



Waste and Resource Recovery Infrastructure and Services Stocktake

SUMMARY REPORT

Prepared for the Ministry for the Environment

21 May 2021

Report for:

Ministry for the Environment

Prepared by:

Duncan Wilson
Lisa Eve
Bruce Middleton
Sunshine Yates
Hannah Blumhardt
Ella van Gool

Approved by:

Duncan Wilson
(Project Manager)

Contact Details

Eunomia Research & Consulting Ltd (NZ)

PO Box 78 313

Grey Lynn

Auckland 1245

New Zealand

Tel: +64 9 376 1909

Fax: +64 9 360 5187

Web: www.eunomia.co.nz

Contents

- 1.0 Organic Material Stream Analysis 1**
 - 1.1 Description of Organics Material Stream1
 - 1.2 Materials & Quantities..... 1
 - 1.3 Facility Types.....2
 - 1.4 Regional Distribution2
 - 1.5 Market Segments and Dynamics3
 - 1.6 Small Scale Composters4
 - 1.7 Compostable packaging.....4
 - 1.8 Future Opportunities4

- 2.0 Fibre Material Stream Summary 6**
 - 2.1 Description of Fibre Material Stream6
 - 2.2 Materials & Quantities.....6
 - 2.3 Stakeholder Mapping.....7
 - 2.4 Key Drivers8

- 3.0 Glass Material Stream Analysis10**
 - 3.1 Description of Glass Material Stream 10
 - 3.2 Materials & Quantities..... 10
 - 3.3 Facility Types..... 12
 - 3.4 Regional Distribution 12
 - 3.5 Market Segments and Dynamics 13
 - 3.5.1 *Bottle Glass*..... 13
 - 3.5.2 *Flat Glass* 14
 - 3.6 Future Opportunities 14

- 4.0 Metal Material Stream Summary.....15**
 - 4.1 Description of Metal Material Stream 15
 - 4.2 Materials & Quantities..... 15
 - 4.3 Stakeholder Mapping..... 16
 - 4.3.1 *Shredders*..... 17
 - 4.3.2 *Re-processing infrastructure* 18

4.3.3	<i>Other relevant infrastructure</i>	18
4.4	Analysis of Material Flows	18
4.4.1	<i>Key Drivers</i>	20
6.0	Plastic Material Stream Analysis	22
6.1	Description of Plastic Material Stream	22
6.2	Materials & Quantities.....	22
6.3	Capacity.....	23
6.4	Stakeholder and Facility Types	24
6.5	Regional Distribution	25
6.6	Market Segments and Dynamics	26
6.7	Future Capacity	27
6.8	Key Opportunities to Expand Onshore Re-processing.....	27
7.0	Construction and Demolition Material Stream Summary	29
7.1	Description of Material Stream	29
7.2	Materials and Quantities	29
7.3	Stakeholders	30
7.4	Regional Distribution	32
7.5	Market Segments and Dynamics	33
7.6	Key Opportunities	33
8.0	Electrical and Electronic Products Material Stream Analysis	34
8.1	Description of Electrical and Electronic Products Material Stream	34
8.2	Materials and Quantities	34
8.3	Stakeholders, Activities and Facility Types	35
8.4	Regional Distribution and Cross-Boundary Movement.....	36
8.5	Market Segments and Dynamics	37
8.6	Health and Safety, Accreditation and Compliance	38
8.7	Future Capacity	38
8.8	Key Opportunities to Expand Onshore Re-processing.....	39
9.0	Farm Plastics Material Stream Analysis	41
9.1	Description of Farm Plastics Material Stream	41
9.2	Materials	41
9.3	Facility Types.....	42

9.4	Regional Distribution	42
9.5	Market Segments and Dynamics	43
9.6	Product Stewardship.....	43
9.7	Future Opportunities	43
10.0	Reusables Material Stream Analysis	45
10.1	Description of Reusables Material Stream	45
10.2	Materials & Quantities	45
10.3	Facility Types.....	46
10.4	Regional Distribution	46
10.5	Waste Prevention and Circularity.....	49
10.6	Market Segments and Dynamics	50
10.7	Key opportunities for infrastructural investment	51
10.8	Future Opportunities	51
11.0	Tyres Material Stream Analysis.....	53
11.1	Description of Tyres Material Stream	53
11.2	Materials & Quantities	53
11.3	Facility Types.....	54
11.4	Regional Distribution	54
11.5	Market Segments and Dynamics	55
11.6	Recent Developments and Future Opportunities	56
12.0	Material Recovery Facility Summary	58
12.1	Description of Material Stream	58
12.2	Materials & Quantities	58
12.3	Facility Types.....	59
12.4	Market Segments and Dynamics	61
13.0	Collection Services.....	62
13.1	Description of Collection Services	62
13.2	Stakeholder interviews	62
13.3	Type of collections	62
13.4	Services by region	62
13.5	Domestic collections.....	63
13.5.1	<i>Planned Capacity.....</i>	<i>69</i>

13.6	Discission and analysis.....	69
13.7	Future Opportunities.....	70
14.0	Transfer Stations and Resource Recovery Facilities	71
14.1	Description of Facilities	71
14.2	Stakeholder Mapping	71
14.2.1	<i>Planned Capacity.....</i>	<i>72</i>
14.3	Barriers	73
14.4	Discussion and Analysis	73
14.5	Future opportunities	74
15.0	Class 1 Landfill Analysis	75
15.1	Definition of ‘Class 1 Landfill’	75
15.2	Class 1 landfills - By Ownership	75
15.3	Class 1 landfills - By Tonnage Bands	76
15.4	Waste to Class 1 Landfills - Tonnage by Region	77
15.5	Economic Drivers for Waste Flows to Class 1 Landfills	77
15.5.1	<i>Ownership and/or Control of Assets</i>	<i>77</i>
15.5.2	<i>Operational Cost of Disposal.....</i>	<i>78</i>
15.5.3	<i>Transport Costs</i>	<i>78</i>
15.5.4	<i>Emissions Trading Scheme and Waste Levy Expenses.....</i>	<i>78</i>
15.6	Market Dynamics.....	79
16.0	Energy Recovery.....	80
16.1	Biogas.....	81
16.2	Liquid Biofuels	82
16.3	Wood Waste and Solid Fuels	82
16.4	Energy from Mixed Residual Waste	83
17.0	Cross-Cutting Themes	85
17.1	Introduction.....	85
17.2	Material Management Dynamics	85
17.2.1	<i>Packaging.....</i>	<i>85</i>
17.2.2	<i>Collections</i>	<i>86</i>
17.2.3	<i>Material Recovery Facilities</i>	<i>86</i>
17.2.4	<i>Waste to Energy.....</i>	<i>87</i>

17.3	Waste Sector Market Dynamics	87
17.3.1	<i>The Rise of Complexity and the Private Sector</i>	87
17.3.2	<i>Territorial Authorities</i>	87
17.3.3	<i>Private Sector</i>	88
17.3.4	<i>Community Sector</i>	89
17.3.5	<i>Market Dominance</i>	90
17.3.6	<i>Sector Innovation</i>	91
17.3.7	<i>Community and Local vs Large Scale</i>	91
17.3.8	<i>Tackling the Hierarchy & Circular Economy</i>	92
17.4	Material Markets	92
17.5	Climate Change.....	93
17.6	Other Themes	94
17.7	Comparative Quantities.....	94
17.8	Common Policy Levers.....	96
17.9	Summary: Everything Works as a System	97

1.0 Organic Material Stream Analysis

1.1 Description of Organics Material Stream


The organics material stream, while predominantly focused on composting, encompasses a diverse range of feedstocks, processes, markets, and types of operators.

1.2 Materials & Quantities

The main material streams that are processed through formal systems in New Zealand include wood and timber wastes, garden waste, commercial sludges, and animal manures.

The chart below presents estimates of the total tonnes of organic waste recovered and disposed of:

Figure 1: Total Tonnes Organic Waste Recovery and Disposal



The data for putrescibles and for green, wood and manure are derived from information gathered in the stocktake. Rendering facilities were not included in the study and so data for rendering plants were calculated based on industry data on the quantity of meat sold and the proportion of the carcass that is utilised.¹ Approximately half of the organic

¹ <https://www.mbie.govt.nz/assets/8fdebf6c7b/investors-guide-to-the-new-zealand-meat-industry-2017.pdf>

waste disposal is estimated to occur on farms, with a further 546,627 tonnes going to Class 1 disposal², and the remainder mainly consisting of timber processing waste going to industrial monofills.³

1.3 Facility Types

In total, 62 active facilities that process organic waste (excluding small scale facilities) were identified. The most common type of facility found was windrow composting (40%) followed by in-vessel processing (15%), vermicomposting (11%), aerated windrow (8%) and mulching (8%).

1.4 Regional Distribution

Household and ICI garden waste tends to be recovered widely across the country while timber waste is concentrated in areas of greater forestry and sawmilling activity, particularly the central North Island. Similarly, with animal manures, formal recovery of these is heavily concentrated in the middle of the North Island and is mostly associated with chicken farms. Commercial sludges are predominantly from food, and fruit packhouse processing wastes across the middle of the North Island.


The quantity of organic material recovered is dominated by activity across the middle - upper North Island. Of the approximately 1.2 million tonnes of organic waste identified as being recovered in New Zealand, 840,000 tonnes (70%) occurs across just four regions – Waikato, Bay of Plenty, Auckland and Taranaki. The quantities are illustrated in Figure 2.

Cross boundary movement of feedstock material is limited and occurs with a relatively small number of operators. Except where the facilities are located near a regional boundary, the tonnages involved are a small percentage of their total inputs.

² Waste Not (2020) Update of National Average Waste Composition for Class 1 Landfills, Report to Ministry for the Environment

³ Sewage sludge (biosolids) going to landfill is classified as ‘hazardous and special waste’ in composition data and is not included in the above totals. There is in the order of 800-900,000 tonnes of ‘hazardous and special waste’ sent to Class 1 landfill annually.

Figure 2: Quantities by Region (x1,000 tonnes)



1.5 Market Segments and Dynamics

Key market segments for the sale of products from organic processes include:

- domestic market
- bulk landscaping supply
- farming. Within the farming segment there are further key markets such as kiwifruit and orchards, feedcrops, pasture, and market gardening.

The three main factors that affect the dynamics of activity in the organic waste recovery sector include:

- The demand for products from organic waste. This is generally static for urban markets⁴ but increasing in rural markets.
- The supply of organic material. Certain valuable materials such as chicken shed manure and bark are sought after and supply constrained. Other less valuable feedstocks are generally not supply constrained.
- The cost of disposal. The planned increase in costs of disposal (due to an increase in the waste levy) are likely to make alternatives to disposal more attractive and this will increase the supply of material.

1.6 Small Scale Composters

The smaller composters interviewed processed less than 1% of overall organic waste streams in New Zealand, yet process about 5% of overall food waste recovered. Types of organisations ranged from commercial entities to, particularly in urban areas, community groups. A variety of composting methods were applied, and the end-product was generally locally used, sold, or shared to improve soil quality.

The challenges faced by this group of composters relate to the ability to obtain funding, council contracts, space, and resource consents. Despite these hurdles, almost all operators were experiencing increases in demand, both for use of community composting facilities, and the demand for end-products.

1.7 Compostable packaging

Compostable packaging could become a more common feedstock as businesses search for alternatives to plastic, and as local authorities introduce food waste collections which utilise compostable bin liners.

For most operators spoken to, compostable packaging is a risk factor. In general, composters are focused on the quality of their outputs and making sure that these meet customer requirements. Compostable packaging has no nutrient value as a feedstock and introduces risk - principally through the potential for contamination, ecotoxicity, and incompletely degraded material in the end-product.

Only a few operators were found to be actively pursuing development and testing of processes for compostable packaging.

1.8 Future Opportunities

From the 48 operators interviewed, 23 indicated some form of intention to expand future operations. A few of these were in the actual planning or development phases, but most were statements that their businesses were growing and that they felt they could expand capacity or utilise more of existing capacity in the future.

⁴ One stakeholder noted that this has changed since Covid 19 lockdowns with an increase in demand for landscaping products

Key potential future demand drivers noted in the stocktake included:

- The potential for biochar to improve soils and sequester carbon
- The potential to create valuable products from organic wastes
- Food waste, particularly from households, becoming available as a feedstock
- Animal skins and stock casualties, requiring processing
- Grape marc requiring processing
- 'Regenerative Agriculture' and soil fertility driving demand for organic soil amendment products
- Businesses focusing on developing products and markets
- Ongoing expansion of the poultry industry
- Increase in the use of compostable packaging
- Increase in the waste levy

2.0 Fibre Material Stream Summary

2.1 Description of Fibre Material Stream

'Fibre', for the purposes of this project, is defined as paper and cardboard made from virgin timber pulp or re-processed recovered fibre. In New Zealand, recovered fibre includes old corrugated cardboard (OCC); mixed paper (newspapers, magazines, office paper, liquid paperboard e.g. Tetra Pak® aseptic packaging and gable-top milk cartons); offcuts/pre-consumer; and newspaper (sometimes sorted separately to other mixed paper, and often noted as 'old newsprint' - ONP).^{5,6}

2.2 Materials & Quantities


Figure 3⁷ summarises the flows of fibre material in New Zealand.

⁵ Note that these are not necessarily the categories or grades used elsewhere – there is significant variation internationally.

⁶ Tetra Pak® and other liquid paperboard containers have been included with fibre for the purposes of this project, although we note that they are a multi-material packaging product (alongside plastic and metal)

⁷ The data has been compiled from a number of sources, including information supplied in confidence. As the sources included data presented on a range of time scales, some of the data applies to a number of years from 2018 to 2020 while some are annual estimates.

Figure 3: New Zealand Fibre Material Flows Overview



The material flows in Figure 3 are categorised into four stages: manufacture and import; consumption; capture (collection, MRF and transfer); and end-of life. The focus for this project is in the capture and end of life stages.

The key characteristics of fibre infrastructure in New Zealand are:

1. The majority of recovered fibre reprocessed within New Zealand passes through one facility, located in Auckland.
2. There is little additional capacity available for domestic reprocessing, although there are several projects underway to expand or offer new options for reprocessing in the order of 5 – 10,000 additional tonnes per annum.
3. A large quantity of recovered fibre is currently exported for reprocessing.
4. Roughly a third of collected fibre goes to some form of disposal.

2.3 Stakeholder Mapping

The stakeholder map in Table 1 includes only those stakeholders that actually reprocess separated fibre material in New Zealand.

Material recovery facilities (MRFs) are an important part of the fibre recovery process, taking material from kerbside collections and sorting it into separate material streams. However, this section focuses on the operators that take the sorted fibre material streams and reprocess the materials into a new product. MRFs are covered separately in section 12.0.

Table 1: Stakeholder Mapping

Operator	Feedstock	Facility Sub Type	Region	Contact status
OJI	OCC; mixed paper	Paper	Auckland	Interviewed
Hawk Group	OCC; mixed paper	Paper	Hawkes Bay	Interviewed
Huhtamaki	ONP	Paper	Auckland	Interviewed
Opal (Nippon Paper Group)	mixed paper	Paper	Auckland	Interviewed

Of the 803,000 tonnes of waste fibre that is collected annually in New Zealand, 550,000 tonnes or 68% is recovered and reprocessed, with the other 32% being disposed of to landfill.

Of this recovered material, 240,000 tonnes, or 43%, is reprocessed domestically. The remaining 310,000 tonnes is exported to various international reprocessing markets.

It is important to note that no domestic re-processors will accept fibre material that has been collected as part of a fully comingled collection.

The remaining 310,000 tonnes of recovered fibre is exported for reprocessing.

2.4 Key Drivers

There are four main factors that affect the dynamics of activity in the waste fibre recovery sector:

- **International changes in the value of recovered fibre.** Due to recent changes, such as China's Green Fence and National Sword policies and other global market trends (largely as a result of China's policies), the value of recovered fibre on international markets had decreased significantly over the last five years, although this effect has been partially reversed in the short term due to COVID-19 impacts (as a result of changing supply vs demand). Ensuring continued access to international markets will require ongoing effort towards maximising the quality of the fibre offered to the market from New Zealand
- **Fibre re-processing infrastructure is costly.** Compared to the infrastructure required to re-process other recovered materials such as plastic, fibre infrastructure is expensive, and the introduction of new capacity requires a longer lead-in time. While, globally, fibre re-processing infrastructure is well on the way to replacing the capacity lost when China restricted imports of recovered fibre; there has been little development in domestic re-processing infrastructure. The private sector has generally concluded in the past that additional domestic re-processing infrastructure is not a financially viable option without some

government intervention⁸. This was one of the options identified for further investigation in the resource recovery sector situational analysis and options carried out by Eunomia and MRA in 2019.^{9,10} However, it was also highlighted at the time that low landfill costs and high infrastructure costs were barriers to implementing this option.

- **A high proportion of exported fibre is mixed paper from fully comingled collections.** The largest domestic re-processor pursues OCC as its preferred feedstock. Although other smaller re-processors accept mixed paper, they do not accept mixed paper from a fully comingled collection. This currently leaves the recovered fibre from the Auckland and Canterbury fully comingled household kerbside collections with export as the only option. While currently the market supply and demand is favourable for sellers of recovered fibre, it is not known how long this situation will last. Mixed paper is the least preferred feedstock, with mixed paper from a fully comingled collection the least preferred sub-category. While recent investment into MRF infrastructure¹¹ has been significant in an attempt to improve the sorting of materials, as discussed in section 12.0, it remains to be seen whether this will be sufficient to meet increasingly stringent export market contamination limits.
- **Domestic demand for re-processed fibre products.** This is a limiting factor for the three smaller domestic re-processors. OJI produces a material that is exported and incorporated into products in other markets (largely Australia). The three smaller re-processors produce a finished product, and if this product can not be sold into the domestic market, then it needs to be competitive on the export market. Due to economic factors such as relatively high employment and environmental compliance rates, this can be challenging.

⁸ Personal communication with many industry contacts

⁹ Eunomia (2019) "National Resource Recovery Project: Situational Analysis Report" redacted version available at www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/waste

¹⁰ MRA Consulting Group (2019) "Proposals for Short to Medium Term Responses to National Sword" redacted version available at www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/waste

¹¹ As detailed here: <https://www.stuff.co.nz/environment/climate-news/122139078/government-invests-124-million-in-recycling-infrastructure-to-reduce-waste>

3.0 Glass Material Stream Analysis

3.1 Description of Glass Material Stream

In terms of resource recovery, glass divides approximately into two types – bottle/jar glass and window glass.

3.2 Materials & Quantities

The best currently available estimates indicate that in 2019 278,613 tonnes of bottle and jar glass was placed on the New Zealand market.¹² Available estimates suggest that, of the total glass consumed, approximately 170,000 tonnes is collected for recycling, and of this, some 120,000 tonnes is returned to Visy Glass for remanufacture into glass bottles. Some 24,000 tonnes go to aggregate, 25,000 goes to ‘other’ uses (stockpiling, system losses, filter media, sand etc.)¹³


About 35,000 tonnes of flat glass is collected annually with a growing quantity being collected. About 7,500 to 9,000 tonnes of this is used in glass wool insulation and a further 15,000 to 17,000 tonnes is used by Visy Glass in the bottle making process. The remainder is exported as filter media or feedstock for insulation or other products.

The chart below presents estimates of the total tonnes of glass recovered and disposed of:

¹² Data from the CRS process shows total glass figures of 278,613 for 2019. This was made up of 250,113 tonnes of beverage container glass and a further estimated 28,500 tonnes of non-container glass. Source: MfE. It should be noted that this figure is disputed by the Glass Packaging Forum who arrived at an estimate of 256,923 tonnes of glass to market in 2019-20. (GLASS PACKAGING FORUM Product Stewardship Scheme Accreditation Report 2019-2020). Eunomia notes that using the higher CRS figure results in a higher quantity of material that is unaccounted for and is less aligned with available landfill composition data.


¹³ Data is sourced from the Glass Packaging Forum (GPF) - a voluntary product stewardship organisation for the glass packaging sector ((GLASS PACKAGING FORUM Product Stewardship Scheme Accreditation Report 2018-2019). They undertake estimates of mass flows and recovery rates annually. The 2019 figures were used to better align with the CRS data. The 2019-20 figure calculated by the GPF was 193,259 collected of which 120,452 tonnes went to bottle, 17,142 to aggregate, 19,323 to ‘council use’, 21,012 to landfill and 15,331 was ‘loss in the glass supply network’.

Figure 4: Total Tonnes Glass Recovery and Disposal (Bottle)



'Stockpiling and other' includes stockpiled material and 'losses in the system'. The figure for disposal is based on the remainder from the total quantity placed on the market, minus tonnages otherwise accounted for and includes litter and other unregulated disposal.

Figure 5: Total Tonnes Glass Recovery and Disposal (Flat Glass)



The disposal figure is uncertain. A figure for total glass to disposal was derived from composition data from Eunomia 2020¹⁴, and tonnages for different fill types from MfE 2019¹⁵. The total estimate for bottle glass (above) was then subtracted from this figure to derive the total disposal figure for flat glass.

3.3 Facility Types

There is one glass bottle manufacturing facility in NZ (Visy Glass in Penrose, Auckland), and one facility that manufactures glass wool insulation (Tasman Insulation in Auckland). Other facilities include a bottle glass beneficiation plant¹⁶ (Visy Glass in Onehunga, Auckland), and 10 regional hubs (5 operational and 5 commissioned) for bulking flat glass and bottle glass (operated by 5R), with glass crushing and re-processing taking place at the 5R Auckland and Christchurch facilities.

3.4 Regional Distribution

Bottle glass is recovered in all regions of NZ with the largest quantities coming from Auckland, Canterbury, Waikato and Wellington. The quantities are illustrated in Figure 6.

Flat glass current is predominantly recovered in Auckland and Christchurch with smaller amounts also coming aggregated in Bay of Plenty, Wellington, Hamilton, Palmerston North and Nelson.


There are substantial movements of material across boundaries, with the principal flows being to the bottle and flat glass re-processing facilities in Auckland. The majority of bottle glass that is collected in the South Island is stockpiled or use as aggregate, however bottle glass from Dunedin, Queenstown and Wanaka, Nelson, Tasman, Selwyn, Waimakariri, South Canterbury, South Westland, commercial Canterbury and Marlborough is transported to Auckland for recovery.

¹⁴ Eunomia (2020) *Improvements to Estimates of Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Landfills*. Report to the Ministry for the Environment. An industry stakeholder suggests the above estimate of flat glass to landfill is likely to be overstated in their experience.

¹⁵ Ministry for the Environment. 2019. *Reducing waste: a more effective landfill levy – consultation document*. Wellington: Ministry for the Environment.

¹⁶ Beneficiation is a process to remove contamination before the glass cullet is used in the furnace.

Figure 6: Bottle Glass Quantities Collected by Region (x1,000 tonnes)



3.5 Market Segments and Dynamics

3.5.1 Bottle Glass

The dynamics of recycling of glass in New Zealand is closely associated with the dynamics of the bottle glass industry. In New Zealand there is a single glass bottle manufacturing facility located in Penrose, Auckland. The fortunes of this particular facility therefore will have substantial impact on the recycling of glass overall. Key factors include the following:

- The local Visy Glass plant competes with imported glass. They are estimated to have a bit over half of the market share.
- While a portion of glass imported and manufactured here is exported (primarily as bottle wine), there is more glass on the market in NZ than Visy Glass could utilise

- The proportions of colours Visy receives back from recycling do not necessarily match their need for those colours
- The supply chain for getting bottle glass to Visy Glass does not have much resilience, and it is difficult for them to manage flows of materials, particularly during peak times. Improving the resilience of the supply chain is a key focus for Visy Glass and the Glass Packaging Forum.

3.5.2 Flat Glass

While flat glass has historically had some limited recycling (utilised by Tasman Insulation to manufacture Pink Batts), the recovery of flat glass has increased substantially in recent years due primarily to the efforts of 5R. 5R have developed their business by securing local and international markets for the material they collect and process, as well as working with glaziers, glass factories etc. to secure supply. They estimate that they are collecting and recycling 90% of the available flat glass and, of the material they collect, 90% is recovered. The market is currently viable without the use of public money or local authority infrastructure.

3.6 Future Opportunities

As noted above, the key infrastructure issues for bottle glass are to manage glass flows while ensuring the continued viability of local glass bottle production, and to develop viable, valuable end use markets for the glass that cannot be processed back into bottles. The flat glass sector is close to reaching a stable market situation once current expansion plans are completed.

Key potential future options noted in the stocktake included:

- Reducing glass consumption (for example through increased use of refillables)
- Increased storage at the beneficiation plant
- Increased the capacity of beneficiation plant
- Increased storage capacity in the regions
- Shipping excess glass to Australia or Asia
- Increasing local production capacity (subject to market demand).

4.0 Metal Material Stream Summary

4.1 Description of Metal Material Stream

The waste metal material stream in New Zealand is made up of a range of different metal items and components that are recovered from both the domestic and commercial sectors. Recovered material is captured through a wide range of pathways as a result, and may be re-processed domestically or (more commonly) sold into global export markets.

A small quantity of recovered ferrous metal (iron and steel) is reprocessed within New Zealand, mostly within manufacturing facilities. Most non-ferrous metals (aluminium, copper, lead, alloys, and other less common metals) are exported, but there are still several non-ferrous foundries operating within New Zealand. Within the larger categories of ferrous and non-ferrous metals, there are a number of sub-categories or grades which are based on a mixture of metal type, size, and use.


The global recovered metals market generally fluctuates in terms of quantities and commodity prices. The markets are largely driven by supply and demand, and the impact of lockdown due to COVID-19 felt since early 2020 has added variability to these factors, with operators in the metals sector noting increased shipping costs in contrast to other waste operators, that have reported reduced costs. This may be due to the differences in geographical locations material is being shipped to. The general volatility of the shipping industry currently is a factor noted across the board.

Analysis shows that demand for recovered metal streams has recovered while supply has been affected, and some raw materials are becoming more expensive and difficult to extract. This has led to strong market prices for many recovered metals.

4.2 Materials & Quantities

The chart below presents estimates of the total tonnes of metal recovered and disposed of:

Figure 7: Total Tonnes (x1,000) Metal Recovery and Disposal



Disposal figures are based on composition data from Eunomia 2020¹⁷, and tonnages for different fill types from MfE 2019¹⁸.

4.3 Stakeholder Mapping

Stakeholders operating key infrastructure directly relating to recovered metal falls into four main categories:

- Shredder operators; shredders are used to pre-process items that have a component of recoverable metal such as end-of-life vehicles and whiteware;
- Metal processors which use other equipment such as shears, balers, and granulators to prepare recovered metal for export;
- Metal re-processing smelters or foundries; used to process recovered metals of various types into new products for sale;
- Mills, such as NZ Steel which are largely closed-loop systems, only recycling material recovered within their manufacturing process.

¹⁷ Eunomia (2020) *Improvements to Estimates of Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Landfills*. Report to the Ministry for the Environment

¹⁸ Ministry for the Environment. 2019. *Reducing waste: a more effective landfill levy – consultation document*. Wellington: Ministry for the Environment.

Table 2: Stakeholders

Operator and location	Shredder/Re-processor	AMR member	Region	Contact status
Global Metal Solutions (Hamilton)	Shredder	No	Waikato	Interviewed
Global Metal Solutions (Papakura)	Shredder	No	Auckland	Interviewed
Glucina Alloys (Avondale)	Re-processor – accepts aluminium, copper, and alloys	Yes	Auckland	Via AMR
New Zealand Steel (Glenbrook)	Mill and re-processor (limited) – incorporates manufacturing waste back into process	No	Auckland	Interviewed
Pacific Steel (Otahuhu)	Mill	No	Auckland	No
National Steel (Manukau)	Shredder	Yes	Auckland	Via AMR
SIMS Metal Management (Otahuhu)	Shredder	Yes	Auckland	Via AMR
Endless Metals (Onehunga)	Shredder	Yes	Auckland	Via AMR
Macauley Metals (Lower Hutt)	Shredder	Yes	Wellington	Via AMR
MetalCo (Te Puke)	Shredder	Yes	Bay of Plenty	Via AMR
Wairarapa Scrap Metals	Shredder	Yes	Wellington	Via AMR
SIMS Metal Management (Christchurch)	Shredder	Yes	Canterbury	Via AMR
MetalCorp (Christchurch)	Shredder	Yes	Canterbury	Via AMR
A W Fraser	Re-processor	Yes	Canterbury	Via AMR
E Hayes & Co	Re-processor	Yes	Auckland	Via AMR

Many stakeholders are members of the New Zealand Association of Metal Recyclers (AMR). The AMR does not consider the material they handle to be a ‘waste’, and states that its industry operates on a fully commercial basis with no external funding.

4.3.1 Shredders

Shredders, as the name suggests, shred a range of items accepted as ‘scrap metal’ with the aim of separating the metal components from other materials, and to reduce overall volume. Shredder feedstock, known as ‘shredder feed’, is mostly post-consumer items such as vehicles, whiteware, end of life machinery, wire, roofing iron that is not suitable for reuse, and manufacturing waste along with a high proportion of other materials.

The outputs from shredders are various types of scrap metal; and waste, known as shredder floc, which is sent to landfill. The price received for the output depends on

global market conditions and the material type, and can vary considerably. On average, shredder floc usually makes up around 35-40% of shredder feed; however, this proportion can vary considerably for specific items with whiteware reaching as high as 60%¹⁹.

Shredders are expensive items (ranging from \$2M to \$20M), and to extract best return from this infrastructure operators are likely to operate these even when the return is marginal.

However, there is also a tension between the economies of scale required to sustain a shredder operation, and the need for a geographical spread of shredder facilities to limit transport costs. Transport costs are a key factor in determining the viability of recovering shredder feed. This tension is unlikely to exist to the same extent in many other countries due to their relatively high population densities compared to New Zealand, and is likely to be a key factor behind the apparently high number of shredder facilities.

Other key factors in determining the ideal operating level for a shredder are prices achievable for recovered metals in export markets, and the cost of disposing of shredder floc.

4.3.2 Re-processing infrastructure

The most common metal re-processed within New Zealand is steel manufacturing waste, along with small amounts of copper, stainless steel, and aluminium alloys. The majority of the product made at these re-processing facilities is then sold to export markets.

4.3.3 Other relevant infrastructure

Other waste infrastructure categories are relevant to the recovery of metals in New Zealand, particularly MRFs (where much of the kerbside collected material is sorted) and kerbside recycling collections which accept a varying range of waste metal items.

4.4 Analysis of Material Flows

There is little data relating to the total quantity of metal waste that could be recovered in New Zealand.

There is reliable information relating to the amount of material that is recovered from shredder operators, and to how much shredder floc is disposed of. An average proportion of 60% recovered metal to 40% shredder floc can be assumed based on previous industry analysis.

¹⁹ Eunomia (2019) "Metals Recycling in NZ", report for the New Zealand Association of Metal Recyclers.

Table 3: Shredder Feed Quantities (Estimated Tonnes per Annum)²⁰

	Total Material Available	Re-processed by Metal Recycling Industry	Straight to Landfill
Estimated Total Shredder Feed	261,000	208,000	34,100

The main metal type reprocessed within New Zealand is steel, with two large steel production facilities in the Auckland region incorporating recovered steel in their processes. The quantities used at these facilities varies year on year, and operators advise that the proportion of recycled steel incorporated is largely driven by the quantity of recovered steel available for their use.

Waste composition data for Class 1 landfills shows that there is around 130,000 tonnes of waste metal being sent to these facilities²¹:

Table 4: Metal Waste Disposal to Class 1 Landfills

Material Type	Proportion of waste to Class 1 landfills	Quantity based on 2018 OWLS data
Ferrous metal	2.7%	99,708
Non-ferrous metal	0.8%	30,438

The quantity of waste metal going to Class 2-5 landfills or other forms of disposal is unknown, as there is very little composition data for these facilities.

There are significant cross-boundary movements of shredder feed. The most significant cross-boundary movements are in the lower South Island, where all shredder feed is processed in Christchurch.

There are few plans amongst stakeholders to expand or introduce new infrastructure to the metals sector. There is currently additional capacity at virtually every shredder around New Zealand. Both Pacific Steel and New Zealand Steel report that there is potential to incorporate more recovered steel into their production lines, and that this proportion varies depending on supply rather than any quality limitation or strict proportion.

²⁰ These figures are based on data provided by the AMR, with 'straight to landfill' figures based on Ministry for the Environment landfill data

²¹ Waste Not Consulting (2020) "National Waste Composition Estimate 2020", confidential report prepared for the Ministry for the Environment.

Hayes Metals are currently exploring an initiative which would enable the recovery of steel and aluminium from bottle tops and food-contaminated aluminium foil.

4.4.1 Key Drivers

There are four main factors that affect the dynamics of activity in the metals recovery sector:

- **New Zealand Association of Metal Recyclers:** The AMR represents a large proportion of the commercial entities involved in the metals recovery sector. The AMR has a very specific view of its sector, which is predicated on the principle that the material they handle is not waste. There are various reasons for this, some of which are related to concern about the implications for international rules and conventions such as the Basel Convention.
- **Infrastructure Cost:** Shredders are costly items, and once an operator has a shredder in place, the balance of economics in achieving sufficient return from operating the shredder while also minimising landfills costs for shredder floc is an ongoing operational adjustment. One of the key factors is the prices achievable for recovered metals on export markets. Other key factors are business expenses such as increasing insurance costs as global insurers place increasing restrictions on facilities deemed to be at high risk of fires which applies to shredder operators.
- **Landfill Disposal Costs:** Shredder operators are vulnerable to landfill disposal costs as such a high proportion of shredder feed must later be landfilled; this cost will increase as the land fill levy is increased and expanded. Some operators use internal transport logistics and backfilling loads to access cheaper disposal prices, or use landfills that are not classed as municipal landfills and therefore do not (currently) need to charge the landfill levy. The increase in rate and scope of the landfill levy is likely to have an impact on the economics of shredder operations. Previous analysis has suggested that this is likely to result in reduced capture by scrap metal operators of some items including whiteware, end-of-life vehicles, and other 'light gauge' shredder feed. This is likely to be felt more so in isolated and rural areas where transport costs already make this marginal. This *may* result in more illegal disposal of these items, or the items may be stockpiled or recycled through other pathways such as waste collection companies and RTS²².
- **Export Market Volatility:** Alongside a reliance on export markets for recovered metal commodities comes exposure to any volatility in these markets. Although this is currently a positive trend, there has been concern in recent years following the impact of China's National Sword policies. There is variation in the extent to

²² Eunomia (2019) "Metals Recycling in New Zealand: Painting the Picture of the Impacts of An Increase in the Waste Levy", report for the AMR

which individual industry stakeholders engage with trade bodies, government departments, and market variation.

In general, there is generous provision of shredders overall across the country, with some issues in the geographical distribution of these.

6.0 Plastic Material Stream Analysis


6.1 Description of Plastic Material Stream

The plastic material stream encompasses a range of different polymers used for diverse applications in both the commercial and residential sectors. New Zealand has onshore reprocessing facilities for both post-industrial and post-consumer polymers. These re-processors convert recovered plastic products into recycled plastic resin granules or powder, and/or finished products, including consumer food packaging, agricultural products, films, bags, and piping. With a few exceptions, the majority of processors deal with end-of-life plastic packaging – there are gaps around comprehensive and consistent recovery and reprocessing of durable (non-packaging) products that include plastic as the sole, or significant, material component.

6.2 Materials & Quantities

The chart below presents estimates of the total tonnes of plastic recovered and disposed of:

Figure 1: Total Tonnes Plastics Recovery and Disposal



The landfill disposal figure is based on the PMCSA report²³, domestic reprocessing is from stocktake data. Export figures were obtained from Statistics NZ Infoshare (data to

²³ <https://www.pmcsa.ac.nz/topics/rethinking-plastics/quantifying-aotearoas-plastic/>

year ended Dec 2020). 'Other disposal' covers material unaccounted for based on the quantity of material placed on the market and subtracting the export, domestic processing and landfill disposal figures. It includes litter and other unregulated disposal.


6.3 Capacity

Collectively, stakeholders re-process 32,584 tonnes of plastic onshore each year. Re-processing capacity is spread unevenly between polymer types (see Figure 2). The polymers most commonly collected and re-processed in New Zealand are:

- Post-commercial low-density polyethylene (LDPE) and linear low-density polyethylene (LLDPE) (35%)
- Post-commercial and post-consumer high-density polyethylene (HDPE), both natural and pigmented (27%)
- Post-consumer and post-commercial clear polyethylene terephthalate (PET) (18%)
- Post-commercial and post-consumer polypropylene (PP) (9%)
- Post-commercial poly vinyl chloride (PVC) (<1%)
- Post-commercial polystyrene (PS), including expanded PS (EPS) (2%)
- Other post-consumer polymers, including ABS, HIPS (8%)

Figure 2: Polymers Processed in New Zealand by Type

Polymers Processed in New Zealand by Type



The remainder of New Zealand’s waste polymers are either:

- put towards niche applications (such as fence posts or roading aggregate) that can tolerate co-mingled, contaminated or hard-to-recycle polymers without prior conversion to flakes or granules;
- collected and exported as scrap for offshore re-processing;
- landfilled; or
- in use or stockpiled
- lost to the natural environment.

The total flow of plastic in New Zealand, of which onshore plastic reprocessing is just one part, is outlined using best available data in Chapter 5 of *Rethinking Plastics in Aotearoa*.

6.4 Stakeholder and Facility Types

Twenty stakeholders were identified and 19 interviewed. The activities these stakeholders conduct include:²⁴

- Re-processing plastic products into recycled resin granules or powder that can then be manufactured into a finished product (75%).
- Manufacturing products from New Zealand recycled resin or putting plastic waste to an end-use (60%).
- Exporting New Zealand recycled resin, partially re-processed recyclate, and/or finished products containing New Zealand recycled resin (45%).

²⁴ Note the percentages do not total 100% because some stakeholders conduct more than one of the listed activities.


6.5 Regional Distribution

New Zealand's plastic reprocessing facilities are unevenly dispersed across the country. Most are concentrated around Auckland and the Lower North Island. The South Island processors are in Canterbury.

Accordingly, any plastic collected in New Zealand that is destined for onshore recycling will be transported to one of the facilities in Auckland, the Lower North Island or Canterbury. Auckland re-processors are more likely to receive recyclate from Auckland, whereas the Canterbury re-processor receives recyclate from across the South Island, and the Lower North Island re-processors receive material from a wide array of districts. Interviews indicated there may be some logistics challenges transporting scrap plastic between the North and South Islands, and further analysis may be required to fully understand the provenance of these challenges and how best to address them.

Both activity source and geographic source (particularly the island upon which the plastic waste is generated) are reliable indicators of the distance recyclate will travel. Post-commercial plastic recyclate is generally re-processed in the region it is generated, whereas post-consumer plastic recyclate often travels further. No appreciable tonnage moves from the North Island to the South Island for re-processing, but some plastic recyclate travels from the South Island to the North, especially clear PET. However, the shipping cost to cross the Cook Strait can be higher than exporting to offshore re-processors (or landfilling).

Figure 8: Provenance of the Plastic Processed Onshore by Region (x1,000 tonnes)



6.6 Market Segments and Dynamics

Collectively, stakeholders produce roughly 43,000 tonnes per year of recycled resin and/or finished products containing recycled resin. This tonnage exceeds the weight of the plastic recyclate re-processed because finished products generally contain a proportion of virgin content.

The three key market segments for sale of re-processed plastic (based on tonnage) are:

- Domestic market for finished products made of recycled resin or granules (51%).

- Domestic market for recycled resin (29%).
- Export market, predominantly for recycled resin or partially re-processed recyclate (14%).

The key dynamics affecting the market and the economic viability of re-processors (either positively or negatively) are:

- The low price of virgin plastic resin vis-à-vis recycled plastic resin, especially when crude oil prices drop.
- The willingness of manufacturers and brands to use recycled content in their products and/or packaging.
- The low price of imported plastic products made of virgin resin vis-à-vis equivalent products made in New Zealand using recycled content.
- Growing public awareness about sustainability and increased demand for recycling activity, but also negative public attitudes towards plastic.
- The price of scrap recyclate, particularly when competing with offshore buyers.
- Plastic export restrictions, especially unprocessed scrap material.
- The poor quality of recovered plastic material, particularly post-consumer.
- Policy activity in the area of plastic waste and recycling, which would improve market drivers for recycling in the long-term, but which also creates a degree of market uncertainty in the short-term.
- The high capital cost of recycling equipment meaning many recyclers use old, small scale equipment, resulting in comparatively low productivity and high production costs.

6.7 Future Capacity

During interviews, a number of stakeholders indicated plans to expand their onshore re-processing capacity over the next five years. Together, these planned expansions would see annual onshore re-processing capacity increase by at least 30,000 tonnes over the next five years. This capacity increase would be predominantly for post-consumer clear PET, and post-consumer and post-commercial HDPE (natural and coloured) and PP.

6.8 Key Opportunities to Expand Onshore Re-processing Capacity

Whether a polymer or particular type of plastic product can be effectively re-processed in New Zealand partly relates to onshore re-processing capacity and available equipment and facilities. Stakeholders highlighted a number of infrastructural gaps. Key suggestions are noted below:

- The need for more re-processing plants distributed across the country, including in the South Island. Re-processing plants do not necessarily need to make finished products to be viable, as good offshore markets remain for re-processed recycled resin. Though there was debate amongst stakeholders

regarding the relative value of fewer large-scale processors or multiple small-scale processors.

- Equipment to granulise a wider range of polymers, including niche polymers, and infrastructure that can granulise mixed plastic and then sort and separate it into polymer type and colour.
- Pyrolysis plants or collection for chemical/advanced recycling for hard-to-recycle plastics. There was debate amongst stakeholders regarding whether waste-to-energy was commercially viable or philosophically desirable for plastics.
- Improved sorting and washing facilities to guarantee clean, high quality, uncontaminated feedstock.
- Small-scale sorting and densifying equipment for the regions to reduce the logistics issues in bringing materials to the major centres for reprocessing.

However, barriers and opportunities are not always infrastructural. Most re-processors have capacity to take greater tonnages of the polymers they already re-process or could expand into a wider range of polymer types provided that:

- the material arrives in clean, separate streams; and
- a viable market exists for the recycled resin and/or finished product(s).

With this in mind, interviewees also suggested other methods to increase onshore re-processing capacity, and these are collated as follows:

- Improve collection methodologies, particularly for post-consumer plastics or dirty post-industrial plastics, e.g. national kerbside standardisation around best practice with accompanying public education/messaging, and deposit return systems and product stewardship.
- Appropriate sorting and washing technology where collection methodologies cannot be improved.
- Policies to increase the economic viability of recycled resin and recycled plastic products (e.g. minimum recycled content legislation).
- Rationalise the polymers used in certain contexts (e.g. phase-out PVC and PS for food and beverage packaging), and continue to reduce the use of hard-to-recycle polymer products, such as composites.

7.0 Construction and Demolition Material Stream Summary

7.1 Description of Material Stream

Construction and demolition waste (C&D) includes a wide range of material streams, with the most common waste types being concrete and rubble, timber (treated and untreated), plasterboard and mixed waste. C&D is a waste stream generally defined best by activity source rather than material type.

Construction and demolition waste is usually captured in one of three ways:

- An unsorted waste receptacle at the site, which is subsequently removed and sorted at a specific facility (the most common methodology for smaller construction project, e.g. a single residential home construction) to remove readily divertible material types and reusable material;
- Specific material streams separated at the site; most often cardboard and rubble, transferred for recycling; and
- An unsorted skip/s at the building site, which is subsequently removed and disposed of to landfill without any further sorting or re-processing.

There is no data in New Zealand to suggest the frequency of each method. However, the relatively scarce provision of facilities that enable the sorting and recovery of C&D waste means it is likely that the last option is used most frequently.


The logistics involved in having source-separation of construction wastes can be reduced in large construction projects, as there is more likely to be space available for multiple containers, and quantities of individual material types make it more likely that separate collection systems will be cost-effective.

Some construction projects also offer greater opportunity for modular and/or off-site construction, such as hotels and apartment buildings.

7.2 Materials and Quantities

The chart below presents estimates of the total tonnes of C&D waste recovered and disposed of:

Figure 9: Total Tonnes (x1,000) Construction & Demolition Waste Recovery and Disposal



Disposal figures are from MfE 2019²⁵, Recovery figures are based on data obtained during the stocktake, but these figures are likely to be incomplete, as data was not obtained from all parties. The quantum of the material recovered but not accounted for may be of a similar order to the aggregate recovery above, however this is highly uncertain, hence it is not represented above.

7.3 Stakeholders

Stakeholders have been separated into those that deal with general construction waste, and those that focus on aggregate and bulk demolition waste recovery. There is a significant difference in the equipment required to recover and recycle aggregate, as opposed to mixed construction and demolition waste.²⁶ For this reason, facilities have been split according to which type of service they offer.

For the purposes of this study ‘demolition yards’ were not included.

Table 5: Stakeholder Mapping

Stakeholder	Brief Description	Material stream	Region(s)
-------------	-------------------	-----------------	-----------

²⁵ Ministry for the Environment. 2019. *Reducing waste: a more effective landfill levy – consultation document*. Wellington: Ministry for the Environment.

²⁶ ‘Aggregate’ consists of concrete, brick, asphalt and other heavy inert materials which are crushed and graded for reuse. Mixed C&D waste includes timber, plasterboard, metals, insulation, plastics, glass etc.

D&T MacDonald	Concrete and metal recovery and managed fill disposal	Demolition and aggregate	Waikato
Green Gorilla	Construction waste sorting and recovery (alongside other waste services)	Construction waste	Auckland
Green Vision Recycling	Aggregate, asphalt and top soil recovery; managed fill disposal	Demolition and aggregate	Auckland
Hall Brothers	Aggregate, asphalt, metal and top soil recovery. Some plasterboard timber and joinery	Demolition and aggregate	Otago
Human Aid Focus	Timber recovery, some scrap metal	Construction waste	Palmerston North
Nash & Rosh	Concrete and metal recovery and managed fill disposal	Demolition and aggregate	Otago
Nikau Group	Aggregate recovery	Demolition and aggregate	Auckland/north Waikato
SimKen Concrete Recycling	Aggregate recovery, cleaning and grading	Demolition and aggregate	Auckland/north Waikato
Ward Demolition	Aggregate recovery	Demolition and aggregate	Auckland
Woods Waste	Construction waste sorting and recovery	Construction waste	Wellington central
Fulton Hogan	Aggregate recovery	Demolition and aggregate	Blenheim
Winstone Wallboards	Construction waste recovery – plasterboard	Construction waste	National
WasteCo	Construction waste sorting and recovery (alongside other waste services)	Construction waste	Christchurch

Waikato Demolition	Construction waste recovery and aggregate processing	Construction, demolition and aggregate waste	Hamilton
Atlas Concrete	Aggregate processing	Demolition and aggregate waste	Auckland

7.4 Regional Distribution

Table 6: Facilities by region

	Construction	Demolition and aggregate	Total
Auckland	1	4	5
Waikato	1	2	2
Horizons	1	0	1
Bay of Plenty	1	0	1
Wellington	1	0	1
Marlborough	0	1	1
Canterbury	1	0	1
Otago	0	2	2
TOTAL	5	8	13

Outside of Auckland, the numbers of construction and demolition waste facilities is limited.

Some additional data on C&D waste diversion was obtained through interviews with the larger waste companies, particularly ESL and WMNZL. Anecdotally, a number of construction and demolition operators recover waste from their own operations (mainly aggregates and steel), but they do not necessarily publicise this fact. It is likely that there is additional recovery of materials taking place at a smaller scale that was not picked up in our survey.

There is a clear focus for C&D waste recovery around Auckland and the north Waikato. In addition to their main Auckland yard, Nikau Group also have a site in Meremere, Waikato.

7.5 Market Segments and Dynamics

There are quite different dynamics in the C&D waste recovery sector for demolition/aggregate waste, and mixed construction waste. Demolition and aggregate waste operators tend to be very high volume, and outputs are low value per unit but similarly produced in volume. Construction waste operators tend to handle much lower volumes, and the outputs from this sector are more likely to be high quality, high value items such as native timber, joinery and household fittings. It is also common for scrap metal and fibre (paper/cardboard) to be recovered.

An increase in the landfill levy for Class 1 landfills, and the expansion of the landfill levy to Class 2-5 landfills, may make diversion of C&D waste more common as it becomes economically viable. Over 80% of construction companies reported that they expect the costs of waste minimisation and increasing landfill levies to have a negative or neutral impact on their operations over the next three years, while also ‘waste minimisation and recycling’ as the top priority action to help their operations become more environmentally sustainable²⁷.

The general feeling of those involved in the construction waste diversion industry is that until disposal costs are higher, the motivation to sort at source or to use a construction waste service that incorporates a sorting stage will remain purely as an environmental choice and the market will be limited.

7.6 Key Opportunities

With landfill costs, including the option of disposal to Class 2-5 landfills in many areas, such a key factor in construction and demolition waste diversion; the forthcoming increase and expansion of the landfill levy has the potential to drive significant change in this sector.

Other opportunities highlighted by stakeholders include:

- Driving demand for services (for aggregates and construction waste) through requirements in tender and service agreements; such as minimum requirements for inclusion of recycled aggregates in roading projects, and waste management and minimisation plans for construction projects;
- Addressing the current restrictions on asbestos contamination in aggregate, as these are currently felt to be unnecessarily strict;
- Tighter consenting and enforcement of consent conditions for Class 2-5 landfills, particularly those that operate as ‘cleanfills’ but accept material that sits outside the normal acceptance criteria for these facilities.

²⁷ Teletrac Navman and Civil Contractors New Zealand (2020) “Construction Industry Survey” available at www.civilcontractors.co.nz

8.0 Electrical and Electronic Products

Material Stream Analysis

8.1 Description of Electrical and Electronic Products Material Stream

Electrical and electronic products span a huge variety of items – from everyday appliances through to specialised medical or telecommunications equipment, and batteries. These products contain componentry and parts that encompass multiple material streams – metals, glass, plastics, battery chemistries, and packaging.

In New Zealand, onshore re-processors mostly dismantle products into these component materials, or commodities like printed circuit boards (PCBs), to on-sell for further re-processing – mostly offshore where final re-processors or refineries are located. Some operate reuse activities, such as refurbishing, repair or parts harvesting.

Because of the potential for reuse, the electrical and electronics material stream is broader than ‘e-waste’ or WEEE. A complete definition can be found in the “Declaration of Priority Products” in the New Zealand Gazette.²⁸

8.2 Materials and Quantities

The chart below presents estimates of the total tonnes of electrical and electronic waste recovered and disposed of:

²⁸ “Declaration of Priority Products” (29 July 2020) *New Zealand Gazette* No 2020-go3343. Retrieved from <https://gazette.govt.nz/notice/id/2020-go3343>.

Figure 10: Total Tonnes Electrical and Electronic Waste Recovery and Disposal



Disposal is estimated based on a total of 99,000 tonnes of consumed-waste generated in NZ annually,²⁹ minus the total quantity collected. ‘Other’ is the difference between total collected material, and the total quantity exported or managed onshore. The fate of this material is unaccounted for in the data, partly because of difficulties getting accurate data from stakeholders that covered both inputs and outputs. However, having been collected, it is likely these materials are either processed and exported, stockpiled or landfilled as residual materials.

8.3 Stakeholders, Activities and Facility Types

We identified 24 stakeholders managing used electrical and electronic products and interviewed 14.³⁰ In New Zealand, stakeholders operating in the sector include both commercially driven organisations, and community-driven organisations working towards a range of social and environmental outcomes.

Most stakeholder re-processing activities are manual and rely on labour and space rather than technical equipment and infrastructure, though some operators have specialised equipment for dismantling particular items (e.g. machinery to separate glass from leaded glass in CRT monitors). Based on the stakeholders interviewed, the main activities in the sector are:

²⁹ V Blake, T Farrelly, J Hannon (2019) Is Voluntary Product Stewardship for E-Waste Working in New Zealand? A Whangarei Case Study *Sustainability* 11(11); <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11113063>.

³⁰ We note that a recent desktop survey of e-product recyclers conducted by the Circular E-Steward Network (CEN) identified a far higher number of recyclers (92). The CEN study took a wider definition of recyclers, and also included various stakeholders who have been captured in other material chapters of our research (metal recyclers, transfer stations and resource recovery centres).

- Dismantling products into component commodities to on-sell (86%).
- Reuse activities, such as refurbishing, repair or parts harvesting (57%)
- Exporting with Basel Permits (36%)
- Re-processing activities, e.g. CRT splitting, plastic granulation, and extracting metals from PCBs (36%)
- Professional data destruction (29%)

In addition, most of the stakeholders interviewed offer private e-waste collection services for commercial clients and/or manage public-facing drop-off points (93%).

8.4 Regional Distribution and Cross-Boundary Movement

New Zealand's re-processing facilities for used electrical and electronic products are grouped around the main centres of Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch. Drop-off/collection points are more dispersed around the country, so collected products are aggregated and transported to one of the main centres for re-processing.

Products and components may also move across regional borders for other reasons. For example, some operators do not dismantle certain products (such as CRTs and printers) and instead send them intact to another operator with the necessary specialised equipment. Furthermore, after dismantling most products, stakeholders usually send components elsewhere for final re-processing. Metals are mostly sent to onshore scrap metal dealers. Plastics are often landfilled (though some are stockpiled or granulated, and then exported in clean and sorted polymer streams). Some materials, such as leaded glass, PCBs and batteries must be exported to offshore refineries, which requires a Hazardous Waste Export Permit (Basel Permit). Operators who do not hold the relevant Permit Basel Permit will send the materials to another operator who does.

Figure 11 Facilities by Region



8.5 Market Segments and Dynamics

Given New Zealand's lack of re-processing facilities for electrical and electronic products and components, stakeholders rely on export to complete the recycling process for e-waste. The key market segments for stakeholders interviewed were:

- Onshore scrap metal recyclers
- Offshore refineries for components such as PCBs and leaded glass
- Offshore re-processors for batteries

By weight, metal and batteries constitute stakeholders' largest output. However, PCBs generate the most revenue because they contain precious metals. Most PCBs are exported to offshore refineries, but a small quantity are bought by an Auckland-based research and development facility that undertakes 'bio-mining' (using microbes to extract precious metals from PCBs).

Reuse and refurbishing represent a fraction of total stakeholder activity. However, for the stakeholders who pursue reuse and refurbishing, these activities generate much higher revenues than dismantling for recycling and save the most material from landfill by extending the product lifespan. A number of stakeholders want to grow this part of their business.

The key dynamics affecting the market and the economic viability of re-processors (either positively or negatively) are:

- Low recovery rate of used/discarded electrical and electronic products (c.2%) due to a lack of incentive (and cost barrier) for recycling at end-of-life compared with landfill, and patchy collection infrastructure.
- Diminishing economic viability of re-processing and exporting legacy products, such as CRT TVs.
- Reliance on offshore re-processors, but high costs and complicated logistics associated with exporting unprocessed products that require a Basel Permit.
- Increased public awareness about the issue of e-waste, and growing public demand for e-waste recycling and reuse and repair services.
- The difficulty of re-processing plastics from electrical and electronic products, particularly flame retardant or brominated plastic.
- The fact that modern electrical and electronic products are not designed to be repairable.
- Insufficient attention to ensuring there is a market for recycled products prior to reprocessing and/or investment.
- For non-profit stakeholders, the difficulty of maintaining a foothold in the market alongside purely commercial operators.

8.6 Health and Safety, Accreditation and Compliance

Lots of stakeholders were worried about the lack of consistent standards for managing e-waste in New Zealand, resulting in risky processes, false environmental claims about services, and even the illegal export of hazardous materials without permits. All stakeholders agreed that New Zealand should adopt one common standard for e-waste re-processing that all stakeholders accredit against, such as AS/NZS 5377:2013. Some called for sensitivity for smaller stakeholders who may struggle with compliance costs.

8.7 Future Capacity

Most stakeholders interviewed are not operating at capacity because e-waste recovery rates are low, but most indicated readiness and willingness to expand to absorb any sustained and ongoing increases in volume. Given that most activity currently relies on manual processes like dismantling, expansion requires increased warehouse space and storage, and more staff.

The most significant planned increases in infrastructural capacity were in the area of battery re-processing, with one stakeholder having invested in a battery recycling plant for lithium and other dry-cell batteries, and another having lodged an application for a

Basel Permit to export mixed batteries to Australia (including lithium batteries and batteries containing cadmium) for further processing and/or consolidation and shipping offshore.

One stakeholder has invested in an e-waste automatic separation line to reduce the need for storing and scheduling product and to enable the dismantling of products that are not economically viable to dismantle manually.

8.8 Key Opportunities to Expand Onshore Re-processing

Stakeholders support more onshore re-processing but noted the need for investment to be strategic given New Zealand's small population (which may mean e-waste volumes limit the number of refineries and re-processing plants that can be viable), and to ensure there is an end-market for reprocessed products. Some interviewees noted it is unrealistic to expect New Zealand will ever be able to re-process all e-waste on-shore, and that this is not necessary to achieve good environmental outcomes. Bearing this in mind, some of the key areas of opportunity for infrastructure investment cited were:

- More onshore capacity for preliminary, pre-processing to extract greater value before export, and potentially reduce reliance on Basel Permits and/or recirculate critical raw materials in local supply chains.
- Specialist equipment for items that cannot be dismantled manually, such as TV and computer desktop screens, flatscreens, modems with heavy plastic content etc.
- Machinery to mechanise processes, including dismantling.
- Shared equipment to assist with the safe logistics of transporting and stored e-waste prior to re-processing, such as fireproof containers for used batteries.

Barriers and opportunities are not always infrastructural. At present, low recovery rates of electronic and electrical products is the primary barrier to stakeholders expanding activities and capacity because most operators rely on their revenue to expand. There was a feeling that low recovery rates were to do with a lack of incentive for users to return e-waste for re-processing rather than landfilling it.

For this reason, all stakeholders strongly support product stewardship and believe it will significantly affect the sector, but see scheme design as critical to harness this potential. The key messages stakeholders communicated about product stewardship were:

- Communicate effectively with all stakeholders from the outset and ensure inclusive design and an inclusive scheme
- Ensure that costs are fairly allocated and that the scheme is equitable and transparent.
- Design product stewardship to protect diverse operators and ensure non-profits are not squeezed out of the e-waste market.
- Prevent cherry-picking activity and ensure all products are re-processed properly.
- Adopt an iterative scheme design process that meets the 'low hanging fruit' standards first, then pushes further to improve over time.

- Support operators with the cost of accrediting to a national quality assurance/best practice e-waste recycling standard.
- Avoid a competitive model where importers “call the shots” and recyclers have to compete on price, which leads to a “race to the bottom”. Finance and empower recyclers to do the job properly.
- Ensure convenience, ease and simplicity for the consumer.
- Require that importers, businesses and OEMs demonstrate a clear end-of-life plan for their products at time of import to New Zealand.

Aside from product stewardship, stakeholders also suggested other methods to increase onshore capacity:

- Increased access to labour and space to dismantle and/or refurbish growing quantities of used and discarded electronic and electrical products.
- Policies to lift recovery rates of discarded electronic and electrical products, particularly mandatory product stewardship incorporating advanced disposal fees, but also a ban on landfilling e-waste and continued increases to the landfill levy.
- Consistent collection infrastructure to ensure access across the country, particularly filling gaps in the regions.
- More public education and training schemes with the private sector on what to do with end-of-life electrical and electronic products.

9.0 Farm Plastics Material Stream Analysis

9.1 Description of Farm Plastics Material Stream


The farm plastics material stream researched included agrichemical containers and silage wrap as these product groups have both been declared priority products. Farm plastics in its entirety encompasses a much larger group of materials.

9.2 Materials

The main farm plastics material streams that are processed through formal recovery systems in New Zealand include wrapping material for hay, and plastic containers and drums used on farms containing fertilizers, insecticides, pesticides, cleaning, and veterinarian products.

The chart below presents estimates of the total tonnes of silage wrap and agricultural chemical containers recovered and disposed of:

Figure 3: Total Tonnes Silage Wrap and Agricultural Chemical Containers Recovery and Disposal



Total quantities are from the PMCSA report³¹ which estimates a national total of 14,518 tonnes of silage wrap, and 2,323 tonnes of drums and containers placed on the market. Recovery data was supplied by stakeholders. Landfill disposal is the quantities of farm

³¹ <https://www.pmcsa.ac.nz/2019/11/05/agricultural-plastic-waste/>

plastics collected and disposed of by voluntary scheme providers. 'Unknown' includes on farm disposal and other classes of disposal.


9.3 Facility Types

Three organisations are involved with collecting and processing of these farm plastic wastes. Two of which operate nationally, and one operates out of 2 regions.

9.4 Regional Distribution

All regions in New Zealand have farms, and all 58,071 farms generate plastic waste. Most of the recovered farm plastics are either picked up or deposited at local collection centres. Materials are then transported to regional collection hubs where they are processed, which involves ongoing cross boundary movements. Most farm plastics originate from Waikato (20%) and Canterbury (24%), see Figure 12.

Figure 12: Quantities of Farm Plastics Collected by Region (Tonnes)



9.5 Market Segments and Dynamics

Collectors estimate that they recover at most 35-45% of their respective waste stream. Exact data and insights about what happens with the remaining material is lacking, however industry sources suggest a small amount (10%) of the containers are recycled (all others are landfilled) and the majority of processed silage wrap is exported.

The main factors that affect the dynamics of activity in the waste farm plastics recovery sector include:

- The prevalence of subsidised local collection events which increases the quantities collected.
- Regulation and enforcement, in most regions of New Zealand, burning or burying farm waste is a permitted activity through regional rules.
- The need for additional collection points and equipment (balers).
- General awareness and education around the long-term harmful effects of burying and burning (plastic) waste.
- Increase in waste levy.

9.6 Product Stewardship

All three operators are currently running voluntary product stewardship schemes and are interested in converting these to mandatory schemes. Their belief is that further regulation, awareness, and enforcement, is needed to capture the remaining 55% of this waste stream.

The suggested agricultural chemical and container scheme would be partly paid for by including the price of disposal/processing in the original sales price. Furthermore, financial assistance would be sought from other sources to assist in dealing with legacy waste and imported materials or from manufacturers that are not part of the scheme.

The majority of silage wrap is imported through a variety of suppliers from different nations, resulting in recommendations to increase processing equipment and infrastructure.

9.7 Future Opportunities

An increase in on-farm plastics usage is expected. All parties interviewed indicated they have additional processing capacity; however, there are limitations around the domestic market capacity for re-processed materials, and safe disposal of the products that cannot be recycled.

To process more silage wrap, additional balers are needed. There is currently international demand for the re-processed product, however an increase in domestic re-processing capacity and markets for recycled material would be beneficial.

The cleaning of containers is mainly a manual process; therefore, the critical component is labour.

Key potential future demand drivers noted in the stocktake included:

- Introduction of mandatory product stewardship schemes.
- Disallowing (and enforcing) the burning and burying of waste on farms through regional rules.
- The potential to research reuse options for farming materials currently packaged in single use plastics.
- Increase in the waste levy.
- Controls on imported products, to avoid free riding.
- Including farm plastic's management in certification and accreditation programs.
- Eco-tax virgin plastics, to make reused materials more competitive and viable.
- Require minimum amount of recycled material in production of farm plastics.
- Limit the use of mixed materials in packaging.

10.0 Reusables Material Stream Analysis

10.1 Description of Reusables Material Stream

The reusables material stream encompasses a range of materials, delivery models, products, markets, and types of operators. While there are a number of different models for reusable packaging systems, we have focused on the ‘returnable packaging’ model, in which retailers, manufacturers and brands take empty reusable packaging back from customers for sanitisation and refill.

Reusable packaging has the potential to help reduce some of the waste streams addressed in other sections of this report and to alleviate some of the pressures currently faced by the resource recovery system for single-use packaging. However, to do so successfully, a number of infrastructural gaps must be addressed.

10.2 Materials & Quantities


This report focuses on reusable packaging systems for the following products:

- beverages,
- takeaway packaging,
- groceries, and
- janitorial, personal care, and cleaning products.

The different reusable packaging fleets used by stakeholders are made of various materials, including glass, metal, and plastic. The reusable packaging also replaces single-use packaging across material types.

The chart below presents estimates of the total numbers of containers avoided through reuse annually:

Figure 13: Total Numbers of Containers Avoided (Millions) Through Reuse Annually



The number of containers avoided was calculated by multiplying the container fleet sizes (provided by stakeholders or through other available sources) by refill rates obtained from stakeholders and industry sources.

10.3 Facility Types

Overall, 49 operators of reuse systems using the returnable packaging model were identified. By numbers of individual stakeholders, the most common provider of reusable packaging interviewed for this section were suppliers of milk in reusable glass bottles (24). However, reuse systems for takeaway coffee cups are the most widely available reusable packaging option going by number of outlets offering this packaging across the country, unfortunately we did not have enough data points to include in the overall assessment.

10.4 Regional Distribution


Milk is being sold in reusable bottles throughout the country. However, in the North Island we did not identify providers in Gisborne and Manawatu-Whanganui. In the South Island, Tasman and Marlborough did not have milk in reusable glass bottle providers, but these regions are services by a facility based in Nelson.

Takeaway packaging reuse systems, and in particular reusable coffee cup schemes, are mainly concentrated in Wellington (93), Auckland (53) and Otago (49). There are also a number of stakeholders who service events and venues nationwide, with one such stakeholder operating a central washing facility in Auckland for their reusable serveware.

There are currently three grocers in New Zealand who operate a returnable packaging model for the food products they retail. These grocers are all in the Upper North Island, in Auckland, Whangārei and Mangawhai.

We identified six stakeholders who operate reusable packaging systems for janitorial, cleaning, and personal care products. One of these stakeholders is a third-party washing facility in Auckland. The other stakeholders are all manufacturers of cleaning products and personal care products who sell their products in returnable bulk dispensers that are available in a variety of outlets nationwide.

Figure 14 Providers by Region of Reusable: (Left) Milk Bottles, (Middle) Takeaway Packaging, and (Right) Washing and Refill Stations (darker colours indicate increased numbers)




10.5 Waste Prevention and Circularity

New Zealanders use an estimated 2.3 billion single-use beverage containers a year, many of which are landfilled or enter the natural environment.³² Most operators of reusable schemes have not been in business long enough to establish accurate waste prevention data, except for two longer term operating providers. Conservative estimates are that the reusable glass bottle providers, with a combined fleet of 30.1 million bottles, prevent an estimated 100.5 million single-use containers from being manufactured, and then entering New Zealand's waste recovery system per year. Most of this prevention occurs in Auckland with 16.7 million, followed by Canterbury with 15.6 million items. It should be noted that 30 million of the 30.1 million total fleet is provided by a single operator ABC, who provide the 'swappa crate' beer bottles.

Similarly, six reusable cup schemes, with an estimated fleet size of 563,000 are expected to collectively prevent 4.7 million single-use cups from being manufactured, and then going on to enter New Zealand's waste streams.

³² <https://www.mfe.govt.nz/waste/container-return-scheme-option>

Figure 15 Estimated Single-Use Containers Prevented Annually by Reusable Glass Bottle Schemes (in millions)



10.6 Market Segments and Dynamics

The reusables sector in New Zealand is nascent and growing but is facing start-up hurdles. The main factors that affect the viability of the reusable packaging sector are dependent on the type of packaging, product, and the companies' maturity, and include:

- A dominance of smaller operators who currently lack economies of scale and the capital needed to finance the types of infrastructure and systems logistics that would enable the sector's growth
- A lack of third-party reusable packaging providers, which means that the majority of reusable packaging is currently operated by 'vertically integrated' businesses who run their packaging system alongside manufacturing their product, which increases costs and hinders scalability
- High upfront capital costs to establish a reusable packaging offering, alongside the difficulty of competing against the low cost and perceived convenience of single-use packaging
- A perceived lack of public, brand and government awareness and education around reuse

- A lack of regulation around “greenwashing”
- A lack of standardised containers, collection, washing and redistribution infrastructure that would reduce the overall cost to brands of using reusable packaging.

10.7 Key opportunities for infrastructural investment

For reusable systems to become competitive pricewise, economies of scale are required. However, this comes with high upfront capital investment that stakeholders are currently unable to address individually. Accordingly, stakeholders identified three key areas where infrastructural investment was most needed:

- Washing and sanitisation facilities (especially run by third-party operators).
- Digital and physical infrastructure to support reverse logistics and collection to achieve high recovery rates for reusable packaging.
- Supporting reusable packaging fleet development and more onshore manufacture of reusable products, including reusable glass bottles for beverages and opportunities to use agricultural by-products.

Stakeholders also noted current difficulties with accessing traditional funding and grants, which they perceived as hindering their ability to expand. They suggested ways in which existing funding opportunities, such as the Waste Minimisation Fund, could be updated to increase access for smaller operators.

10.8 Future Opportunities

Globally, reusable packaging is a growing area of interest, yet it remains a small percentage of the packaging market overall. In New Zealand, many operators are experiencing growth in demand, but many are not always able to address their growing pains in order to break even financially, maintain a long-term growth trajectory, and/or translate their own growth into a wider societal shift towards reusable packaging.

Stakeholders largely believed that reusable packaging has positive environmental credentials and aligned with the government’s circular economy aspirations, but that it requires support to break into the mainstream. In addition to direct investment in infrastructure noted above, other potential opportunities that could drive an increase in reusable packaging infrastructure included:

- Policy efforts to level the playing field between single-use and reuse, such as banning or taxing of single-use packaging, prohibiting greenwashing, incentives to reduce costs associated with reverse logistics, particularly transport, container return scheme and product stewardship.
- Greater coordination of the sector through incorporating reuse into the government-led waste strategy, and encouragement of a representative body of the reusable packaging sector.
- Prioritising activities higher in the waste hierarchy for both policy and funding decisions.

- Investing in public education about reuse, the circular economy, and the waste hierarchy.
- Leverage corporate drive for sustainability and behaviour change around reusables.

11.0 Tyres Material Stream Analysis

11.1 Description of Tyres Material Stream


In 2019, an estimated 81,000 tonnes of tyres reached end-of-life in New Zealand. Tyres come in various sizes depending on their activity source, such as small scooters, cars, vans, busses, trucks, motorcycles, farm equipment and heavy machinery.

11.2 Materials & Quantities

Tyres are a composite product made up of various materials, including synthetic rubber (27%), carbon black (28%), natural rubber (14%), steel (14%), and textiles and other fillers, accelerators and antiozonants (16%). The three key material types in tyres that are relevant for recycling are rubber, steel, and textiles. Tyres are re-processed by repurposing, retreading, or recycling tyre-derived medium (TDM) created by cutting or shredding tyres into smaller sizes or by turning the rubber to crumb. Tyres have a high caloric value and can therefore also be used as a fuel source referred to as tyre-derived fuel (TDF).

The chart below presents estimates of the total tonnes of tyres recovered and disposed annually:

Figure 16: Total Tonnes of Tyres Recovered and Disposed Annually



11.3 Facility Types


New Zealand has no onshore tyre manufacturing facilities. There are six facilities that manufacture products using tyres as inputs, including three tyre re-treading businesses. There are a further 19 operators who re-process tyres for various purposes (primarily shredding and some producing rubber crumb).

11.4 Regional Distribution

The facilities are distributed across most parts of the North Island (with the exception of Gisborne and Taranaki), but only Canterbury has facilities in the South Island. No regional data was available on the quantities of end-of-life tyres (ELTs) generated. For the purposes of this exercise regional quantities were assumed to be roughly proportional to household/population figures. These quantities are illustrated in Figure 17.

There was little industry data available on cross boundary movement of feedstock however it can be assumed that there will be movement from the points of generation to where re-processing facilities are located.

Figure 17: Quantities by Region (x1,000 tonnes)



11.5 Market Segments and Dynamics

There are currently a wide range of potential uses for the materials from ELTs including:

- Reusing tyres in their original state
- Re-treading tyres
- Civil engineering
- Use on farms
- Fabricated/cut products
- Ambient and cryogenic material recovery/size reduction

- Tyre derived medium (TDM) –essentially rubber crumb which can be used in applications such as:
 - artificial turf, rubber-modified asphalt, moulded rubber products for civil engineering, garden mulch, reinforcing rubber crumb for lawns, landfill engineering, roading applications, or equestrian arenas
 - an additive in a product, including back into the manufacture of tyres, industrial adhesives, moulded products like speed ramps, curb ramps, wheel chocks, mats, cable guards, signalling posts and accessories for equipping cycle tracks, artificial turf and sporting arenas, rubber modified asphalt
 - in a secondary process, particularly pyrolysis
 - in a destructive process, such as a source of fuel for the manufacture of cement, pulp and paper and tyres, or to generate power or operate industrial boils (when used in this way, the material is referred to as Tyre Derived Fuel (TDF)); for mining applications like stemming and blasting; or as a source of steel and carbon black (to replace anthracite) in industrial processes like foundries and steel works.
- Devulcanisation (for use back in tyres).

However, to date the markets for ELTs appear to have been driven primarily by attempts to try and seek beneficial end uses for tyres, rather than by a pull-through demand for the products from ELTs. While many of the applications noted above are in use in NZ, they tend to be niche applications, with insufficient demand to process the quantities of ELTs generated in NZ.

11.6 Recent Developments and Future Opportunities

The most significant facility for processing ELTs is Golden Bay Cement in Northland that is permitted to use ELTs as an alternative fuel to run their cement works. At the end of 2020 they commissioned new equipment (called HOTDISC) at their facility that removes the need for tyres to be reduced to a crumb before being used as fuel. The new facility will enable Golden Bay Cement to use up to 3.1 million shredded tyres per year, less than half of all ELTs. It is not clear at this point how much of this material will come from tyres going to disposal as opposed to replacing existing markets for recovered tyres or from stockpiled tyres.

Tyrewise, a report issued by a group of representatives from the tyre industry, highlights a number of gaps in the market, which we highlight here as these may be an appropriate avenue for infrastructure investment. Although not directly stated, our interpretation is that, in the event of mandatory product stewardship, the quantity of recovered tyres is likely to outstrip available re-processing capacity. Key gaps and opportunities noted include:

- A significant gap in processing capacity in the South Island.
- A significant gap in the value-add market.
- Minimal growth in facilities that would use ELT as a secondary raw material onshore to make new products. The Tyrewise report notes that the export

market for crumb was still strong until mid-2019. However, we note that the potential of COVID-related market disruptions may justify exploration of onshore uses for recycled crumb.

- Industry research and development projects to develop new applications for ELT derived products are generally funded privately and, given the need for more onshore capacity to manage the sheer quantity of ELTs in New Zealand, this could be an appropriate avenue for government investment.

A further infrastructure gap in New Zealand is the lack of tyre manufacturers, which impacts on waste minimisation outcomes. Tyrewise highlights the relevance of applying the waste hierarchy to managing ELT (from design through to disposal), and notes that “actions at a higher level of the waste hierarchy (e.g. import regulations around higher quality imports, promoting extended life span of tyres and retreading) can reduce the costs of actions at a lower level and the environmental impacts of activity at a higher level are generally less than those at a lower level.”

12.0 Material Recovery Facility Summary

12.1 Description of Material Stream

Material recovery facilities (MRFs) accept collected waste materials and sort the mixed stream to a point at which the material can be reprocessed; usually by recycling. This description can be applied to facilities that sort a range of materials, including kerbside recycling collections, textiles, and construction and demolition waste. In this section, a 'MRF' is defined as a facility that accepts only materials from kerbside recycling collections and similarly mixed materials from private collections from commercial and industrial customers.

The material from a MRF may be reprocessed within New Zealand or exported. The role of the MRF is to:

- remove gross contamination (items that should not have been in the collected material);
- remove cross-contamination (where one collected item contaminates another, such as glass fines contaminating paper);
- produce sorted material that fits the required maximum contamination levels;
- sort materials into different grades, such as certain types of plastic; and
- prepare material for shipping e.g. baling.

MRFs in New Zealand vary significantly with respect to how much material the facility can process and what inputs are accepted; from simple manual sort lines to fully automated facilities. There is also variation in how they are owned and operated, and who has ownership of the material at various stages. In those cases where the owner and the operator are separate entities, arrangements can vary for ownership of the materials, receipt of the income from material sales, and responsibility for disposal costs.

12.2 Materials & Quantities

The chart below presents estimates of the total tonnes of material processed by MRFs in NZ annually:

MRFs typically accept and sort the following materials types:


- Fibre
- Plastics
- Steel cans
- Aluminium cans
- Glass (fully comingled MRFs)

These materials may be sorted into a number of different grades depending on the MRF configuration and the markets for the materials. Typical grades include

- Plastics 1
- Plastics 2

- Plastics 5
- Mixed plastics (3 – 7)
- OCC (old corrugated cardboard)
- Mixed paper
- Clear (flint) glass
- Amber glass
- Green glass

Figure 18: Total Tonnes of Material Processed by Collection Type



Of the 336,000 tonnes of material estimated to be processed through MRFs annually approximately 266,000 tonnes is sent to markets in NZ or internationally. The lost proportion of around 21% represents the proportion that is removed as contamination, and any sorted material that for some reason is later landfilled rather than being recycled.

12.3 Facility Types

There are 20 MRFs of significant size in New Zealand³³ that accept mixed kerbside-collected material. These are operated by ten different organisations.

Of these 20 MRFs accepting over 1,000 tonnes of input materials per annum, there are four that accept material from fully comingled kerbside recycling collections:

- Visy in Auckland;
- EcoCentral in Christchurch;

³³ MRFs accepting over 1,000 tonnes of input material per annum. Other MRFs include Raglan and Wanaka.

- WMNZL in Timaru³⁴; and
- Southland DisAbility Enterprises in Southland.

Together these facilities process 49% of the tonnage of all domestic kerbside-collected recyclables.

A further fourteen MRFs process material from two-stream, glass-out collections. These are:

- SEL in Kopu, Fielding, Tasman, and Buller;
- WMNZL in Tauranga and Queenstown;
- Metallic Sweepings in Te Awamutu;
- Palmerston North City Council in Palmerston North;
- Earthcare in Masterton (also able to split bales and reprocess mixed plastic);
- OJI in Seaview (Hutt City) and Dunedin; and
- ESL in New Plymouth, Hamilton and Taupo.

In addition, there are two MRFs that process material from kerbside sort collections. Typically, kerbside sort systems separate glass and paper at kerbside and send the mixed plastic and metal containers over a sort line. These MRFs are:

- MetroWaste in Huntly; and
- Metallic Sweepings in Marlborough.

One MRF (SEL in Gray) is currently not in operation following a fire in late 2020.

The sort line removes the metal containers and usually the uncoloured PET and HDPE containers.

It is common for MRFs in New Zealand to report contamination rates of between 10 – 18%. The lower contamination levels will usually be from facilities that accept kerbside sorted material; and it is possible for these facilities to achieve below 10%. Facilities accepting material from two-stream, glass out collections will usually fall around 12 – 16%. Facilities accepting fully comingled material will usually be at the higher end of the range, depending on the level of investment in specialised sorting equipment.

Several MRFs have received investment during 2020 from the COVID-19 Response and Recovery Fund (CRRF). Generally, this investment is not expected to enable the facilities to accept a larger quantity of material; rather, the investment is intended to address issues of contamination in sorted material. For example, Visy received investment, in the order of \$16M, from the government's \$37M allocation of the \$124M COVID-19 CRRF. A particular focus for the investment will be improved fibre quality through the installation of improved and additional optical sorting for fibre. EcoCentral has also recently received government funding, with \$16.8 million in funding being provided for

³⁴ From 1 July 2021 Timaru's kerbside recycling collection will transition to a glass-out collection and a new sorting line is being constructed for this material, so this facility will then move to the second category

EcoCentral to upgrade the optical and mechanical sorting machines used at its Parkhouse Road MRF.

12.4 Market Segments and Dynamics

MRF provision in New Zealand is generally provisioned by the private sector, with the majority of facilities owned and operated by waste companies, and aligned with kerbside recycling collection contracts, this means that MRF provision has tended to evolve over time to meet/suit the requirements of the various contracts held by operators.

Notable exceptions to this are:

- Palmerston North City Council's MRF, that is council owned and operated;
- Visy's Auckland facility which was built under a BOOT contract;
- Queenstown's facility is owned by Council, and operated on their behalf by WMNZL; and
- Christchurch City Council own a majority shareholding in EcoCentral, which operates kerbside services and infrastructure on behalf of council.

There is a known issue with marketing sorted fibre material that has originated from fully comingled domestic kerbside recycling collections. This material is not accepted by any domestic re-processing facility and therefore is exported. Once again, while fibre that is known to have come from a fully comingled collection system is unlikely to receive lower prices in export markets, it is viewed as being lower quality and if supply of recovered fibre exceeds demand, it is the lowest quality material that will lose markets first³⁵.

This issue has partially been resolved by recent investment in the Visy and EcoCentral MRFs; and may be further addressed should changes be made to domestic kerbside recycling collections in Auckland and Christchurch (as is recommended in the kerbside standardisation study).

There are other MRFs that may benefit from investment, such as the Palmerston North City Council MRF and the Southland DisAbility Enterprises MRF in Invercargill. However, investment at these facilities is likely to be targeted at increasing the capture of target materials, reducing cross-contamination, and enabling a wider range of materials to be collected at kerbside.

Although EnviroNZ will be delivering the new council kerbside collection contracts for Tauranga City and Western Bay of Plenty District Councils from July 2021, the kerbside-collected recyclables will continue to be processed by WMNZL as a sub-contractor.

³⁵ The Eunomia & TRC (2021) *National Resource Recovery Project – Fibre Investigation and Response*. Report for Ministry for the Environment

13.0 Collection Services

13.1 Description of Collection Services

The study of collection services focused on domestic kerbside recycling, waste, food scraps and green waste collections, both private and council contracted, as well as commercial recycling collections.

Commercial waste collection service providers were excluded from this research, as these services are provided by numerous small and large organisations across the country, in many cases providing only a freighting service, from a business site to a disposal site.

13.2 Stakeholder interviews

Much of the information was gathered from phone interviews and through a spreadsheet completed by interviewees outlining services provided.

Additional information was gathered from websites, through interviews with council staff, and from council Waste Assessments.

In total, 38 organisations providing collection services were identified, 63% were contacted, and 47% were interviewed. One organisation declined to be interviewed. Most of the organisations that were not interviewed are smaller collection companies offering localised services.

13.3 Type of collections

Overall, 18 commercial recycling collectors were identified, 20 domestic recycling collectors, 26 domestic waste collectors, four domestic food scrap collectors and 11 domestic greenwaste collectors. Several organisations are counted in more than one of the above categories.

Cardboard collections are the most frequently offered commercial collection (14 organisations), followed by comingled recycling (11 organisations) and plastic wrap recycling (8 organisations).

13.4 Services by region

As might be expected, certain regions have more domestic collection contractors operating within their boundaries than others. For example, in Gisborne we only identified one domestic collection contractor, while Waikato and Wellington each have eight domestic waste collection contractors with four domestic recycling contractors in Auckland and six in Waikato. Canterbury also has six domestic recycling collection contractors offering their services across the region and five domestic waste collection contractors.

There are more commercial recycling services available in Auckland, Waikato, Canterbury, and Otago than in other regions. Very few commercial recycling services were identified in the upper South Island or West Coast region.

13.5 Domestic collections

The following table provides a summary of the service providers collecting domestic kerbside recycling and waste in each district and city. This information is subject to regular change.

In the column headed 'Recycling collection system' information has also been provided as to the type of glass collection provided (comingled or separate) and the grades of plastic accepted for recycling. Almost all recycling collections also accept fibre (paper and cardboard), and aluminium and steel cans.

Table 11.1: Domestic kerbside collections by local authority

Local authority	Recycling collection contractors	Council or private	Recycling collection system	Council waste collection contractors	Council waste collection system
Ashburton	EnviroWaste	Council	Wheelie bin and glass in crate Plastic 1, 2, 5	EnviroWaste	Wheelie bin
Auckland	EnviroWaste, JJ Richards, Smart Environmental, AIMS (inner city), Envirokiwi (and Aotea Contractors) on Great Barrier Island	Council	Wheelie bin Glass comingled Plastic 1-7	Green Gorilla, Waste Management, Northern Environmental (joint venture between Smart Environmental & Northland Waste), AIMS (inner city), Envirokiwi (and Aotea Contractors) on Great Barrier Island	Wheelie bin
Buller	Smart Environmental	Council	Wheelie bin and glass in crate Plastic 1-7	Smart Environmental	Bags
Carterton	EarthCare	Council	Wheelie bin and glass in crate Plastic 1, 2, 5	EarthCare	Bags
Central Hawke's Bay	Smart Environmental	Council	Crate(s) Plastic 1-7	Smart Environmental	Bags
Central Otago	All Waste	Council	Two wheelie bins, one for glass Plastic 1, 2, 5	All Waste	Wheelie bin
Chatham Islands	No collection services			No collection services	

Local authority	Recycling collection contractors	Council or private	Recycling collection system	Council waste collection contractors	Council waste collection system
Christchurch	Waste Management	Council	Wheelie bin Glass comingled Plastic 1, 2, 5	Waste Management	Wheelie bin
Clutha	WasteCo	Council	Wheelie bin No glass Plastic 1, 2, 5	WasteCo	Wheelie bin
Dunedin	EnviroWaste	Council	Wheelie bin and glass in crate Plastic 1, 2, 5	EnviroWaste	Bags
Far North	Northland Waste Waste Management	Private	Crate(s), Bags & crate Plastic 1, 2		
Gisborne	Waste Management	Council	Crate Plastic 1, 2, 5	Waste Management	Bags
Gore	Bond Contracts	Council	Wheelie bin for glass only	Bond Contracts	Wheelie bin
Grey	Smart Environmental	Council	Wheelie bin Glass comingled Plastic 1-7	Smart Environmental	Wheelie bin
Hamilton	EnviroWaste	Council	Wheelie bin and glass in crate Plastic 1-7	EnviroWaste	Wheelie bin
Hastings	Smart Environmental	Council	Crate(s) Plastic 1, 2, 5	JJ's Waste & Recycling	Wheelie bin
Hauraki	Smart Environmental	Council	Wheelie bin and glass in crate Plastic 1, 2	Smart Environmental	Bags
Horowhenua	Northland Waste	Council	Wheelie bin and glass in crate Plastic 1, 2, 5	Northland Waste	Bags
Hurunui	Waste Control NZ	Council	Bags No glass Plastic 1, 2, 5	Waste Control NZ	Bags
Hutt City	Waste Management	Council	Crate(s) Plastic 1, 2	Waste Management	Bags
Invercargill	Bond Contracts	Council	Wheelie bin Glass comingled Plastic 1-7	Bond Contracts	120-litre wheelie bin

Local authority	Recycling collection contractors	Council or private	Recycling collection system	Council waste collection contractors	Council waste collection system
Kaikōura	Innovative Waste Kaikoura	Private	Crate(s) Plastic 1, 2, 5	No council services	
Kaipara	Kaipara Refuse	Private	Bags Glass comingled Plastic 1, 2	No council services	
Kāpiti Coast	Northland Waste Waste Management Lucy's Bins EnviroWaste	Private	Wheelie bin and glass in crate, Crate (s) Plastic 1, 2, 5	No council services	
Kawerau	Waste Management	Council	Crate (s) Plastic 1, 2		Wheelie bin
Mackenzie	EnviroWaste	Council	Wheelie bin and glass in crate Plastic 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7	EnviroWaste	Wheelie bin
Manawatu	Smart Environmental	Council	Wheelie bin and glass in crate Plastic 1-7	Smart Environmental	Bags
Marlborough	Metallic Sweepings Waste Management	Council, Private	Crate(s), Plastic 1-7 Wheelie bin Plastic 1, 2	Metallic Sweepings	Bags
Masterton	EarthCare	Council	Wheelie bin and glass in crate Plastic 1, 2, 5	EarthCare	Bags
Matamata-Piako	Smart Environmental	Council	Wheelie bin and glass in crate Plastic 1, 2	Smart Environmental	Bags
Napier	Smart Environmental	Council	Crate(s), glass separate Plastic 1, 2, 5	Waste Management	120-litre wheelie bin
Nelson	Waste Management, Betta Bins	Private	Wheelie bin, glass in crate Plastic 1, 2	No council service	
New Plymouth	EnviroWaste	Council	Wheelie bin and glass in	EnviroWaste	Wheelie bin

Local authority	Recycling collection contractors	Council or private	Recycling collection system	Council waste collection contractors	Council waste collection system
			crate Plastic 1, 2, 5		
Ōpōtiki	Handee Can Services	Council	Crate (s) Plastic 1-7	Handee Can Services	Bag
Ōtorohanga	EnviroWaste	Council	Crate (s) Plastic 1, 2	EnviroWaste	Bag
Palmerston North	Waste Management	Council	Wheelie bin and glass in crate Plastic 1-7	City Enterprises (owned by PCC)	
Porirua	Waste Management	Council	Two wheelie bins, one for glass Plastic 1, 2	Waste Management & Civic Contractors	
Queenstown Lake	Waste Management All Waste	Private	Two wheelie bins, one for glass Wheelie bin comingled glass Plastic 1, 2, 5	Waste Management	120-litre wheelie bin
Rangitīkei	No collection services				
Rotorua Lakes	Smart Environmental	Council	Wheelie bin and glass in crate Plastic 1-7	Smart Environmental	Wheelie bin or bags in specific areas
Ruapehu	EnviroWaste	Council	Crate(s) Plastic 1, 2	EnviroWaste	Bags
Selwyn	Waste Management	Council	Wheelie bin Glass comingled Plastic 1, 2, 5	Waste Management	Wheelie bin
South Taranaki	EnviroWaste	Council	Wheelie bin and glass in crate Plastic 1, 2, 5	EnviroWaste	Wheelie bin
South Waikato	EnviroWaste	Council	Wheelie bin and glass in crate Plastic 1, 2, 5	EnviroWaste	Wheelie bin
South Wairarapa	EarthCare	Council	Wheelie bin and glass in crate Plastic 1, 2, 5	EarthCare	Bags

Local authority	Recycling collection contractors	Council or private	Recycling collection system	Council waste collection contractors	Council waste collection system
Southland	Bond Contracts	Council	Wheelie bin Glass comingled Plastic 1-7	Bond Contracts	240-litre wheelie bin
Stratford	EnviroWaste	Council	Wheelie bin and glass in crate Plastic 1, 2, 5	EnviroWaste	Wheelie bin
Tararua	Smart Environmental	Council	Any container No glass Plastic 1, 2, 3, 5	No council service	
Tasman	Smart Environmental Various	Council Private	Wheelie bin and glass in crate Plastic 1, 2, 5 Wheelie bin Plastic 1, 2	Smart Environmental	Bags
Taupō	EnviroWaste	Council	Crate (s) Plastic 1, 2, 5	EnviroWaste	Bags
Tauranga	EnviroWaste	Council	Crate for glass Wheelie bin Plastic 1, 2	EnviroWaste	Wheelie bin
Thames- Coromandel	Smart Environmental	Council	Wheelie and glass in crate Plastic 1, 2	Smart Environmental	Bags
Timaru	Waste Management	Council	Wheelie bin Glass comingled Plastic 1, 2, 5	Waste Management	Wheelie bin
Upper Hutt	Northland Waste, Waste Management	Private	Wheelie bin and glass in crate Plastic 1, 2, 5	Waste Management	Bags
Waikato	Metro Waste Xtreme Zero Waste Smart Environmental	Council	Crate(s) Plastic 1, 2, 5 Crate(s) Plastic 1-7 Crate(s) Plastic 1, 2, 5	Smart Environmental, Metro Waste, Xtreme Zero Waste	Wheelie bin or bags
Waimakariri	Waste Management	Council	Wheelie bin Glass comingled Plastic 1, 2, 5	Waste Management	Wheelie bin or bags

Local authority	Recycling collection contractors	Council or private	Recycling collection system	Council waste collection contractors	Council waste collection system
Waimate	EnviroWaste	Council	Wheelie bin and glass in crate Plastic 1, 2, 5	EnviroWaste	80-litre wheelie bin
Waipa	Metallic Sweepings	Council	Two wheelie bins, one for glass Plastic 1, 2	No council service	Wheelie bins
Wairoa	Smart Environmental	Council	Crate(s) Plastic 1, 2, 5	Smart Environmental	Bags
Waitaki	WasteCo	Private	Wheelie bin Glass comingled Plastic 1, 2, 5	No council service	
Waitomo	EnviroWaste	Council	Crate (s) Plastic 1, 2	EnviroWaste	Bags
Wellington City	EnviroWaste	Council	Bags / crates / wheelie bins Plastic 1, 2, 5	EnviroWaste	Bags
Western Bay of Plenty	EnviroWaste	Private	Wheelie bin and glass in crate Plastic 1, 2	EnviroWaste	Wheelie bin
Westland	EnviroWaste	Council	Wheelie bin No glass Plastic 1, 2, 5	EnviroWaste	Wheelie bin
Whakatāne	Waste Management	Council	Wheelie bin and glass in crate Plastic 1, 2	Waste Management	Wheelie bin
Whanganui	Waste Management	Private	Wheelie bin Glass comingled Plastic 1-7	No council service	
Whangarei	Northland Waste	Council	Crate(s) Plastic 1, 2	Northland Waste	Bags

Twenty recycling collection contractors were identified during this research, with some of the smaller contractors providing recycling collections in only one or two localised areas, and other contractors operating across the country.

Domestic recycling collections vary from wheelie bin collections, collecting all materials combined, to wheelie bins and a separate glass crate or wheelie bin, to crates only. The types of plastics collected also vary from area to area, with some areas accepting plastic

grades 1 and 2 only, or 1, 2 and 5, and others accepting all plastic grades 1 to 7. One council collection accepts all plastics except for plastic 6.

In 2020, WasteMINZ published a report for the Ministry for the Environment, entitled *Recommendations for standardisation of kerbside collections in Aotearoa*. In this report it was recommended that the materials collected in kerbside recycling be standardised across the country and include plastic 1, 2, 5, aluminium and steel cans, glass bottles and jars, and fibre (paper and cardboard). It was also recommended that glass be collected separately to other materials. Of the 67 local authorities included in Table 11.1, 43% collect (only) plastics 1, 2, 5, and 75% collect glass either in crates or in a separate wheelie bin. A further 7% do not collect glass.

Domestic waste collections are generally undertaken using wheelie bins (80-, 120-, 140- or 240-litre) or refuse bags. Many councils provide their residents with a regular council waste collection provided by a contractor. In most areas there are also private collection contractors competing for market share with the council collection. Some councils choose to leave waste collections to the private market. A total of 25 domestic waste collection companies were identified (plus two council organisations - AIMS (in Auckland) and City Enterprises (in Palmerston North)).

Domestic food scrap collections are available in a small, but growing, number of areas around New Zealand. Some of these collections are food scraps only, while others accept food scraps and garden waste combined (FOGO – Food Organics and Garden organics). Other councils are planning food scrap collections (Auckland) or trialling food scrap collections (Wellington City Council).

Greenwaste (only) collections are provided across much of the country but are generally offered as a private service that householders can subscribe to, with the exception of a handful of councils such as Whakatane and South Taranaki that provide green waste collection services (excluding food scraps).

13.5.1 Planned Capacity

The most common comment from organisations providing collection services was that they were delaying investment in infrastructure due to current uncertainties in the marketplace, mostly with regards to funding. The uncertainty included possible government funding for infrastructure, funding of competition through the Waste Minimisation Fund (WMF), and the potential impacts of container return schemes (CRS) on markets.

Certainty around standardisation of domestic collection services was also being awaited.

13.6 Discussion and analysis

Concern over future government investment was expressed by several businesses operating collection services, as well as a general uncertainty over the government's future direction and priorities.

Generally, the larger commercial operators expressed confidence in the market providing the necessary infrastructure and services and expressed concern over intervention in a commercial marketplace.

Community led resource recovery enterprises (members of the Zero Waste Network and other community enterprises) expressed a desire for the government to support more community level education and community services that promote waste reduction, reuse and repair. They implied that local government still relates to waste as an engineering issue, when it is actually part of a larger behaviour change and consumer education issue.

A range of policy responses were recommended by service providers. A desire to see government ban certain packaging materials or at least provide disincentives to their use was mentioned by a majority of interviewees.

Other key recommendations from stakeholders included a need for the government to take bolder action around waste minimisation and urging the government to take stronger leadership to reduce carbon emissions from waste.

A commercial operator mentioned the national shortage of collection drivers as a significant issue and the ageing population of current drivers as a key future risk.

13.7 Future Opportunities

It is expected that future services will adapt to meet business needs, markets for materials, and the direction set by local and central government.

Future drivers for domestic waste and recycling collections are likely to revolve around some standardisation of kerbside collections, and the adoption of these standards by local authorities. The outcomes of current health and safety research into collection methodologies is also likely to influence future collection services.

The implementation of a CRS will likely affect kerbside recycling collections, with certain materials currently collected being diverted to the CRS. This could result in changes to the materials collected, the frequency of collection services, and the financial viability of collection services.

Commercial collections are more likely to be influenced by the availability of markets for materials and the willingness of businesses to meet the costs of recycling.

Product stewardship programmes may increase the provision of commercial collection services for certain materials.

14.0 Transfer Stations and Resource Recovery Facilities

14.1 Description of Facilities

The terminology used to describe waste and recycling facilities in New Zealand is varied and non-standardised. Services provided at Refuse Transfer Stations, Resource Recovery Centres, Community Recycling Centres vary from site to site, and the names are often used interchangeably. Within this report all of these facilities are being referred to as 'transfer stations and resource recovery facilities'.

The term 'community led resource recovery enterprise' is used in this section to refer to members of the Zero Waste Network and other community enterprises operating facilities. Generally, facility operators are either community-led resource recovery enterprise or profit driven commercial enterprises.

14.2 Stakeholder Mapping

A total of 31 facility operators were identified as part of this research and 81% of these operators were interviewed.


Altogether, 277 separate facilities were identified across the country. Waikato region has the most facilities (42), followed by Canterbury region (40), and Northland region (36).

The types of services provided in each facility varies. Some sites are set up specifically to accept recyclable materials only, or waste only, while other sites provide a range of services. Separated greenwaste is accepted at 70% of sites and scrap metal at 66% of sites.

A further 57% of sites accept tyres and 44% accept e-waste.

Fourteen per cent of sites include a reuse shop.

Map 1: Number of facilities per region



Of the 277 facilities identified, 83% accept waste, 91% accept some recyclable materials, and 70% accept greenwaste. Scrap metal is accepted by a further 66% and tyres by 57%. Fourteen per cent of facilities have a reuse shop.

14.2.1 Planned Capacity

Many of the interviewed operators stated a desire to expand resource recovery opportunities at their sites. One operator discussed increasing capacity to compost, and to recover C&D waste and wood waste. Another spoke of creating 'integrated community facilities' to enable additional upcycling of waste materials.

Auckland Council is planning a further nine Community Recycling Centres across the region to create new jobs and move the region towards a circular economy.

Several of the community led resource recovery enterprises have plans to accept a wider range of materials, including organics, timber, C&D waste materials etc.

Most operators mentioned their desire to be involved in future CRS and product stewardship schemes.

14.3 Barriers

A range of barriers were outlined by operators. These included:

- the economics of long-distance haulage and low commodity prices (and in some instances needing to pay for commodities to be recycled (e.g. fibre))
- a lack of scale in smaller communities, and a lack of regional consolidation facilities
- difficulty in obtaining suitable land and resource consents for sites
- sites being too small to offer additional services, and a lack of covered areas on existing sites
- a lack of incentives for local authorities to invest in facilities
- tension between ongoing economic growth and waste reduction
- lack of funding for ongoing behaviour change and a tendency for local authorities to view waste as an engineering issue rather than a behaviour change issue
- need for more R&D and innovation
- need for government leadership including a ban on non-recyclable packaging, national standardisation, waste minimisation targets, and prioritising specific products to be targeted
- lack of revenue in resource recovery.

14.4 Discussion and Analysis

The majority (84%) of transfer station and resource recovery facilities are owned by local authorities and their operations are contracted out to private businesses or community enterprises. However, there appears to be a move by private waste operators towards operating more private facilities.

It became apparent during the interviews that the role of the traditional transfer station is changing, with larger waste companies investing in reuse shops and more recycling services.

Community led resource recovery enterprises generally voiced a desire to see more support to drill further down into waste minimisation and behaviour change. They also warned against infrastructure that locks you into a certain way of doing things, when what is needed is a move to a new circular economy model, with funding for behaviour change and community engagement alongside infrastructure.

They suggested that using social procurement as a tool provides the ability to generate multiple benefits from the same spend - including regional development, Covid recovery, and jobs in local economies and for marginalised people.

A private operator commented on the difficulty of establishing regional facilities and making them commercially viable as there is often not the scale of material needed.

Another operator suggested that they would like to see a subsidy for the transport of materials to end markets, paid to the buyer rather than the vendor.

14.5 Future opportunities

It appears that owners and/or operators of transfer stations and resource recovery facilities are poised to adapt to the changes they see coming in the industry but are awaiting certainty as to the details of those changes. Many organisations spoke about increasing opportunities within their facilities for resource recovery, and several showed a willingness to invest in infrastructure to do so.

Auckland Council, Para Kore, and the Zero Waste Network are advocating for more community led resource recovery enterprises to ensure true waste reduction, rather than more waste management.

The introduction of product stewardship schemes and of a CRS have the potential to impact on the services offered by transfer stations and resource recovery facilities, and the extent of these impacts are greatly dependent on the design of these new schemes.

Increases to the waste levy are also likely to ensure that more resource recovery can be undertaken at many sites. In particular, several operators mentioned their desire to divert more C&D waste once the waste levy is increased.

15.0 Class 1 Landfill Analysis

15.1 Definition of 'Class 1 Landfill'

The Waste Minimisation Act 2008 (WMA) definition of a 'disposal facility' aligns closely with the WasteMINZ *Technical Guidelines for the Disposal to Land of Residual Waste and Other Material* definition for 'Class 1 landfill'. The *Guidelines* define a 'Class 1 landfill as 'any site that accepts municipal solid waste'.

Section 6 of the WMA imposes a levy on waste disposed of at a 'disposal facility'. The accompanying regulations require operators of disposal facilities to provide a monthly return of the tonnages of waste entering the facility. Only those facilities that provide a monthly levy return, which represent a very high proportion of disposed tonnages, have been included in the analysis in this section.

15.2 Class 1 landfills - By Ownership

The New Zealand solid waste disposal market is gradually transitioning from local government to private enterprise dominance. Through most of the twentieth century, local government owned all waste infrastructure, such as landfills and transfer stations, and provided rates-funded kerbside rubbish collection services to residential properties.

Local government responsibilities for waste management originated with the Health Act 1956, which *obliged* councils to provide sanitary works for the collection and disposal of waste for the purpose of public health protection. Many of these services were contracted out to private enterprise, but local authorities maintained ownership of the assets.

During this period, solid waste was disposed of at a large number of small, council-owned landfills, which were poorly engineered by modern standards. A 1987 Department of Health survey identified 462 landfills, while MfE's 1995 *National Landfill Census* identified 327 landfills.³⁶

The moves towards private ownership began in Auckland, with the opening in 1993 of Redvale Landfill, by Waste Management NZ Ltd (WMNZL), and the sale by local government-controlled Infrastructure Auckland of its share in the other major landfills in the region.

The Resource Management Act 1992 (RMA) also had a significant impact on the expansion of the private waste disposal market. Tighter environmental regulations under the RMA resulted, over a period of a decade, in many of the smaller council-

³⁶ Ministry for the Environment (MfE), *1997 National Waste Data Report*. Ministry for the Environment, Wellington

owned landfills throughout the country closing and being replaced by regional landfills, which are largely privately owned and require significant capital investment to establish.

The tonnages from the 36 Class 1 landfills submitting monthly levy returns in 2018 are analysed in terms of ownership in Table 7.

Table 7: Analysis by Ownership - Class 1 landfills - 2018

Ownership of Class 1 landfills	# of Class 1 landfills	% of Class 1 landfills	Tonnes/annum	% of tonnes/annum
Private	6	17%	2,238,201	60%
Private/public	3	8%	627,501	17%
Public	27	75%	839,126	23%
TOTAL	36	100%	3,704,828	100%

Nearly three-quarters (75%) of Class 1 landfills were in public ownership in 2018. These landfills accepted 23% of all waste to landfill, by weight, in that year. The six Class 1 landfills that are completely privately owned (17% of landfills) received 60% of all waste to landfill.

15.3 Class 1 landfills - By Tonnage Bands

The 36 Class 1 landfills that submitted monthly levy returns in 2018 are analysed in terms of tonnage bands in Table 8.

Table 8: Analysis by Tonnage Bands - Class 1 landfills - 2018


Online Waste Levy System Tonnage 2018	# of Class 1 landfills	% of Class 1 landfills	Tonnes/annum	% of tonnes/annum
< 5,000 tonnes/annum	9	25%	15,056	0.4%
5 - 40,000 tonnes/annum	10	28%	163,651	4%
40 - 90,000 tonnes/annum	8	22%	545,115	15%
> 90,000 tonnes/annum	9	25%	2,981,006	80%
TOTAL	36	100%	3,704,828	100%

Approximately 20%, by weight, of all waste in 2018 was disposed of at the 75% of Class 1 landfills that are in the lowest three of the four tonnage bands. Over 80% of all waste was disposed of at the 25% of Class 1 landfills that accept over 90,000 tonnes of waste per annum. Subsequent to the closure of five Class 1 landfills between 2018 and 2020, the percentage of waste disposed of at Class 1 landfills that accept over 90,000 tonnes of waste per annum would have risen to 83% by 2020, based on 2018 OWLS tonnages.

15.4 Waste to Class 1 Landfills - Tonnage by Region

The 2018 tonnage of waste disposed of to Class 1 landfills in each region is illustrated in Figure 19. The tonnages do not represent the quantity of waste generated in each region, but, rather, the quantity of waste disposed of in each region. Class 1 landfills in Waikato region, for example, receive significant quantities of waste from Auckland and Bay of Plenty regions. There are no Class 1 landfills in three regions - Taranaki, Bay of Plenty, and Tasman.

Figure 19: Quantities Landfilled Within Each Region -2018 (x 1,000 tonnes)



15.5 Economic Drivers for Waste Flows to Class 1 Landfills

15.5.1 Ownership and/or Control of Assets

In general terms, for any waste operator the most financially beneficial waste flows are likely to be those in which the operator owns or controls all stages of the waste disposal

process, from collection from the waste generator, through amalgamation at a transfer station, to disposal at a landfill. This type of vertical integration results in multiple opportunities to derive profit from the waste flow and the ability to compete more aggressively with other companies. The New Zealand waste market is dominated by two companies, Waste Management NZ Ltd and EnviroWaste Services Ltd, with nationwide vertically integrated operations.

15.5.2 Operational Cost of Disposal

Although Class 1 landfills have a nominal disposal charge, this 'gate charge' is not fixed for every customer. In situations where there is a competitive market for landfill disposal, the landfill operator will offer large customers lower prices than they would to a smaller customer to gain their business. Amongst other considerations, the operator may also charge lower gate charges to customers with high transport costs (i.e. longer distances to travel) than customers with lower transport costs.

The price per tonne that a Class 1 landfill operator is able to offer a potential customer is related to the operational cost of disposing of waste at the facility. Based on publicly-available data on six landfills, operational costs range from \$42 per tonne at Omarunui in Hawke's Bay to \$125 per tonne at York Valley Landfill.

15.5.3 Transport Costs

As a majority of waste disposed of at Class 1 landfills is aggregated and transported to the landfill for the disposal, the cost of transport can be a significant component of the total cost of disposal. Based on information from confidential commercial sources, the cost of a 'tonne/km' for transporting waste is generally in the range of \$0.30-\$0.60 for 20-tonne aggregated loads. At \$0.40 per tonne/km, the cost to transport a single 20-tonne load 100 km would be \$800, or \$40 per tonne.

15.5.4 Emissions Trading Scheme and Waste Levy Expenses

The Climate Change Response Act 2002 requires emitters of greenhouse gases, which includes operators of Class 1 landfills, to surrender one emissions unit for each tonne of emissions from listed activities. With the cost of emissions units currently over \$30, the costs imposed upon Class 1 landfill operators with no gas capture by the Emissions Trading Scheme are already substantial, relative to disposal costs, and likely to increase further over time. However, landfills are able to reduce their liabilities by capturing and destroying the methane that is emitted. Under current regulations up to 90% methane capture is allowed to be claimed and high rates of capture are claimed by several of the large modern landfills, which substantially reduces their liabilities from the ETS.

Currently set at \$10/tonne, the current government plans to increase the waste levy to \$60/tonne by 2024 and expand it to other classes of landfills (to \$30 for Class 2 landfills and \$10 for Class 3-4 landfills).

15.6 Market Dynamics

Over the last 30 years, ownership and control of Class 1 landfills has changed from complete control by local government to a dominance by private enterprise. This rapid shift is no longer occurring and the current balance of public/private ownership is likely to be relatively stable in the medium-term.

The rate at which small facilities that no longer meet environmental requirements are closing has slowed, and the remaining facilities in this category represent a very small proportion of all landfilled waste. However, increased costs imposed by the ETS, relative to large landfills, is a concern for some smaller landfills and may make them uneconomic in the medium- to long-term.

Most medium to large council-owned landfills have resource consents that will allow the facilities to remain operative for 15 to 20 years. The only major council-owned landfill that is likely to close in the near-term is Green Island Landfill in Dunedin. Planning for its replacement is well-advanced.

The three landfills that are owned by public/private partnerships received 17% of all waste to Class 1 landfills in 2018. All three landfills are consented for the next 15-20 years and are likely to continue operations for that period.

As of 2020, there are five Class 1 landfills in private ownership, one fewer than in 2018. These five facilities receive over 60% of all levied waste. The only significant change in the near-term will be the closure of Redvale Landfill, north of Auckland, after 30 years of operation. Redvale Landfill is likely to be replaced by another facility further north. The other four privately owned facilities are expected to continue operating for several decades.

The most dynamic environment for waste flows in the near to medium-term is likely to be in the upper North Island. The three large privately owned facilities in the region receive 55% of all levied waste.

The ongoing competition between Redvale Landfill (and its successor) and Hampton Downs Landfill for Auckland region waste flows is likely to continue. Although both facilities are owned by vertically integrated waste companies with their own network of transfer stations, they compete for disposal contracts from large waste generators.

There is similar competition between Hampton Downs Landfill and Tirohia Landfill, which are only 70 km apart in Waikato region. These facilities compete for both council and private waste flows.

Waste flows in the South Island are less dynamic than in the North Island. The only significant competition for waste flows is between privately owned AB Lime Landfill and the council-owned facilities in south Canterbury and Otago.

16.0 Energy Recovery

The potential for recovering energy from waste materials is a theme that cuts across a number of material types, in particular organics, plastics, fibre, tyres, and construction and demolition wood waste.

This section provides a brief overview of the potential for energy recovery from waste materials in New Zealand. This is an area of cross-over with the energy sector and, overall, the future potential of this sector has been well covered by interests in the energy sector.³⁷

Energy recovery activity is presented in this section in terms of the fuel type.

- Biogas
- Liquid fuels
- Solid fuels
- Energy from residual waste

The following potential quantities of waste materials that could be used for energy generation have been identified:

Table 9: Biofuel Energy Potential from Waste

	Tonnes	Petajoules (PJ) energy potential*
Wood waste to landfill	267,000	1.88
Orchards	46,398	0.39
Crop residues	121,995	1.04
Municipal biosolids (dry weight)	82,000	1.08
Manures (dry weight)	4,075,000	1.66
Industrial effluents		1.23
MSW	235,000	1.64

³⁷ It is worth noting that recovery of energy from waste materials is a relatively small subset of the bioenergy sector. Moves towards increased use of biofuels for energy generation may result in new facilities and economies of scale that in turn lead to opportunities for recovery of energy from waste materials where these are not necessarily viable in their own right.

Forestry residues	1,240,000	10.55
Tallow	178,000	5.16
TOTAL	6,245,393	24.63
* estimated from available data		

Data compiled from: Scion (2018) The New Zealand Biofuels Roadmap Summary Report, Scion (2007) Bioenergy Options for New Zealand, and MBIE (2019) ENERGY IN NEW ZEALAND. Comprehensive information on and analysis of New Zealand’s energy supply, demand and prices

As can be seen from the above table, forest harvest residues are the largest potential source of waste materials identified. This is not material that currently goes to landfill. Similarly, tallow is also currently going to other high value uses (e.g. cooking fats), and Scion (2018) notes it would therefore likely be too expensive to play a large role in future biofuel production. Forest residues are seen as the most promising source material for current and future biofuel production. Scion (2018) estimates these could provide up to 4.5% of the equivalent 2015 liquid fuel demand for NZ.

While quantities of other organic wastes are small in energy production terms they may have increased viability in the future due to new drivers such as the avoiding the waste levy and NZETS, reducing the use of fossil fuels and associated greenhouse gases and

16.1 Biogas

Biogas is essentially methane generated from the decomposition of organic materials and captured for the production of energy. The gas can be used to generate heat and/or electricity or can be cleaned up and used as a vehicle fuel. The most common of these facilities are associated with wastewater treatment plants (13) and landfill gas capture (14). Excluding these and pilot plants there are only 6 operational anaerobic digestion facilities in New Zealand we were able to identify.

The most significant development in the biogas space is the planned EcoGas facility which is due to become operational from early 2022. The plant will have a capacity of 75,000 tonnes per annum. It will take kerbside food waste from Auckland, commercial food waste, and food processing wastes.

The Bioenergy Association suggests there is significant potential for growth in the production of biogas a year from residual organic wastes from food processing, waste water treatment facilities and dairy effluent if supplemented with other organic material.³⁸ There is also likely potential for increased capture of biogas from waste water treatment plants from the 309 plants that do not have anaerobic digesters but could be

³⁸ <https://www.biogas.org.nz/resource/is47-role-of-biogas-in-transition-to-low-carbon-economy>

converted.³⁹ The dairy sector could also produce biogas from anaerobic treatment of milking shed effluent but is currently constrained by lack of economies of scale and the alternative of direct dispersal onto pasture.

16.2 Liquid Biofuels

Liquid biofuels are substitutes for liquid fossil fuels and include biodiesel, bioethanol, and bio-oils. Liquid biofuel use makes up less than 0.1% of total liquid fuel sales in New Zealand.

Z Energy built a plant that is able to produce 20 million litres a year of biodiesel from tallow. However recent increases in the price of tallow has reportedly rendered the plant uneconomic. The tallow is now being exported for biofuel production in the USA.⁴⁰

A number of New Zealand companies are or have been exploring the potential to produce biofuels.⁴¹ However there are currently limitations around the quantity of feedstocks which, without expansion, would limit the role they are likely to play. Any such expansion would come primarily from energy crops rather than residual or waste material.

Biocrude can be produced from any organic waste. An interim is to use residual plastic waste to produce a crude oil- then as the use of biomass becomes economic the feedstock can transition from plastic to biomass using the same facilities.

16.3 Wood Waste and Solid Fuels

Wood biomass, primarily from forestry slash and, to a lesser extent, sawmill by-products is the most commonly used biofuel in NZ. The most recent available data suggests that in NZ biomass provides 51.3 Petajoules of energy annually (Approximately 14,250 gigawatts)⁴² with residential uses adding a further 7.53PJ.⁴³ Woody biomass from residuals from the wood processing industry makes the largest contribution to bioenergy currently used in New Zealand. There is around 22.3 PJ per annum from solid wood fuels and a further 12.6 PJ from Black liquor at the two kraft pulp mills in the Central north Island. There is a further resource of in-forest post-harvest residues of 21 to 27PJ that

³⁹ <https://www.waternz.org.nz/WWTPInventory>

⁴⁰ <https://www.stuff.co.nz/environment/climate-news/300010423/z-energy-puts-biofuel-plant-to-sleep-asks-for-govt-money>

⁴¹ Scion (2018) New Zealand Biofuels Roadmap Summary Report

⁴² For context, NZ's total energy supply is approximately 591 Petajoules annually, and so biomass represents in the order of 8.5% of total energy supply. <http://www.mbie.govt.nz/building-and-energy/energy-and-natural-resources/energy-statistics-and-modelling/energy-publications-and-technical-papers/energy-in-new-zealand/>

⁴³ Source: <https://tools.eeca.govt.nz/energy-end-use-database/> 2019 data

currently is largely untapped. The use of these in-forest residues may accelerate in the near futures due the Governments focus on eliminating coal from process heat.

Industry sources suggest that NZ is still at bottom end of realising its future potential in terms of biomass. There is room for more use of wood residues from wood processing with current use within the wood processing being around 65 to 70% of the residuals produced. The use of in-forest residues is probably less than 5% of the potential. Future projects in the pipeline (such as dairy factory conversions) could take this as high as 50% to 60%.

Announcement by Government in 2021 to phase out use of fossil fuels for process heat by 2037, and to transition all government owned heating facilities to using low emission fuels (biomass or electricity) by 2030 have provided a strong incentive for investment in biomass fuelled plant.

The 'Wood Energy Industrial Symbiosis' project⁴⁴ undertaken by Scion identifies Wood processing clusters in regions with significant forestry resources co-located with other industries can make the best use of wood and energy supply and demand. The regions with the greatest potential include Gisborne, Hawkes Bay, Southland and South Otago, and Northland.

The Bioenergy Association, which promotes bioenergy uptake, notes that the use of some waste materials as feedstocks is restricted by regional air plan rules. In their view a more consistent national approach that takes better account of technical capabilities of individual boilers and focuses on outputs rather than inputs could result in greater utilisation of waste timbers.

16.4 Energy from Mixed Residual Waste

Energy from Waste (EfW), also known as Waste to Energy (WtE), and Alternative Treatment Technology (ATT) involves the heating or combustion of waste to extract energy, heat, and potentially other by-products. There are a wide range of technology types including mass-burn incineration, fluidised bed incineration, gasification, pyrolysis, torrefaction, steam reforming, plasma arc, hydrothermal oxidation, autoclaving etc. Within each of these broad technology types there are a large range of variants, hybrid technologies and proprietary processes. Each of these processes have certain strengths and weaknesses and may be more or less suited for different feedstocks and/or scales of operation. The main benefits claimed for EfW technologies are that they generate energy from mixed waste materials and reduce the quantities sent to landfill. It is beyond the scope of the current paper to evaluate the potential role of EfW or the particular technologies.

⁴⁴ Scion wood energy industrial symbiosis. From:
<https://www.scionresearch.com/science/bioenergy/towards-biorefining>

There is no large-scale incineration or other forms of energy generation from mixed waste in New Zealand at present, although there have been, and continue to be, a number of efforts to establish EfW facilities.

The principal reason for the lack of EfW facilities for mixed residual waste in NZ up to this point appears to be their relatively high cost compared to large-scale landfill. Internationally EfW facilities are associated with electricity generation which is not an economic proposition in New Zealand where electricity can be produced from other lower cost renewable resources.

17.0 Cross-Cutting Themes

17.1 Introduction

While compiling this report, it became clear that the boundaries between the different material/activity types used for the stocktake were sometimes arbitrary (e.g. organics and energy recovery, or glass and reusable containers). Furthermore, various issues and responses recurred across material streams. This section collates and elaborates on some of these key themes.

This section, while informed by the stakeholders, represents Eunomia's analysis of key dynamics and themes that emerged from the stocktake. Our observations are offered to assist the Ministry in deepening its understanding of the sector, but are not necessarily the only lens that could be placed on the information. These observations are not intended to constitute advice or recommendations.

17.2 Material Management Dynamics

Perhaps the most obvious theme is that a number of key materials, in particular the commodities of plastic, paper, metal, and glass - often follow the same pathways from production/import, consumption, collection, and recovery, and may be substitutable in their functions. Key themes in this respect are noted below.

17.2.1 Packaging

Packaging can be made of a range of materials, but most commonly plastic, paper, metal, and glass. For example, beverages can be packaged in glass bottles, plastic bottles, aluminium cans, or paper (e.g. liquid paper board containers). Sometimes a packaging type will be a composite of different materials (such as tetrapak, which includes plastic, paper and metal). The dynamics of one type of packaging material can affect others.

The configuration of initiatives such as CRS, restricting the use of certain polymer types, and product stewardship schemes for specific packaging types could therefore affect not only the products and materials implicitly covered, but also those which could subsequently be used as alternatives. Without a thorough appreciation and addressing of these dynamics, there is the potential for policy initiatives to result in unintended consequences - such as product packaging moving from plastic to less recyclable multi-material packaging.

The interrelated impacts of the different packaging materials suggests that a material-agnostic approach to addressing packaging waste, could be a valid approach. For example, a CRS design may include all beverage containers within the design scope, regardless of material composition. On the flipside, attempts to formulate policy approaches to packaging through the lens of one material may reduce the flexibility needed to develop a comprehensive and coherent approach across the packaging

system. For example, the decision to declare only plastic packaging a priority product, rather than all packaging.

Focusing on material streams rather than product types can also obscure possible opportunities for waste reduction within a product category. This becomes more obvious when looking at the systems through which a particular product, like packaging flows. For example, most packaging currently follows a linear pathway, regardless of the material it is made from. Our analysis of reusable packaging, which is not focused on a particular material stream, provides one example of how a material agnostic view of packaging can bring to the fore new, more circular, approaches to addressing packaging waste, while highlighting infrastructural gaps that have previously received less attention.

17.2.2 Collections

A common theme across the commodity materials was how recycling collection methodologies can affect material quality. The standardisation of kerbside collection was put forward as a key initiative across the recycling and organic material streams. Standardisation of collections is expected to not only lead to a more consistent set of materials being collected, which could potentially improve economies of scale for those materials, but also result in better material quality by reducing consumer confusion and lowering contamination rates. In some cases, the introduction of kerbside standardisation could have a very significant impact on infrastructure recommendations for certain materials, such as fibre.

Other means of reducing contamination while also lifting recovery rates were raised by various stakeholders. These included deposit/return systems (for example, for beverage containers), ongoing efforts to phase-out hard-to-recycle contaminants (such as PVC in consumer packaging), or the establishing a coordinated approach that can deliver more regular and consistent communications to the public about what is and what is not recyclable.

17.2.3 Material Recovery Facilities

Material recovery facilities (MRFs) handle a range of material types (e.g. paper/plastic/glass/metal). How MRFs are operated therefore has potential impacts across these material streams. The operation of MRFs includes decisions around variables such as whether sorts are positive or negative for particular grades, line speed, technology, facility sizing and staffing levels, screening for contamination, and accepted contamination levels for particular markets. These can all affect the viability of operations (particularly under different market conditions) and the quality of material produced.

Decisions made in respect of investment in MRF infrastructure (for example providing funding for upgrades, or seeking development of regional facilities), will also impact decisions across other parts of the material value chain – such as collection

methodologies, householder education, material acceptance, standardisation of services etc.

17.2.4 Waste to Energy

Waste to energy (WtE) covers a wide range of technologies that generally use some form of thermal process to extract energy (and potentially other by-products) from waste materials. WtE processes were put forward by a number of stakeholders as an alternative to landfill and as a potential way to extract value from lower quality feedstocks, which may not have viable recycling or recovery markets. Potential feedstocks that were noted include low-value plastics, tyres, mixed paper, and woody organic materials (for example, to produce biochar).

It is, however, beyond the scope of the present work to assess the viability of these proposals. As these types of processes could potentially accept a range of feedstocks, conducting a comprehensive assessment of their potential would be of relevance to a number of material areas. There are a range of factors that need to be taken into consideration (such as cost, technology type, feedstocks, alternatives, carbon and other environmental impacts etc.), and any such proposals are likely going need to be considered on an individual basis.

17.3 Waste Sector Market Dynamics

A vital dimension to understanding how each of the sectors operates and how infrastructure investment provision may be viewed, is to understand how the waste sector currently operates in practical and commercial terms. This section provides a high-level overview of these dynamics.

17.3.1 The Rise of Complexity and the Private Sector

Activity within the waste sector is predominantly undertaken by three different types of organisations – territorial authorities, the private sector, and the community sector. Each type of organisation tends to play different roles, which have evolved over time in response to changing market environments.

17.3.2 Territorial Authorities

Territorial authorities (TAs) have statutory responsibilities for waste management and planning. However, beyond the need to plan for waste management and minimisation (as provided under the WMA), the methods used to meet these obligations vary. A small number of TAs elect to provide no waste or recycling collections, leaving this function to the private sector. The majority of TAs however do provide household rubbish and recycling services, with a growing number also providing some form of organic waste collection. Many TAs also own some waste infrastructure, such as transfer stations, composting operations, and landfills. With only a few exceptions, operation of these services and facilities are contracted out to external organisations – once again, usually the private sector.

TAs' actions in the waste sector are driven by two key considerations – the need to fulfil their statutory obligations in respect of waste, and the need to meet the expectations of their communities which relate to service levels, but also cost. TAs therefore tend to have a locally focused view of waste issues and, even where individual officers may take a wider view, the mandate (and budgets) of officers (or indeed the council generally) usually only extends to ensuring these local considerations are met. Furthermore, many councils have a focus on waste minimisation and are expected to develop Waste Management and Minimisation Plans that at least consider the waste hierarchy (s 44). However, in practice, TAs do not have the relevant regulatory powers, legislative mandate nor resources to achieve policy or infrastructural outcomes at the top of the waste hierarchy.

A further factor is that TAs can often be resource-constrained in their ability to take a proactive role in waste minimisation. While there is a growing recognition of the need for specialist waste minimisation roles within councils, for many of the smaller TAs, waste is still one part of a council engineer's or contract manager's role. Consequently, technical knowledge around waste and resource recovery (e.g. MRF or transfer station design) increasingly resides outside of council. This situation is exacerbated by the drive towards increasing waste minimisation, which is making the sector more complex.

In terms of infrastructure provision, these factors have generally meant that, except where TAs have historical assets, TAs' role in infrastructure, particularly in developing new infrastructure, is limited, and has been diminishing. TAs may own infrastructure (or enter into some form of partnership arrangement) related to delivery of council services, such as a MRF or a composting facility, but the assets are likely to be limited to these roles. A particular issue is that many smaller councils do not have the scale, capital, or capacity to develop infrastructure on their own, and there are few existing structures or mechanisms that enable effective joint-working and the sharing of assets.

17.3.3 Private Sector

Not only is the private sector the primary provider of council-contracted services, but it also provides services to industry and business and, in many cases, competes with council services for the household rubbish collection market. It is a critical factor in waste market dynamics that the vast majority of the waste and recovered material in New Zealand is controlled by the private sector.⁴⁵

The main motivating factor for the private sector is the need to be commercially viable. This has both positive and negative impacts in the context of waste and resource recovery. The positive impacts are the ongoing drive for efficiency and innovation, which has been responsible for many recent advances in resource recovery (e.g. MRF

⁴⁵ For example, in 2009 it was estimated that the private sector controlled 90% of all waste and recovered materials in Auckland. [Eunomia, SKM, Waste Not (2009) *Auckland Region Waste Stocktake & Strategic Assessment*, Report for Auckland Regional Council]

technology, container types, finding new markets for materials), and increased consumer access to a wide range of services. The private sector's access to substantial capital has resulted in investment in new resource recovery technology, improved environmental performance of landfills, and increased work across council boundaries.

On the downside, the private sector's incentive to divert material is limited by its need for commercial viability. Where it is marginal or unprofitable to divert material, this generally won't be undertaken by the private sector without some form of public subsidy. The private sector also tends to invest in infrastructure and deliver services where it makes sense within their business model - which is not necessarily the same as where it makes sense overall. This has led to both duplication and service/infrastructure gaps and a range of different approaches and levels of service across the country.

Another emerging theme is that a larger proportion of the private sector is involved in waste minimisation than may be obvious, but many of these businesses are not included or involved as stakeholders in the development of waste policy or infrastructure. Traditionally, conversations around waste and the private sector have focused on businesses that collect and re-process waste and recycle or who control or run waste and resource recovery facilities. However, this is a narrow view of the private sector's role as the circular economy and zero waste continue to grow in prominence. A growing number of businesses are operating in the 'reuse economy', with the specific aim of preventing or reducing waste. This suggests there could be benefit in widening the range of private sector stakeholders that TAs and government liaise with when developing waste policy and infrastructure (This is further discussed in 17.3.6 below).

17.3.4 Community Sector

In terms of the quantity of materials handled, the community sector plays a minor role in the waste sector in NZ, although this varies across material streams and product categories. For example, the community sector is well-represented in the re-processing of electrical and electronic goods. While a range of community sector organisations deliver services around NZ, with some exceptions, most of these groups are focused on reuse and community-scale resource recovery. However, in terms of leadership and community engagement, the role of the community sector has been vital. The sector has led the way in terms of recovered material quality (particularly through the promotion of the source separation of materials), the ability to generate high rates of resource recovery, and continuing to advocate for interventions at the top of the waste hierarchy.

The motivation of the community sector is usually two-fold: to reduce environmental impacts through maximising resource recovery; and to generate community benefit through employment, upskilling of the workforce, raising awareness, and providing access to low-cost consumer items. This approach has allowed the community sector to 'dig deeper' into the waste stream. However, the community sector is usually resource-constrained and lacks the capital to invest in infrastructure. This has limited the role of the community sector, and hence the ability for what it offers to be applied more widely.

17.3.5 Market Dominance

Within the private sector itself, there is a further dynamic that is worth exploring - the market dominance of the two large waste companies: Waste Management NZ Ltd and EnviroWaste Services Ltd. It is difficult to calculate their share of the sector (as it depends largely on how this is defined). However, we estimate that across the core waste and recycling activities, the companies together control in the order of two-thirds of all material at any stage of the process from collections to disposal. They are involved across most areas of activity in the sector, including household collections, commercial collections, transfer stations, disposal, MRFs, organic waste processing, and hazardous wastes.

This level of market influence is a significant factor in the dynamics of the industry. In essence, the plans and strategies of these two companies will, by their nature, have a significant impact on the sector. For example, if they decide to invest for a circular economy future, this could drive significant change, or conversely, if they decide to favour a linear economy model, this could be an impediment to this type of change.

A key feature of these companies is that they are 'vertically integrated'. In other words, they provide a full range of services across the waste and resource recovery processes from collection, bulking, sorting, re-processing, and sale of commodities, through to disposal. This vertical integration affords them advantages in the marketplace, as they are able to design services efficiently as end-to-end processes and determine where the cumulative profit centres are (i.e. they don't have to be profitable at each step as long as they are able to maximise profit overall).

In the disposal market this becomes a particular factor. The construction of large landfills requires high levels of capital investment. The landfills represent significant assets, which must generate a return on investment. Because fixed costs expand at a lower rate relative to the landfill airspace, the larger the landfill the lower the capex cost per cubic metre of airspace will be.

Once the initial construction phase of a large landfill is completed, the marginal costs of disposal per tonne are low. The need to provide a return on investment for the landfill asset incentivises landfill owners to fill up their landfills as quickly as possible.⁴⁶

Combined with low capex and opex costs per tonne, large landfill owners are able to vary their pricing to maintain flows of material into their facilities. The ability to access low landfill costs internally also means they can utilise the landfill asset to compete aggressively in collection and transfer station markets.

⁴⁶ This incentive, however, may be reduced by the owner's need to complete a new landfill when an existing facility is nearing the end of its operational life. For example, Waste Management needs to extend the life of its Redvale Landfill, north of Auckland, until a replacement facility, currently planned for Dome Valley, is operational.

17.3.6 Sector Innovation

A further theme to emerge from the stocktake was that a lot of the innovation in the sector appears to be coming from outside the sector – i.e. not from waste and resource recovery businesses and organisations, but from other types of businesses. At present, because these businesses are not traditionally viewed as relevant to waste and resource recovery, their perspectives, infrastructural needs, and possible circular solutions to critical waste problems are not often heard, recognised or considered in the development of waste policy or investment decisions, which may signal a missed opportunity in light of the growing importance of the circular economy in national and international policy.

Waste and resource recovery organisations tend to view waste materials from the perspective of supply – in other words, they identify a quantity of waste/scrap material that must be managed and look for options for recovery or disposal. The options for recovery or disposal tend to be existing markets, facilities, or processes.

Businesses outside of the waste sector that are successfully driving innovation in waste minimisation tend to focus on the market or customer for the product or service. These businesses identify a potential demand for a product or service, then develop the product or service. In these situations, waste materials are simply a readily available source of feedstock (at a usually low -, no -, or negative cost), or alternatively their business model may avoid waste through reuse, providing less material intensive products, or replacing products with services. Rather than disposing of waste, these businesses are meeting a consumer demand in the most economic manner possible.⁴⁷

In addition, change is also being driven by large corporates looking at their environmental footprint and taking steps to address waste generation and sustainability through their own internal processes.

17.3.7 Community and Local vs Large Scale

A theme that emerged across almost all parts of the sector was a tension between local community-scale organisations and large operators. Many community -scale operators tend to be focused not just on waste minimisation but also on local benefits such as local employment, sustainability - including reducing transport emissions, providing high quality (e.g. artisan) products, and personal service. Larger scale operators on the other hand tend to focus on the total quantities, achieving economies of scale, and increasing standardisation. Community scale operators view their approach as more aligned with a circular economy model, while the large operators tend to hold the view that to make a big difference in terms of waste minimisation large tonnages are required. The question of the degree to which small scale type approaches can ‘scale-up’ to make a difference

⁴⁷ It should be noted that innovation does not necessarily lead to waste minimisation. For example, multi-material products and packaging, single use, products, waste disposal technologies,

at a national level is one that would be worthwhile examining further in the circular economy context.

17.3.8 Tackling the Hierarchy & Circular Economy

When considering waste infrastructure, the primary focus in the study has been on recycling and recovery (e.g. composting), with relatively niche consideration of waste reduction and reuse. However, higher in hierarchy actions did emerge as a consistent theme and are important to consider in the context of waste infrastructure.

The potential of implementing higher in hierarchy solutions was particularly noted in the fibre, electrical and electronic goods, reusable packaging, and resource recovery centre sections. However, the challenges of widescale adoption of these types of solutions was also evident. These challenges include establishment costs (such as purchasing a fleet of reusable bottles), lower in hierarchy options being able to externalise their costs (such as the cost of disposal or recycling), a lack of consumer awareness and acceptance, scale, and finding appropriate business models.

Higher in hierarchy activities, while often requiring some infrastructure themselves (e.g. reuse stores, bottle washing plants, repair and refurbishment shops etc.) have a potential impact on other infrastructure through reducing the quantity of material in the system that needs to be recovered or recycled. It will be important to consider the balance of infrastructure that is required if the economy shifts to a more circular model, where there may be less material requiring recycling or recovery. Large recycling or re-processing facilities, sized for current or expanding amounts of material, could be oversized or stranded assets if circular economy outcomes are achieved. If a more circular economy approach is ultimately favoured it will be necessary to attempt to calculate and map these impacts and plan an appropriate transition pathway.

17.4 Material Markets

The viability of markets was a common theme across all material types. Resource recovery activity can be placed on a continuum, from those that are most readily recovered to those that are less recoverable:

- The most readily recovered materials are those that have high value and are generally seen as by-products rather than waste (for example abattoir wastes or offcuts from aluminium manufacturing).
- Next are materials that generally have a stable, long-term value that can support a recovery industry on purely commercial terms (e.g. metals, cardboard),
- There is a range of materials that have some value, but the value is not necessarily stable or is insufficient to support an industry without charges. This includes most of the 'commodities', such as plastic, glass, paper, and most organic waste. The charges are either in the form of public subsidies, such as council funded recycling collections, or charges to the customer.
- A number of materials have little, no, or negative value and require charges for recovery (if recovery is possible) or disposal. These materials include hazardous wastes, contaminated soils, and mixed municipal wastes.

For a material to be able to be recovered viably, there needs to be a stable market that at least matches the supply of that material. The existence of viable markets is therefore the key to resource recovery, as material value will enable and drive material recovery. Development of markets for the less valuable materials was a theme that emerged from the research as an important way to stimulate further recovery. This could include policy initiatives, such as material and recycled product standards, mandatory recycled content, and procurement policies. In other cases, phase outs of low value and difficult to recycle materials and exploration of alternatives, such as reusables, may be most appropriate.

A common theme across the main commodity types was the debate between the merits of local versus export markets. As has been well-documented, New Zealand's reliance on export markets for many grades of recovered material was highlighted by China's National Sword import restrictions. For a number of materials, in particular fibre and plastics, the potential for greater levels of onshore re-processing to add value to materials is under careful consideration. The expectation is not necessarily that there will be more end uses found for recycled materials in NZ, but that recovered material will be re-processed to a higher standard and therefore able to find end markets, whether local or export, more readily.

17.5 Climate Change

The impacts of climate change and climate change policy on the different material sectors was one of areas where stakeholder feedback was sought. Responses varied, from some seeing it as having little direct impact on their operations to others seeing direct potential impacts through things like increased transport and material costs, to others seeing it as an opportunity to promote the carbon benefits of their product or service.

Looking forward, it will be important to understand in detail the potential carbon impacts of different materials in relation to waste reduction, recycling and disposal. This will in turn impact decisions on where infrastructure investment should be made for maximum carbon benefit.

In our experience, because different materials have different carbon intensities through their life cycle, putting a climate change lens on waste activities can result in a different set of priorities from a waste minimisation approach that tends to focus on quantities of materials. Broadly speaking however, higher in hierarchy options tend to be favoured as they can achieve a multiplier of benefit through the value chain. Put simply, not producing a product or material avoids the emissions associated with its production, packaging, transport and logistics, use, and end of life management.

Solutions that seek to reduce end of life climate impacts (for example energy recovery, mechanical biological treatment, landfill gas capture etc.) can, by their nature, only affect the end-of-life phase, and are therefore limited in their ability to reduce overall emissions.

Work undertaken by Eunomia in 2019 on marginal abatement cost curves (MACC) for reducing carbon impacts from waste found that food waste prevention is the most cost-effective abatement measure, whilst implementing a biostabilisation phase prior to disposal to landfill has the greatest potential to cut sectoral emissions.⁴⁸

17.6 Other Themes

Other, less prevalent themes but ones still worth noting included:

- **Data.** A lack of adequate data, the difficulty of gathering data, and the importance of data for planning and evaluation were noted by a range of stakeholders across the different areas. The fact that this stocktake is being undertaken is a recognition of the lack of data, and its importance for future planning – in particular around infrastructure. While the stocktake has provided a more comprehensive picture than has previously been available, it has also highlighted the difficulties in gathering data (differences in measurement, record keeping, definitions, commercial sensitivity, what should be included or not etc.) It is also clear that the ability to gather consistent, regular data will be a key tool going forward.
- **Consents.** The time, costs, and difficulty in obtaining consents for waste infrastructure was raised as a barrier to infrastructure investment by a number of operators. It was seen to increase risk, (for example land needs to be purchased or leased before consents can be obtained but there is no guarantee this will be possible, or the time or cost involved), cost, and make the business case more difficult.


17.7 Comparative Quantities

This section provides a brief overview of the relative quantities of materials reviewed in this stocktake. This will help develop an in understanding of the relative quantum, in tonnage terms, of the potential issues and opportunities for each material type.

The chart below shows the quantities of materials recovered onshore, exported for recovery, landfilled in class 1 disposal facilities and sent to class 2-5 and on-farm disposal.

⁴⁸ Eunomia (2019) Waste MACC - An analysis of greenhouse gas abatement options for New Zealand's waste sector. Report for Ministry for the Environment

Figure 20: Tonnes Recovered and Disposed



Note: ‘Other’ includes textiles, sanitary paper, and special wastes which were not included in this stocktake.

Overall onshore recovery accounts for 23% (2.8m tonnes) of all material managed, while exports result in another 9% of material (1m tonnes) recovered. 28% of these materials (3.4m tonnes) are sent to Class 1 disposal⁴⁹ and 40% (4.65m tonnes) goes to ‘other disposal’. Other disposal includes Class 2-5 disposal, on-farm disposal, and system losses.

The above chart highlights how the relative quantities from each material stream are managed. The two largest material streams are organics and C&D waste. Close to half of organic material is estimated to be recovered, with other disposal, primarily on farm management and disposal, accounting for the majority of the remainder. The key feature in terms of C&D waste is that, although large quantities are recovered, this is dwarfed by the quantity going to disposal – primarily class 2-5 disposal. Fibre and metals also have high levels of recovery, although they are both heavily dependent on export for recovery. Glass has a high proportion of onshore recovery, but still loses a substantial portion of material to disposal. Plastic stands out as having the lowest levels

⁴⁹Tonnages for total disposal to Class 1 landfill calculated in this study do not align exactly with total tonnages to Class 1 landfill noted in 15.3. The disposal figure in 15.3 was derived from 2018 levy data. The disposal figure calculated here was based on a number of sources which calculated disposal figures for specific material types (most notably C&D waste and plastics), which differed from those derived from the latest composition data.

of recovery and relatively large quantities. Tyres, farm plastics, and electrical and electronic goods have low rates of recovery but also relatively low quantities.

17.8 Common Policy Levers

While there are a diversity of material types and issues unique to each sector, many of the policy solutions put forward by stakeholders were similar. Key solutions that were noted include (in no particular order):

- **Standards** - Introducing standards for material quality or processes was seen as a potential tool to improve consumer confidence and grow markets. Examples put forward were compost products, recycled aggregate, recycled content requirements for plastic products, right to repair for electronic items, and use of tyre-derived products.
- **Landfill bans** - The straightforward banning of a material type from landfill was raised as a potential tool to stimulate recovery for a number of materials including organics, e-waste, non-recyclable packaging materials, and tyres.
- **Levy** - The raising and extending of the landfill levy could potentially impact all waste streams. Raising and extending the levy will tend to have the greatest impact on the heaviest and most common materials, but a reduced impact on less common, but still potentially problematic, materials, such as e-waste and hazardous wastes.
- **Reduction** - Virtually all sectors noted the potential to reduce the levels of residual waste by addressing the production of the materials in the first place. This was noted particularly strongly in relation to packaging and the potential for reusable packaging systems to assist in reducing to quantity of disposable packaging.
- **Product stewardship** - As with waste reduction, the introduction of product stewardship as a policy response was widely noted. Key materials included e-waste, farm plastics, glass, paper, plastic, and tyres.
- **Kerbside standardisation** - The potential to standardise kerbside collection systems and improve the quality and quantity of material collected was raised in relation to organics, paper, glass, plastic and cans, as well as being noted in relation to collections.
- **Regional infrastructure bodies** - Establishing an effective mechanism for delivery of infrastructure at a regional level (or similar) would address the question of scale and offer a planned approach to infrastructure provision. This could apply to resource recovery facilities and transfer stations, organic waste processing facilities, MRFs, and construction and demolition sorting facilities.
- **Central delivery agency** - A delivery focused quasi-government agency (such as EECA in the energy sector, or WRAP from the UK), that could coordinate behaviour change, kerbside standardisation, recovered material markets research etc. could have a role across a range of material streams.

- **Purchasing policies** - The public sector can potentially play a role in stimulating the demand for products made from recovered materials. This was noted in relation to organics, plastics, paper, and C&D waste streams.

17.9 Summary: Everything Works as a System

The overarching theme to emerge from the research is that the different elements of the waste sector, and, for that matter, waste infrastructure, are difficult to separate in reality.

This came through strongly when considering infrastructure gaps. For example, a lack of onshore re-processing capacity may be identified as an infrastructure gap. However, the options to address this gap are not necessarily solely infrastructure options (such as developing more onshore re-processing capacity). Options could include reducing the quantity of material placed on the market (e.g. through banning junk mail or eliminating the use of certain polymer types in plastic packaging), developing less material intensive packaging systems (i.e. reusable and refillable packaging systems, where appropriate), improving collection systems to generate higher grades of material (which would then have wider market access), improving sorting infrastructure (again to produce higher grades of material), or seeking alternative markets or uses for material (for example, energy recovery).

Similarly, material types often co-exist in systems, such as through kerbside collections, transfer stations, MRFs or energy recovery processes, which have been considered separately in this research. As a result, initiatives that relate to one of these systems will affect a range of material types.

Another way in which materials are related is through substitution. For example, packaging can be manufactured from a range of materials including paper, plastic, metal, and glass. Attempts to control or promote one type of packaging could lead to impacts on other types of packaging.

Finally, waste arises as part of a larger system of human activity. It is almost impossible to isolate what happens in the waste sector from national and international forces and trends. The impact of China National Sword and the changes resulting from Covid-19 nationally and globally are recent examples. Technological changes and societal expectations, such as sustainability or the desire for convenience, are other trends that will continue to shape the sector, as are political considerations, such as employment and developing regional economies.