can’t when you’re at home’. So there are just little nuances like that that need to be clarified and communicated if people are going to make good use of the system, and the system does rely totally on people doing the right thing at home. If they are not on board, well then it tends to compromise everything else because there is only so much contamination that the processors will accept.

The ACTING CHAIR: If I can, I would like to throw it open to the rest of the Committee members to ask you questions.

Mr GIBSON: Certainly.

The ACTING CHAIR: If time allows at the end—because quite often we find that while someone is having a question answered, another question pops into someone’s head—we might have a few more, if that is okay with you?

Mr GIBSON: I am yours for as long as it takes.

The ACTING CHAIR: Fantastic. If we can start with you, Ms Bath.

Ms BATH: Thank you very much for coming and for your presentation today, Robert. One comment that we heard in the morning session earlier was that I think it was Southern Grampians Shire Council have had the opportunity to access a grant in order to implement, I think it was, their FOGO bins. It might be something to offset that cost, because yours was going to be quite considerable.

Mr GIBSON: Yes.

Ms BATH: So it might be something—you may have already had that discussion. It would be my suggestion that you have a chat to them to see how they access that grant.

Mr GIBSON: Yes.

Ms BATH: I think it was Southern Grampians.

Mr GIBSON: Yes.

Ms BATH: So it would be worth having a chat to them on that one, because using government money—and the levy is part of that—is certainly important, if you can offset that. What is your budget? It is always interesting to understand what your overall shire budget is, off the top of your head?

Mr GIBSON: A ballpark figure is \$40 million, maybe just over.

Ms BATH: Much smaller than metropolitan Melbourne. I am interested in your procurement policy in terms of recyclable material. We often talk about that there needs to be a market, and local government can be a source of that market. How can you go about procuring local recycled or recyclable material in general?

Mr GIBSON: Recycled goods, yes. So the council has, whether through a 5 or 10 per cent buffer in the pricing difference, tried to encourage more use of recycled materials. So there is some flexibility in the procurement policy to accommodate the potential increased costs of procuring recycled products or products made from recycled materials.

Ms BATH: That is excellent. I notice in your submission you talk about the Schulz Organic Dairy in Timboon, and I feel like I am going back in time because it goes to the point where it says it is going to re-use glass bottles. Now I think that is an excellent idea. Is that yours?

Mr GIBSON: Timboon? I do not think so.

The ACTING CHAIR: No, that would be Southern Grampians.

Mr GIBSON: That might be Corangamite perhaps.

Ms BATH: Oh, it says Moyne on there; it does say Moyne. Anyway, that is all right. Maybe take it on notice. It does say Schulz. This is from the Moyne Shire one. I would just be interested if it does come from Moyne—just check. You know that recycling is very much a closed circuit if you can get to a point where you are recycling the actual wash-and-clean and sterilising—

Mr GIBSON: Yes, the effluent on farm and not having to move things around. There is obviously a multitude of efficiencies that come with not having to transport anything in the process and re-using locally. It would be good to see that applied to businesses beyond the agricultural sector as well—how they might be able to make use of their otherwise waste materials, definitely.

Mr LIMBRICK: Thanks for coming in here today, Mr Gibson, and for your submission. One of the things that is mentioned in the submission, which is a problem that I do not think we have heard about from other councils but I imagine must be a very widespread problem in agricultural areas, is silage wrap.

Mr GIBSON: Oh, yes.

Mr LIMBRICK: That sounds like it is a big problem—well, possibly; I am going to ask you. So it says in the submission that at the moment farmers either burn it, bury it or take it to landfill. I have got two questions associated with that. Is that actually a problem? Are there problems associated with them burning it? And are you aware of any solutions for silage wrap either in Australia or around the world, because it must be a problem anywhere they do dairy, right? But I do not know if there are any solutions.

Mr GIBSON: Yes. You have touched on one of our ongoing problems. So obviously Moyne is big with the dairy industry, and for a while we did have a fairly successful silage wrap program where landholders, dairy farmers, could deposit their silage wrap with us, and then every so often a company in Warrnambool would come and collect it and send it off and it would get turned into other products. That market collapsed at some point in the last 12, 18 months, and we have not been able to move the silage wrap since. So it has stockpiled to the point until, I think it was last week actually, that company, they have come, taken whatever size wrap was in there—they provided the bins for it—taken the silage wrap and taken the bins. They cannot deal with it at this point in time. So that market has failed for us.

Mr LIMBRICK: What were they doing with it?

Mr GIBSON: They sent it off to another processor. So they did all the consolidating and sorting and then they transported it off to the like of a Replas-type company, who would turn it into plastic-based products. So that is a problem. Obviously burning plastics is not an ideal outcome for anyone, and landfilling is not much better. There is no shortage of the product; there are copious volumes of it. It is just a question of trying to secure an end-use market for it, and that is one that we would be very keen to be involved in because of the amount of silage wrap we do have produced within the shire.

Mr LIMBRICK: If there was not a market for it, one of the other things that other councils have been talking about is waste to energy. It would probably have a really high calorific value you would think.

Mr GIBSON: I imagine it would, being totally plastic, yes. But at this point in time whatever uses or markets there were for it have failed, so it is a landfill or a waste-to-energy or a burn-in-the-back-paddock type scenario at this point in time.

Mr LIMBRICK: Okay, interesting.

Ms TAYLOR: I have a couple of questions. You were talking about compulsory waste avoidance education programs in primary schools. Just yesterday I was at Gardenvale Primary and they do not allow bins. I saw the kids at lunch. They have to bring their own re-usable lunch pack things. Is that kind of the direction you are thinking, and have you seen that in your area at all yet?

Mr GIBSON: Yes, so particularly around Port Fairy, where I live, the schools are into the whole nude food type thing.

Ms TAYLOR: That is good.

Mr GIBSON: Yes, so that has multiple benefits. Obviously there is no litter lying around the schoolyard and they are not producing the waste, because obviously you buy the sultanas or whatever it is in bulk at home and then you just decant it into a smaller container and away you go. That is the kind of practice we do need to encourage because it is about stopping the little individual packet of tiny teddies and just buying the one big packet. Packaging in itself is a problem. I can speak from personal experience. At home my wife is pretty committed. I am moving away from council services here, but you know, what she has been able to do when she does her shopping in terms of not buying anything or minimising what she has to buy already wrapped in plastic, we are really only putting out one kitchen bin a week and it is made of soft plastics now. That is what we are back to.

So with community education and working with the food providers and the packagers to encourage them to move away from micropackaging and inside packaging, it is going to (a) force people's hand to buy the bulk pack and manage it at home rather than just doing it the quick, easy way which is to grab a little pack of tiny teddies and off you go. I think the whole packaging thing has gotten out of hand. If there is one opportunity for improved regulation to tighten things up it is probably in that bulk packaging compared to what I would define as the micropackaging of everything which just adds to the problem.

In half the supermarkets here you struggle to find apples loose to grab. Everything is already in a plastic container wrapped in plastic. There has been a dramatic shift towards that that is not helping us in any way, shape or form. I think that is something we really need to have a good look at as a collective state and a nation.

Ms TAYLOR: That leads into my second question about effective product stewardship and how you see that coming about. Do you think regulation is the way forward? Or is it any sort of incentivisation? I am just wondering.

Mr GIBSON: I think there has been plenty of opportunity for producers and manufacturers of whatever it happens to be to be proactive and create that product stewardship model, and it has not happened yet. So I think there needs to perhaps be a trigger to force their hand a bit and think a bit more positively in that space about how things are packaged and how much foam is involved when you open up the box and what else we could do with that product if they do have to use it, rather than just crushing it up and putting it in the garbage bin. So yes, product packaging has become a challenge and I think the only way we are really going to resolve it is to have that complete ownership of, if you are producing it, you need to have some accountability for it at the end.

That is probably the only way that it is going to trigger a strategic change at their end about how they are packaging, what they are packaging with and how they can best promote the re-use of whatever packaging they have to use.

Ms BATH: Thank you, and if I can just chip in there, it is totally possible. Years ago I owned a health food store in a country town and we had cellulose bags, we had paper bags, we had paper labels and the only thing that needed to be recycled were the clips. Customers used to bring them back in to recycle or they brought in their own containers for their peanut butter et cetera. So it is possible and it is crazy that we need to go back to the old ways, but it is really important, I think. I just want to ask you: you cover off on Port Fairy, is that correct?

Mr GIBSON: Yes, that is correct.

Ms BATH: You would have an influx of tourists, and that is a really key driver of your economy, I am sure, in those regional locations or great locations, but it also comes with the burden of dealing with the waste. The people who come in to visit you do not pay a levy in your location, in your town, so how do you deal with that and what sort of burden is that? Talk us through that.

Mr GIBSON: Something like a third of the properties, residential properties, in Port Fairy are available for short-term let, so I suppose initially, principally, the person who owns that property is paying their dues in terms of managing the waste that their tenants generate. So from that perspective it is quite reasonable. Obviously our caravan parks generate a lot of waste. We have actually got little bit of work to do there to try and even better how waste is managed in our parks. But again, in terms of a cost, people come and pay their fee to stay there, and there is an element of that that just goes towards paying for the running of the park. Part of that is their waste management. In terms of the cost burden in those two scenarios, it is pretty well managed. The real additional cost comes from the public place bins. Obviously lots of tourists are out buying ice creams and whatever it is they do, and that all goes into a public place bin, so that adds some cost. But as you alluded to, from a broader tourism economy, that comes with all those people who visit us and is probably fairly negligible in the bigger picture.

Ms BATH: That is good.

Ms TAYLOR: I may as well just ask: small-scale re-use programs, what do you see those as being, particularly in your area, those you would like to foster?

Mr GIBSON: It is probably the things around the batteries, the mattresses, e-waste, gas bottles—it is the stuff we do not produce huge volumes of but they still need to be managed properly. We are clearly not going to meet an economic model of management. Given the Government's state waste strategy is so heavily based on a market for waste, it has got to be a usable valuable resource, but there has also got to be factored in the cost of getting that resource. The cost of coming and getting a gas bottle from a Moyne shire transfer station could be in the order of \$50 a bottle, and we charge our customers something like \$10 a gas bottle. So there is a discrepancy there that is not being met. Because we need to do the right thing and get those gas bottles where they need to be, that is the cost we wear. The same would apply whether it is car batteries, mattresses, fridges—all those things. They are not huge volumes, but they are there and they need to be dealt with, and therefore we need to have a regional approach to how those items are processed. I have just come from Mortlake this morning—somewhere like that that is centrally located in the region and could potentially service Ararat, Beaufort, Hamilton, Port Fairy, Warrnambool and Camperdown, where those things could come together and then perhaps start to be of a volume or meet a critical mass where it is viable or involves less government investment potentially.

The ACTING CHAIR: I only have one more question, which relates to what Ms Bath was talking about. With tourism also, rather than people who are coming and staying in holiday homes or in caravan parks I am thinking more in terms of the influx particularly over the summer months of tourists who are coming in in large numbers on buses, for instance—daytrippers, for instance. Are there any noticeable problems around waste and problems in trying to sort that and educate those types of tourists in how to sort that, and having bins available?

Mr GIBSON: Port Fairy as a whole—and you could include Peterborough in there a little, as it sort of comes to the end of the Great Ocean Road where the Twelve Apostles are—does not tend to be a bus destination. The odd bus comes through, but most of the buses do the ocean road and the Twelve Apostles and then cycle back through.

We tend to get more of the self-drive clientele. They are tripping around. They will come through Port Fairy and then maybe head up her to the Grampians and make their way back through Ballarat, for example. So we do not get that bus type as a rule. So engaging with the bigger share of the market, which is clearly those who come and stay for a week or two weeks, whether it is in someone's home or in a caravan park—they are the ones where we have real opportunity to engage with and make sure that they are separating their waste. Particularly in the caravan parks, people are on holiday and are a bit more relaxed: 'She'll be right. I don't live her; not my problem'. So we really need to work with those clientele to really emphasise that it is not just important to separate your waste at home; it is also important when you come here and enjoy your holiday that you do the right thing also. Again it just underpins that message I tried to convey earlier that education is just fundamental to making whatever changes we make to the recycling system or the kerbside service really effective and to have impact.

The ACTING CHAIR: Thank you, Robert, for making the trip here to give us that and to give us your answers. As I said before, you will be provided with a proof version of the transcript of what has been said here in the next few days. I would also like to take the opportunity to thank Michael Baker, the Secretary, and his staff and also the Hansard staff for making the trip as well and for all the work that they have done. Thank you very much to the rest of the Committee.

Mr GIBSON: Thank you for the opportunity.

Committee adjourned.